

LIBRARY · OF · THE
DEPARTMENT · OF
EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
CANADA



CALL No.

ROOM

JX1977.2

C3

1948

43.205.226

Dept. of External Affairs
Min. des Affaires extérieures

MAY 15 1991

RETURN TO DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARY
RETOURNER A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE DU MINISTÈRE

CANADA

and the

UNITED NATIONS

1963

REPORT

OF THE

UNITED NATIONS

1962

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OTTAWA, CANADA

CONFERENCE SERIES 1963, No. 1



OTTAWA
PRINTED AND BOUND BY THE KING'S PRINTER
CONTROLLER OF PRINTING

89745
2

CANADA
and the
UNITED NATIONS

1948

REPORT
on the
UNITED NATIONS

1948

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OTTAWA, CANADA

CONFERENCE SERIES 1948, No. 1



OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY

1949

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE - The Secretary of the United Nations

Page

ANNUAL SURVEY

13

MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Annexure to Memorandum

Annexure to Memorandum of the Governor General

Annexure to the Memorandum of the Secretary of State

To His Excellency

The Governor General in Council

YOUR EXCELLENCY:

I have the honour to lay before your Excellency the attached annual report, "Canada and the United Nations, 1948".

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your Excellency's obedient servant,

L. B. PEARSON

Secretary of State for External Affairs.

OTTAWA, February 3, 1949.

To His Excellency
The Governor General in Council

Your Excellency:

I have the honour to lay before your Excellency the attached annual
report, "Canada and the United Nations, 1948".

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your Excellency's obedient servant.

L. B. PEARSON
Secretary of State for External Affairs

OTTAWA, February 1, 1949.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE—The Structure of the United Nations.....	7
GENERAL SURVEY.....	13
I MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNITED NATIONS	
1. Applications for Membership.....	27
2. Election of Officers of the General Assembly.....	29
3. Elections to the Security Council.....	30
4. Elections to the Economic and Social Council.....	31
5. Elections to the International Court of Justice.....	32
6. Elections to the International Law Commission.....	33
II POLITICAL AND SECURITY QUESTIONS	
1. Atomic Energy.....	37
2. Berlin.....	42
3. Czechoslovakia.....	46
4. Disarmament.....	48
5. Greece.....	51
6. Guard Force.....	54
7. Indians in the Union of South Africa.....	55
8. India-Pakistan Dispute.....	56
9. Indonesia.....	59
10. Interim Committee.....	64
11. Korea.....	67
12. Mexican Proposals for Peace.....	72
13. Military Staff Committee.....	73
14. Palestine.....	74
15. Spanish Question.....	78
16. Trieste: Governorship.....	79
17. Trieste: Yugoslav Complaint.....	81
III ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS	
1. The First Three Years of the Economic and Social Council.....	85
2. Commissions of the Economic and Social Council:	
a) Commission on Human Rights.....	90
b) Commission on the Status of Women.....	91
c) Economic and Employment Commission.....	93
d) Fiscal Commission.....	95
e) Narcotics Control.....	96
f) Population Commission.....	99
g) Social Commission.....	99
h) Statistical Commission.....	101
i) Transport and Communications Commission.....	102
j) Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.....	103
k) Economic Commission for Europe.....	105
l) Economic Commission for Latin America.....	107
3. Freedom of Information.....	108
4. International Children's Emergency Fund.....	110
5. Migration.....	112

III ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS— <i>Continued</i>	PAGE
6. United Nations Appeal for Children.....	113
7. Co-ordination of the Work of the Economic and Social Council.....	115
 IV SPECIALIZED AGENCIES	
1. Food and Agriculture Organization.....	121
2. Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organization	124
3. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	126
4. International Civil Aviation Organization.....	128
5. International Labour Organization.....	130
6. International Monetary Fund.....	132
7. International Refugee Organization.....	134
8. International Telecommunications Union.....	137
9. International Trade Organization.....	138
10. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.....	142
11. Universal Postal Union.....	144
12. World Health Organization.....	145
 V TRUSTEESHIP	
1. Non-Self-Governing Territories.....	149
2. South West Africa.....	151
3. Strategic Areas.....	153
4. The Trusteeship System.....	155
 VI ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS	
1. Report of the Board of Auditors.....	161
2. Budget of the United Nations.....	162
a) Budget for 1949.....	162
b) Supplementary Expenditures for 1948.....	166
3. The Working Capital Fund.....	168
4. Scale of Contributions to the Budget.....	170
5. Transfer of Assets of the League of Nations.....	172
6. Other Administrative and Budgetary Questions:	
a) Payment of Travelling Expenses and Subsistence Allowances.....	173
b) Transfer to the United Nations of Residual Assets and Activities of UNRRA.....	173
c) Use of Spanish as a Working Language.....	173
d) Training in Public Administration.....	174
e) United Nations Postal Services.....	174
f) United Nations Telecommunications System.....	175
7. Appointments to Standing Committees of the General Assembly.....	177
8. Questions Relating to the Secretariat:	
a) United Nations Staff Pension Scheme.....	179
b) Tax Equalization.....	179
c) Composition of the Secretariat and the Principle of Geographical Distribution.....	180
d) Salaries and Allowances.....	181
e) Expatriation Allowances.....	181
f) Cost-of-living Bonus and Administrative Tribunal...	181

VI ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS— PAGE
Continued

9. Budgetary and Financial Co-ordination of the Specialized Agencies.....	182
10. Permanent Headquarters of the United Nations.....	184

VII LEGAL QUESTIONS

1. Chilean Complaint against the U.S.S.R.....	189
2. Genocide.....	191
3. Privileges and Immunities.....	193
4. Registration and Publication of Treaties and International Agreements.....	195
5. The International Court of Justice.....	196

VIII APPENDICES

(I) GENERAL

A. Statement by the Chairman of the Canadian Delegation in the Opening Debate in the General Assembly, September 28, 1948.....	199
B. Statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the House of Commons, April 29, 1948.....	204

(II) POLITICAL

A. Canadian Statement, Ad Hoc Political Committee, November 22, 1948: Admission of New Members.....	207
B. (1) Canadian Statement, First Committee, September 30, 1948: Atomic Energy.....	208
(2) Canadian Statement, General Assembly, November 4, 1948: Atomic Energy.....	210
(3) General Assembly Resolution, November 4, 1948: Atomic Energy.....	212
C. Canadian Statement, Security Council, October 15, 1948: Berlin.....	213
D. Canadian Statement, Security Council, March 31, 1948: Czechoslovakia.....	214
E. (1) Canadian Statement, First Committee, October 11, 1948: Disarmament.....	215
(2) General Assembly Resolution, November 19, 1948: Disarmament.....	219
F. (1) Security Council Resolution, April 21, 1948: India-Pakistan.....	219
(2) Canadian Statement, Security Council, April 17, 1948: India-Pakistan.....	223
G. Security Council Resolution, February 28, 1948: Indonesia	224
H. (1) Canadian Statement, Interim Committee, July 9, 1948: Voting Procedure in the Security Council...	224
(2) Canadian Statement, Ad Hoc Political Committee, November 17, 1948: Interim Committee.....	226
I. (1) Canadian Statement, General Assembly, December 12, 1948: Korea.....	227
(2) General Assembly Resolution, December 12, 1948: Korea.....	228

	PAGE
(II) POLITICAL— <i>Continued</i>	
J. (1) Canadian Statement, Security Council, March 24, 1948: Suspension of Partition Plan for Palestine...	230
(2) General Assembly Resolution, May 14, 1948: Appointment and Terms of Reference of a United Nations Mediator in Palestine.....	232
(3) Security Council Resolution, May 29, 1948: Palestine	233
(4) Security Council Resolution, July 15, 1948: Palestine	234
(5) Security Council Resolution, November 16, 1948: Palestine.....	235
(6) Canadian Statement, First Committee, November 22, 1948: Palestine.....	236
(7) General Assembly Resolution, December 11, 1948: Palestine, Progress Report of the United Nations Mediator.....	240
(8) Canadian Statement, Security Council, December 2, 1948: Admission of Israel to the United Nations...	243
(9) Canadian Statement, Security Council, December 17, 1948: Admission of Israel to the United Nations..	244
(III) ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL	
A. Canadian Statement, Second Committee, October 18, 1948: Work of the Economic and Social Council.....	246
B. Canadian Statement, General Assembly, December 10, 1948: Declaration of Human Rights.....	247
C. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as approved by the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, December 10, 1948.....	249
(IV) ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY	
A. Canadian Statement, Fifth Committee, September 26, 1948: Budget of the United Nations.....	256
B. Canadian Statement, Fifth Committee, September 29, 1948: Scale of Contributions.....	258
(V) LEGAL	
A. Canadian Statement, Sixth Committee, December 7, 1948: Chilean Complaint against the U.S.S.R.....	261
B. General Assembly Resolutions, December 9, 1948: Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide....	263
(VI) MEMBERS OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, THE SECURITY COUNCIL, THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL, THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL, THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE AND OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.....	268
(VII) LIST OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS IN CONSULTATIVE STATUS WITH THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL	273
(VIII) PUBLICATIONS DURING 1948 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS ON THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES.....	275
(IX) UNITED NATIONS DOCUMENTS, 1948: A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	278

PREFACE

THE STRUCTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Principal Organs

The General Assembly

The General Assembly consists of the fifty-eight states which are members of the United Nations. Each member has one vote in the Assembly. Each member may send to a session of the Assembly five representatives, five alternate representatives and as many advisers and experts as it considers necessary.

The regular annual session of the General Assembly begins each year on the third Tuesday of September. Special sessions may also be held. Thus a special session was held to discuss the Palestine question in April-May, 1948.

Each regular session opens with a general debate, during which the head of each delegation may make a statement indicating the views of his government on the international situation in general, and on the items on the agenda in particular. The items on the agenda are then referred to the committees of the Assembly. The committees, after considering the items referred to them, report their conclusions, together with any resolutions they may have prepared, to the Assembly for final consideration.

The Assembly has six main committees, on which each delegation is represented:—

- First Committee—Political and Security;
- Second Committee—Economic and Financial;
- Third Committee—Social, Humanitarian and Cultural;
- Fourth Committee—Trusteeship;
- Fifth Committee—Administrative and Budgetary;
- Sixth Committee—Legal.

At the first part of its third session the General Assembly created an Ad Hoc Political Committee to consider a number of items on the agenda of the First Committee which, it seemed certain, would not be able to complete all the business with which it was charged.

The Assembly also has two procedural committees: a steering committee called the General Committee, consisting of the President of the Assembly, the seven Vice-presidents, and the Chairmen of the six committees (these officers are elected at each session); and a Credentials Committee, consisting of nine members elected at the beginning of each session of the General Assembly to verify the credentials of delegates.

There are also four Standing Committees which have been established to deal with continuing problems. They are;

1. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions
2. Committee on Contributions
3. Board of Auditors
4. International Law Commission.

In addition, the General Assembly or any of its committees may establish committees and commissions for special purposes. Among others, the following special committees and commissions are now functioning:

1. The Interim Committee
2. The United Nations Commission on Korea
3. The United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans
4. Special Committee on Information transmitted under Article 73e of the Charter
5. Headquarters Advisory Committee.

Committees take decisions by a majority of the members present and voting. The Assembly decides important questions by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, and other questions by a majority.

The Security Council

The Security Council consists of five permanent members (China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States of America), and six non-permanent members selected for two-year terms by the Assembly at its regular annual session. Non-permanent members are not eligible for immediate re-election.¹ The Security Council is so organized as to be able to function continuously.

There are two Standing Committees of the Security Council with the same membership as the parent body. These are the Committee of Experts which was established to advise the Security Council on the application of its rules of procedure; and the Committee on the Admission of New Members, which examines all applications for membership in the United Nations.

The Military Staff Committee

The Military Staff Committee is a subsidiary organ of the Security Council. It consists of the Chiefs of Staff (or their representatives) of the permanent members of the Security Council.

The Commission for Conventional Armaments

The Commission for Conventional Armaments is composed of representatives of the eleven members of the Security Council. It considers and reports to the Council on proposals for the general regulation and reduction of armaments and armed forces. It may not, however, deal with matters within the competence of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Atomic Energy Commission

The Atomic Energy Commission was created by the General Assembly by a resolution of January 24, 1946, and is a subsidiary organ of the Assembly. It consists of six permanent members (Canada, China, France, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the U.S.A.), and the non-permanent members of the Security Council.

It is responsible for proposing specific solutions of the problems raised by the discovery of atomic energy and related matters. It submits its reports and recommendations to the Security Council and receives directions from the Council.

¹ Membership of the Security Council for 1949 is given in Appendix VI., pp., 268-272.

The Economic and Social Council

The Economic and Social Council consists of eighteen Members of the United Nations elected for three-year terms by the Assembly at its regular annual session. Members are eligible for immediate re-election.¹

It has established twelve commissions. The Council elects states as members of the commissions and each state nominates an expert to serve on the commission. They are:—

Economic and Employment	Social
Fiscal	Statistical
Human Rights	Status of Women
Narcotic Drugs	Transport and Communications
Population	

In addition there have been three commissions established to deal with problems relating to specific areas. They are:

- Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East
- Economic Commission for Europe
- Economic Commission for Latin America.

The International Children's Emergency Fund

The International Children's Emergency Fund was established by the General Assembly by a resolution of December 11, 1946, to provide assistance to children and adolescents, especially of countries which were victims of aggression. The Fund is administered by an Executive Director under policies established by an Executive Board, in accordance with principles laid down by the Economic and Social Council. The Executive Director is appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Executive Board is designated by the General Assembly and consists of the representatives of twenty-five member states and Switzerland which is not a member of the United Nations.

The Trusteeship Council

China, France, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the U.S.A. are permanent members of the Trusteeship Council. Australia, Belgium and New Zealand are also permanent members, since they administer trust territories. Any other state which becomes the administrator of a trust territory will become a permanent member of the Trusteeship Council. The Assembly elects to the Trusteeship Council whatever number of other states is required to create an equal balance in the Council between states which administer trust territories and those which do not. These elected members serve for three-year terms and are eligible for immediate re-election.²

The International Court of Justice

The International Court of Justice is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. It consists of fifteen judges, elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council for nine-year terms. Judges are eligible for immediate re-election.³

¹ Membership of the Economic and Social Council for 1949 is given in Appendix VI, pp. 268-272.

² The membership of the Trusteeship Council in 1949 is given in Appendix VI, p. 270.

³ The membership of the Court in 1949 is given in Appendix VI, p. 271.

Since, at the first election in February, 1946, all fifteen judges were being elected, it was necessary to choose by lot five to serve for nine years, five for six, and five for three. Five judges were therefore elected at the third regular session of the Assembly in 1948.¹

The seat of the Court is at The Hague, but the Court may sit elsewhere.

The Secretariat

The Secretariat consists of the Secretary-General (Mr. Trygve Lie), eight assistant secretaries-general, and about three thousand other members of the staff.

The Secretary-General is appointed for a five-year term by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council. He is eligible for appointment for a further five-year term. He appoints the other members of the Secretariat, under regulations established by the Assembly and in accordance with the provision of the Charter that the "paramount consideration . . . shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity".

The Secretariat is divided into eight departments, each of which is directed by an assistant secretary-general:

- (1) Security Council Affairs, Mr. A. A. Sobolev;
- (2) Economic Affairs, Mr. David Owen;
- (3) Social Affairs, Mr. Henri Laugier;
- (4) Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self Governing Territories, Dr. Victor Hoo;
- (5) Public Information, Mr. Benjamin Cohen;
- (6) Legal, Dr. Ivan Kerno;
- (7) Conference and General Services, Mr. Adrian Pelt;
- (8) Administrative and Financial Services, Mr. Byron Price.

Budget

The expenses of the United Nations are, at present, approximately \$41,650,000 (U.S.) a year. The budget must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly. The Assembly, also by a two-thirds vote, approves of the apportionment of the expenses among the Members of the U. N.

Constitution

The United Nations has a written constitution, the Charter of the United Nations, drawn up at the San Francisco Conference in 1945 on the basis of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals. This Constitution is supplemented by rules of procedure of the respective organs of the United Nations.

Formal amendments of the Charter come into force only when they have been adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and ratified by two-thirds of the members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council.

¹ For an account of the elections at the third session of the General Assembly see Section I, Chapter 5, p. 32.

Specialized Agencies

Specialized agencies are bodies which are not established by the Charter of the United Nations but are established by other inter-governmental agreements and have wide international responsibilities in economic, social, cultural, health and related fields. In order that their activities may be co-ordinated to a common end, they are brought into relationship with the United Nations by agreements negotiated with the agencies by the Economic and Social Council and approved by the General Assembly. Most of these agreements have already been concluded.

The thirteen existing or contemplated specialized agencies are:

- (1) Food and Agriculture Organization
- (2) Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organization
- (3) International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
- (4) International Civil Aviation Organization
- (5) International Labour Organization
- (6) International Monetary Fund
- (7) International Refugee Organization
- (8) International Telecommunications Union
- (9) International Trade Organization
- (10) United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
- (11) Universal Postal Union
- (12) World Health Organization
- (13) World Meteorological Organization

Ten are now in existence. It is expected that during 1949 the International Trade Organization and the Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organization will be established as specialized agencies.

Non-Governmental Organizations¹

The Economic and Social Council is given power by the Charter to make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with international economic, social, cultural, educational, health and related matters. A very large number of such organizations have applied for recognition.

The various organizations have been divided into three categories:

- (a) Organizations which have a basic interest in most of the activities of the Council, and are closely linked with the economic and social life of the areas which they represent.
- (b) Organizations which have a special competence, but are concerned specifically with only a few of the fields of activity covered by the Council.
- (c) Organizations which are primarily concerned with the development of public opinion, and with the dissemination of information.

¹ A list of non-governmental organizations that have been granted consultative status by the Economic and Social Council is given in Appendix VII, pp. 273-274.

General Survey

"Canada and the United Nations, 1945" is a record of the part played by Canada during 1945 in the work of the United Nations and its associated agencies. In the year 1945 following the establishment of the United Nations in 1945, Canada's main contribution was made to the Department of External Affairs of the work of the United Nations and its agencies. The main part of the work of the United Nations in 1945 was to bring about the formation of the United Nations as a whole in order to bring about the work of the United Nations in order to give a more complete picture of the part played by Canada.

It is not only that these events and the United Nations have made it clear that the high purposes of international co-operation which are set forth in the Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations are:

to secure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the extreme self-defence, and to employ international machinery for the settlement of international and social disputes of all peoples.

It may be said at this point to wonder, in the light of the experience of the year which has just passed, how the complex international machinery which has been established by the United Nations and its associated agencies, fulfils the main purposes for which it was created. In the "Survey" therefore the progress of the United Nations in dealing with the problems of the world is surveyed in a critical and objective way. In the following pages the progress of the United Nations in dealing with the following issues is surveyed: **General Survey.**

Political and Security Questions

Progress in solving political and security questions in the United Nations in the year 1945 has continued to be greatly hindered by the division of the world into Communist and non-Communist areas. Such a division is not only a world wide barrier which depends for its effect on the voluntary co-operation of all its members.

The great and continuing division between the Communist and the non-Communist world, and particularly between the Soviet Union and the United States, has been a great barrier to the United Nations in 1945. The Soviet Union and the United States, which were the two main powers in the world, continued to divide the work of the United Nations in 1945. In a number of ways in each matter of importance, and in the division of the work of the United Nations in the United Nations, the United States has been a great barrier to the work of the United Nations. The United States has been a great barrier to the work of the United Nations in the United Nations, particularly in the work of the United Nations in the United Nations, particularly in the work of the United Nations in the United Nations.

In the year 1945, the United Nations in the United Nations, which was the main purpose of the United Nations, was greatly hindered by the division of the world into Communist and non-Communist areas. The United Nations in the United Nations, particularly in the work of the United Nations in the United Nations, particularly in the work of the United Nations in the United Nations.

In the year 1945, the United Nations in the United Nations, which was the main purpose of the United Nations, was greatly hindered by the division of the world into Communist and non-Communist areas. The United Nations in the United Nations, particularly in the work of the United Nations in the United Nations, particularly in the work of the United Nations in the United Nations.

General Survey

"Canada and the United Nations, 1948" is a report of the part played by Canada, during 1948, in the work of the United Nations and its associated specialized agencies. In the two years following the establishment of the United Nations in 1945, annual reports were prepared by the Department of External Affairs on the work of the Canadian delegations to the General Assembly, the meetings of which provide an occasion for a review of the work of the United Nations. In this year's report an effort has been made to examine the activities of the United Nations as a whole throughout the year, in order to give a more complete picture of the part taken by Canada.

It is now more than three years since the United Nations undertook to carry out the high purposes of international co-operation which are described in the Preamble to the Charter in the following words:

to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples.

It may be useful at this time to consider, in the light of the experience of the year which has just passed, how the complex international machinery, which has been established by the United Nations and its associated specialized agencies, fulfils the main functions for which it was created. In this "Survey" therefore the progress in the United Nations in dealing with the problems of the current international situation is examined under the following heads: political and security, trusteeship, legal, administration and the budget.¹

Political and Security Questions

Progress in solving political and security questions in the United Nations in the past year has continued to be gravely retarded by the division of the world into Communist and non-Communist areas. Such a division is bound to affect seriously a world organization which depends for its effectiveness upon the voluntary co-operation of all its member states.

The great and continuing disagreement between the Communist and the non-Communist world, and particularly between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers, hung like a cloud over the General Assembly held in Paris in 1948. The Soviet Union and the states within its orbit have, throughout the year, but particularly in the General Assembly, continued to pursue their propaganda objective of representing the U.S.S.R. as a champion of peace in such matters as disarmament, and as the defender of the United Nations against what are termed disruptive efforts to curtail the use of the veto in the Security Council. They have tried to represent the Western Powers as imperialist, and their leaders as war-mongers, threatening the national sovereignty and independence of small nations and the peace of the world.

In the circumstances, on almost every important subject which was discussed during the recent session of the General Assembly, accommodation or agreement was impossible. The Canadian delegation to the General

¹ An appreciation of the Economic and Social work of the United Nations during the past three years is given in Section III, Chapter I, pp. 85-89.

Assembly had therefore to limit its objectives. In the continuing debate on the way in which the world should be organized politically, economically and socially, the Canadian delegation was at pains to state its position clearly and to communicate its views on world organization in precise terms in order that these views might carry conviction to others who were willing to listen. For it cannot be assumed that agreement in support of the purposes and principles of the Charter will come automatically. The merits of the case have to be argued in the democratic manner in order that the Members of the United Nations who are willing to co-operate may do so with conviction and to good effect. For unity by agreement of all peace-loving states in the General Assembly on major political issues is in itself a condition which tends to prevent aggression.

The tensions resulting from the disagreements between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers were perhaps especially perceptible in Paris, where the meeting of the General Assembly was held this year, in such close proximity to the areas where the dispute between the East and West is focused at the present time. The fears arising from these tensions were frankly expressed in the General Assembly. For instance, the Belgian Prime Minister, M. Spaak, speaking for the Benelux countries in the opening debate in the General Assembly, said:

The Soviet delegate need not look for complicated explanations of our policy. I will tell him what is the basis of our policy—in terms, perhaps slightly cruel, but the ones a representative of a small nation uses: Do you know what is the basis of our policy? It is fear of you, fear of your government, fear of your policy!

The consequences of the division of the world between Communist and non-Communist areas, and the fears which have been engendered by the continued disagreement between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers, have had their greatest effect upon the security system of the United Nations. Under the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council was charged with the principal responsibility of maintaining international peace by collective action. The present basic weakness of the United Nations security system lies in the inability of the Security Council, because of the present lack of co-operation between the Great Powers, (especially illustrated in the exercise of the veto by the Soviet Union), to take action under Chapter VII of the Charter in the event of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or an act of aggression involving one of the Great Powers.

This co-operation between the Great Powers is required for two main reasons. In order that the Council may be able to reach a decision under Chapter VII, the permanent members must at least agree to abstain rather than to cast a negative vote. If they are not thus agreed, decision and action by the Council are impossible. The co-operation of the Great Powers is also required to establish the international armed forces which are called for under the Charter to give effect to Security Council decisions. So far, the Military Staff Committee, composed of the five permanent members of the Council, which has been working out plans to meet the military requirements of the Council, has completely failed to reach agreement because of basic differences of view between the Soviet Union on the one hand and the United Kingdom, the United States, France and China on the other.

It is concern over the powerlessness of the Council to act in the event of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or an act of aggression involving one of the Great Powers, which has led some of the Members of the United Nations, including Canada, to seek other methods, within the Charter, of obtaining security for themselves and for other peace-loving peoples. In a statement before the General Assembly in Paris on September 28, the Chairman of the Canadian delegation, Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King said:¹

Security for individual nations, under such circumstances, can be assured only by the effective co-operation, and the united power of those nations whose determination to maintain their freedom constitutes a strong bond of community between them. It is not surprising therefore that certain nations, knowing that their security depends on collective action in some form, and which are not yet able to achieve that security on the universal basis which the United Nations contemplates, should, pending this large accomplishment, seek to achieve their security on a less than universal basis.

The Charter of the United Nations expressly bases security upon collective action by the Members of the Organization. This indeed is the first and principal purpose of the United Nations.

Article 51 of the Charter however recognizes the "inherent" right of self-defence collectively as well as individually "until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security".

The year 1948 has seen continuing efforts to establish pacts of collective self-defence within the United Nations so that nations, by exercising their right of self-defence against aggression under Article 51, may make preparations in advance to deter aggression. It is on this basis that the pact between the Brussels Powers (the United Kingdom, France and Benelux) was signed on March 17, 1948. Consultations also began in 1948 on a diplomatic level, between the representatives of the Brussels Powers and the United States and Canada, with a view to a pact of collective self-defence of the nations in the North Atlantic. The treaty of Rio de Janeiro, binding the republics of the Western Hemisphere to mutual defence against aggression (negotiated in August-September, 1947) became operative on December 3, 1948 upon its ratification by the required two-thirds of its participating states.

Another important consequence of the division of the world into Communist and non-Communist areas has been that during the year no progress towards agreement has been possible on the important questions of the international control of atomic energy and of general disarmament.

This year the Soviet Union, while continuing to press for the immediate banning of atomic bombs, also introduced a proposal at the third session of the General Assembly that the five Great Powers should, as a preliminary to general disarmament, immediately reduce their armaments and armed forces by one-third.

The Western Powers on the other hand, remembering the costly experience of unilateral disarmament by peace-loving states in the years

¹ For the full text of Mr. King's statement see Appendix I-A, pp. 199-203. See also statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the House of Commons, April 29, 1948, Appendix I-B, pp. 204-206.

following the war of 1914-18, have insisted upon the principle that disarmament must follow—not precede—the establishment of an effective system of security.

This principle was asserted when the General Assembly rejected the Soviet proposal for a one-third reduction in the armed forces of the five Great Powers, and instead asked that the Commission on Conventional Armaments should continue its work of formulating proposals for a system of disarmament which would give no individual state an advantage over any other state, and would provide for an effective system of international control and inspection.¹

The principle that adequate conditions of security must be established to enable disarmament to proceed safely and equitably has also been followed in dealing with the question of the international control of atomic energy. Thus, the proposals of the Soviet Union for the immediate banning of atomic bombs and the destruction of existing stocks of bombs were rejected, and the Assembly instead adopted a resolution, approving the plans worked out by the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission which envisage that atomic weapons will be banned and existing stocks destroyed only when all nations have an assurance, through mutually acceptable safeguards and an effective international system of control and inspection, that atomic warfare will not be prepared in secret.² The General Assembly also decided that the Atomic Energy Commission should continue its work on “such of the subjects remaining in the programme of work as it considers to be practicable and useful”. Meanwhile, the six permanent members of the Commission (the five Great Powers and Canada), have been requested by the Assembly to meet in a further effort to search for a basis for agreement on the international control of atomic energy.

The Charter requires all Members of the United Nations to “settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered” (Article 2, paragraph 3). The year 1948 marked some progress, even though in a limited degree, in the pacific settlement of international disputes.

Although the United Nations, on account of the continued disagreements between the Great Powers to which reference has been made above, has lacked both the authority and the means to impose a settlement (as for instance in Palestine),³ it has been able, through truce and mediation procedures initiated by the Security Council and by the General Assembly, to bring an impartial moderating influence to bear and to localize threatening conflicts.

Examples can be cited of the manner in which the United Nations can use its authority effectively and usefully, if it does not extend its responsibilities beyond what it can appropriately undertake to do. The Security Council intervened in disputes which arose between India and Pakistan, and also in Indonesia. In both interventions, the Council was careful to avoid trying to use coercive powers. Instead, the Council used its powers of mediation and gave advice to the parties in dispute, and sent out commissions to facilitate direct negotiation and the adjustment of their differences through compromise. Though it has not in this way been able to

¹ See Section II, Chapter 4 on Disarmament, pp. 48-50.

² See Section II, Chapter 1 on Atomic Energy, pp. 37-41.

³ See Section II, Chapter 14 on Palestine, pp. 74-77.

prevent fighting or to ensure a peaceful settlement, it has helped to localize disputes and to exercise some restraining influence on the parties.¹

Most of the work done by the Security Council to date has been directed to the peaceful settlement of differences and to the adjustment of situations which might lead to war. Indeed, this is the kind of duty which it was anticipated would form the normal business of the United Nations security system. In the past year efforts have been made to improve the existing procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement so that it might work more smoothly, promptly and effectively. Notably, it is now the practice to arrange private consultations, with the assistance of the President of the Council, between parties to a dispute, after the matter has been placed on the agenda of the Council. Thus a peaceful settlement can at times be facilitated, since the parties to a dispute may discuss and negotiate in private, where mutual concessions and compromises are easier to make than in public. This procedure proved helpful in dealing with the Kashmir dispute. Moreover, private consultations between representatives of members of the Security Council, not directly involved in a dispute, may be undertaken in order to work out a fair and equitable basis of peaceful settlement of a dispute by those directly concerned. This procedure was followed in dealing with the Berlin question when it came before the Security Council.²

If the processes of peaceful settlement run smoothly and are permitted to be applied effectively, the risk in the international disputes or tense international situations which might lead to war is reduced. Therefore, every effort to improve the methods and produce of peaceful settlement has been supported by Canada, not only in the Security Council, but also in the Interim Committee of the General Assembly. This Committee prepared a recommendation to the General Assembly this year on the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security. It recommended the establishment of a panel of conciliators, made recommendations for the use of methods of conciliation in the Security Council and the General Assembly and requested the restoration of the General Act of 1928 for the Pacific Settlement of Disputes. It also recommended steps to reduce the application of the veto, which has so severely crippled the functioning of the Security Council even in the field of pacific settlement of disputes.³

As long as a fundamental antagonism continues between the Communist and non-Communist parts of the world, too much cannot be expected of the United Nations in the solution of political and security problems through the agency of the Security Council and the General Assembly. However, some successes, even though limited, have been noted in the pacific settlement of disputes during the past year. These are not spectacular operations. However, it is the aim of the Security Council and of the General Assembly to prevent disputes from becoming spectacular. The constant objective has been to bring the influence of third-party judgment to bear upon the parties in dispute, in order to localize the conflict and to resolve the differences by methods of negotiation and peaceful settlement.

¹ See Section II, Chapter 8 on India-Pakistan Dispute, pp. 56-58 and Section II, Chapter 9 on Indonesia, pp. 59-63.

² See Section II, Chapter 2 on Berlin, pp. 42-45.

³ See Section II, Chapter 10 on Interim Committee, pp. 64-66.

In the great political issues of the present time the United Nations has served to provide an important international forum in which public opinion can express itself. This is in itself important for although the debates may in themselves contribute little or nothing towards a lasting settlement, open and continuous discussion of the points at issue serves to create a vigilant and informed public opinion, aware of present dangers. The United Nations, moreover, still serves as a bridge or means of contact between the Communist and non-Communist areas in the present divided world. When direct negotiations between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers break down, as for instance in the case of Berlin or Korea, the United Nations provides an opportunity for a further effort to negotiate a peaceful solution of the problem.

Moreover, the basic weakness of the United Nations at the present time has been shown to lie in the inability of the Security Council to reach decisions or to take effective action in the event that one of the Great Powers is involved in a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace or an act of aggression. In order to meet this serious gap in the United Nations security system, Members of the United Nations have had to turn to regional defence arrangements under Article 51 of the Charter. In this way an inner security system is being built up to stabilize the international position and to prevent aggression until a way is found to make a security system on a universal basis effective.

The Trusteeship System

The process of transition from the League of Nations mandate system to the trusteeship system of the United Nations was virtually completed in the year under review, except in South-West Africa, which the Union of South Africa does not desire to place under trusteeship. Trusteeship agreements, confirmed by organs of the United Nations in 1946 and 1947, are now in effect in ten different territories formerly under mandate. Six of these are in Africa, four in the Pacific.

The composition and functions of the Trusteeship Council give that body far more power than was possessed by the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations. The chief differences are that the members of the Trusteeship Council speak with the authority of government representatives, all administering authorities have seats, and the presence of an equal number of representatives of non-administering states gives the Trusteeship Council a balance which the Mandates Commission lacked. The Trusteeship Council performs all the functions that were exercised by the Mandates Commission (drafting questionnaires and examining and commenting on annual reports and written petitions) and in addition hears oral petitions, sends visiting missions to trust territories and accepts special assignments falling outside the immediate scope of trusteeship agreements. It is a more flexible and authoritative body, and has already demonstrated its ability to act more quickly and effectively than the Permanent Mandates Commission, which was a purely advisory body composed of individual experts who might not accept employment by their respective governments.

In 1948 the Trusteeship Council for the first time began the routine examination of annual reports on the administration of trust territories. For the first time also it sent a visiting mission for a routine examination of conditions prevailing in two trust territories in Africa.

The Trusteeship Council has shown an unfortunate tendency to become a debating ground between representatives of the Eastern and Western blocs, and attacks on administering authorities on general grounds have consumed much time that might have been spent more profitably on constructive debate on specific issues. However, a growing impatience with this aspect of the Trusteeship Council's proceedings may result in an improvement of the debates in 1949.

Non-Self-Governing Territories

The United Nations is still feeling its way towards a decision on what its functions should be in relation to non-self-governing territories outside the trusteeship system. Annual reports on economic, social and educational developments in these territories are received from eight administering powers; of these six are voluntarily supplying information on political developments as well. What practical use is to be made of these reports is a major issue which this year's discussions did not settle.

It was the understanding of administering powers, when they agreed at San Francisco to the inclusion in Chapter XI of the Charter of a declaration on non-self-governing territories, that they were undertaking to supply certain information and to observe certain principles but that nothing in the declaration implied the exercise of supervisory functions by the United Nations. It was merely intended that with the aid of the United Nations a system of standard reporting should be inaugurated, which would facilitate scientific study of the problems of dependent territories by qualified persons, stimulate both co-operation and a healthy rivalry among administering powers and make it easier for specialized agencies to offer appropriate assistance in improving the lot of the inhabitants of dependent territories. Some Members of the United Nations, however, are engaged in a determined effort to have a permanent committee of the United Nations appointed to examine the annual reports, with authority to question representatives of the administering powers and to comment on administrative policies. The matter is likely to come up for consideration again in 1949.

Meanwhile specialized agencies are already at work on problems of non-self-governing territories. The ILO, which decided in 1945 to see what could be done about applying to dependent territories the minimum standards of social policy accepted in metropolitan territories, has been making quiet progress in this direction. It is also studying the problem of migrant labour. UNESCO is conducting educational studies in East Africa, the International Children's Emergency Fund is operating in several non-self-governing territories, and other specialized agencies have expressed a desire to give assistance in their respective fields.

Already, as a result of the inclusion in the Charter of the declaration on non-self-governing territories, several practical advantages have become apparent. The United Nations now has at its disposal more information on conditions in colonial dependencies, inhabited by 200,000,000 people, than is available on conditions in many of its own Member states. The possession of this information, compiled on a basis which makes comparative analysis possible, provides specialized agencies with invaluable aids in planning necessary projects for improving world conditions generally. The excellent progress made in certain fields by administering powers on their own initiative is becoming better known and may therefore be emulated

more readily by other administrations, possibly in independent states as well as in colonial areas.

Principal Judicial Developments

There were no developments of outstanding significance during 1948 in the field of international law. Progress in 1948 was, however, of such a nature as to facilitate work in the future. The record of the International Court of Justice will probably encourage its greater use; the International Law Commission was finally organized, and the Legal Committee of the General Assembly was able to make progress despite ideological differences among its members.

The International Court of Justice, while its responsibilities in the field of international security are not so immediate or so important as those of the Assembly or of the Security Council, is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. The Court is, moreover, the successor to the old Permanent Court of International Justice which, it is generally agreed, contributed substantially to the development of international jurisprudence. During 1948 five Members of the United Nations accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. In July, 1948, Switzerland became the first state not a Member of the United Nations to become a party to the Statute of the International Court.

Though the Court has thus far dealt with only two cases, (both of which came before it in 1948),¹ it is of great importance to have constantly available a principal organ of the United Nations capable of resolving juridical disputes between states, and of giving advisory opinions on legal matters to United Nations organs and agencies. In its first two cases, the new Court has shown itself fully worthy of the traditions of its predecessor. It may be expected, especially if international affairs become normal, that increasing use will be made of the Court and that it will contribute notably to the establishment of international order founded upon law.

The Court will itself derive material assistance from the work of the International Law Commission, a body of fifteen international legal experts appointed by the Assembly and shortly to undertake its task of developing and codifying international law.

The General Assembly, during the recent session, dealt with a variety of legal matters. The most important of these was "genocide". After considering a proposed convention on this subject, article by article, the Assembly adopted a "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide". Following its ratification by the various nations, the convention will be added to other international multilateral agreements, the substance of which is contributing to the evolution of international law. It is for this reason that the convention is, at least potentially, of importance. Genocide, defined as the organized destruction of groups or classes of people, is not practiced or even envisaged in Canada and there is of course no legislation on this matter. It may therefore be argued by some that Canada is not concerned. However, genocide may in some form be practised by less liberally inclined countries and the present convention proposes to make it an offence under international law.

Secretariat and the Budget

The estimated budget of the United Nations for 1949 is \$38,692,578 (U.S.) and supplementary estimates for 1948 to be contributed amount to

¹ See Section VII, Chapter 5 on International Court of Justice, p. 196.

\$2,958,235.40 (U.S.), of which Canada's share will be 3.20%, i.e., approximately \$1,335,000 (Can.). Canada's share of the costs of the specialized agencies will amount to about \$6,386 000 (Can.). Canada continues to be vigilant toward the mounting cost of international organizations and has urged the elimination of unnecessary expenditures. Canada's representatives have repeatedly laid stress on the need for careful scrutiny of proposed expenditures and for efficient budgetary and financial administration. Canada has also continued to press for proper co-ordination of all the various activities of the United Nations and its specialized agencies to ensure that duplication of effort is avoided and that consistent fiscal controls and common budgetary and financial practices are carried out.

As for the Secretariat, it is the view of Canada that the interests of the United Nations can best be served by a body of civil servants whose character is international and whose loyalties are wholly devoted to the organization rather than to the states of which they are citizens. Concerning the composition of the Secretariat, the Canadian view continues to be based upon the principles of securing the highest standard of efficiency, competence and integrity, while at the same time bearing in mind the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible. During the year there were 130 Canadian nationals employed in the United Nations.

In spite of the difficulties and complexities of its task, the Secretariat has shown itself capable of meeting the heavy responsibilities expected of it. In the past year, particularly, the Secretariat has been put to severe tests of its loyalty and efficiency, especially in the United Nations missions sent to such hazardous areas as Palestine, Kashmir and Korea. The tragic deaths of Count Bernadotte, the late Mediator for Palestine, and others who shared the dangers of the assignment in Palestine, are examples of the willingness of the servants of the United Nations to sacrifice themselves for its ideals.

Conclusions

The United Nations has not yet achieved sufficient strength to resolve the major political problems of the contemporary world, nor has it yet been able to provide to its Members the degree of security which would enable them to put it to full use for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Despite its evident shortcomings, however, the United Nations has already demonstrated its usefulness in the development of international co-operation and in the maintenance of peace. The machinery which it has at its disposal is in the process of development, and is being tested through practical application in actual cases. Even though the growth of world government must be slow and painful, and though the experiment may be cut short by emergencies which are too great for the United Nations to overcome, the purposes of the organization nevertheless remain valid. On the foundations which were laid in the Charter, and through the experience which it has gained in its brief but vigorous life, the United Nations may still provide to the peoples of the world the means to resolve their problems by negotiation and compromise, rather than by force.

The United Nations Charter offers a common standard of international conduct. It serves to act as a restraint upon purely national interests, and points the way to a world organized by peaceful processes. The United Nations, which is based upon this Charter, embodies a recognition of the

growing interdependence of the peoples of the world. All those nations which are willing to co-operate, have in the United Nations, a means of taking effective common action for the maintenance of peace and for their common welfare.

In the chapters that follow, the many questions which have formed the subject matter of discussion and action by the United Nations in the past year are examined. The activities and attitude of the Canadian Government and of its representatives have had to be given in summary form. For a full record of the Canadian position, reference must be made to the many official statements which have been made in the course of the year, a selection of which is given in the appendices to this Report.

I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNITED NATIONS

1. Applications for Membership¹

Article 4 of the Charter provides that membership in the United Nations is "open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations." Admission of any such state "will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council".

In 1948 only one new member-state, Burma, was admitted to the United Nations. The application of Ceylon which applied for membership in May of 1948, and again in August, was rejected on both occasions because the representative of the U.S.S.R. voted against it.

In April 1948, the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States on the Security Council requested reconsideration of the applications of Italy, Greenland, Eire, Portugal and Austria. The representative of the Ukrainian S.S.R. requested reconsideration of the applications of Albania, Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Czech Republic and Rumania. After discussion in the Council, a vote was taken on April 10, 1948, on Italy's admission. The vote was nine in favour (including Canada) in favour with the representatives of the U.S.S.R. and the Ukrainian S.S.R. voting against; the application was therefore rejected. In his vetoed vote of Italy's application, the Soviet representative

I. Membership of the United Nations.

stated that the United States representative had clearly stated that this application would not be approved, he would therefore vote against it.

After the veto of Italy's application by the Soviet Union it became known that the members of the Security Council were not willing to change their vote in regard to the admission of the other outstanding applicants and the Security Council therefore agreed to postpone further discussion of these applications until at least the 10th annual session of the General Assembly.

On April 19, 1949, the special session of the General Assembly approved the Security Council's recommendation to admit Burma.

At the third session of the General Assembly several resolutions were adopted by its Ad Hoc Political Committee which considered the question of the admission of new members. Australia supported a resolution recommending that each member of the Security Council and the General Assembly should act in accordance with the views of the International Court of Justice, which in an advisory opinion requested by the second session of the General Assembly, had stated that a member of the United Nations is not entitled to make its consent to admission dependent on conditions not expressly provided by paragraph one of Article 4. Australia

¹The Security Council's recommendations on the admission of new members in 1948 and 1949 were: Burma, 1948, Conference Series 1948 No. 2, pp. 25-27 and 30-31; and Cyprus, the Congo, 1949, Conference Series 1949, No. 1, pp. 21-23. The U.S.S.R. voted against Italy's first application for admission in August 1948.

I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNITED NATIONS

1. Applications for Membership¹

Article 4 of the Charter provides that membership in the United Nations is "open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations." Admission of any such state "will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council".

In 1948 only one new member-state, Burma, was admitted to the United Nations. The application of Ceylon which applied for membership in May of 1948, and again in August, was rejected on both occasions because the representative of the U.S.S.R. voted against it.

In April 1948, the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States on the Security Council requested reconsideration of the applications of Italy, Transjordan, Eire, Portugal and Austria. The representative of the Ukrainian S.S.R. requested reconsideration of the applications of Albania, Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Mongolian People's Republic and Roumania. After discussion in the Council, a vote was also taken on April 10, 1948, on Italy's admission. The vote was nine (including Canada) in favour with the representatives of the U.S.S.R. and the Ukrainian S.S.R. voting against; the application was therefore vetoed. In explaining his renewed veto² of Italy's application, the Soviet representative said that his Government would agree to admit Italy if Bulgaria, Hungary, Finland and Roumania were also admitted. Since the United Kingdom and United States representatives had clearly stated that these applications would not be approved, he would therefore vote against Italy's admission.

After the veto of Italy's application by the Soviet Union it became evident that the members of the Security Council were not willing to change their attitude in regard to the admission of the other outstanding applications and the Security Council therefore agreed to postpone further discussion of these applications and to report this to the third session of the General Assembly.

On April 19, 1948, the special session of the General Assembly approved the Security Council's recommendation to admit Burma.

At the third session of the General Assembly several resolutions were submitted to its Ad Hoc Political Committee which considered the question of the admission of new members. Australia sponsored a resolution recommending that each member of the Security Council and the General Assembly should act in accordance with the views of the International Court of Justice, which, in an advisory opinion requested by the second session of the General Assembly, had stated that a member of the United Nations is "not juridically entitled to make its consent to admission dependent on conditions not expressly provided by paragraph one of Article 4". Australia

¹ For a summary of the discussions on the admission of new members in 1946 and 1947 see *The United Nations, 1946*, Conference Series 1946 No. 3 pp. 46-50 and *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Conference Series 1947 No. 1, pp. 67-73.

² The U.S.S.R. voted against Italy's first application for admission in August 1947.

also submitted six separate resolutions stating that the opposition to the applications of Portugal, Transjordan, Italy, Finland, Ireland and Ceylon was based on grounds not included in Article 4 of the Charter, and requested the Security Council to reconsider these applications. The United States submitted a resolution asking the Security Council to reconsider the application of Austria. These resolutions, which were approved by the majority of the Ad Hoc Political Committee and by the General Assembly in plenary session, were opposed by the six Eastern European States.

The General Assembly also adopted a Swedish resolution requesting the Security Council to consider all previously rejected applications. Canada, together with several other members, abstained in the voting on this resolution, since the preamble contained the phrase "having noted the general sentiment in favour of the universality of the United Nations". This introduces a principle not mentioned in the Charter.

During the general debate in the Ad Hoc Political Committee, the Canadian representative stated that any attempt to impose conditions for membership in the United Nations other than those set forth in Article 4 constituted a violation of the Charter. He stated in addition, that the Canadian delegation deplored any attempt to make one state's admission conditional upon the admission of other states¹.

On December 14, 1948, at the request of the third session of the General Assembly, the Security Council reconsidered the application of Ceylon for membership in the United Nations. When the application was put to the vote, nine members including Canada voted in favour, with two against, the U.S.S.R. and the Ukraine. The application was therefore vetoed by the negative vote of the U.S.S.R.

The Security Council on December 17 considered the application of Israel for membership. Since the vote was five in favour, one against, with five abstentions, the application failed to secure the seven votes necessary for adoption. Canada abstained in the voting, and the Canadian delegate made a statement explaining the position of the Canadian Government on this matter.²

¹ For the text of the statement of the Canadian representative see Appendix II-A, pp. 207-208.

² This question is discussed in Section II, Chapter 14 on Palestine, pp. 74-77.

2. Election of Officers of the General Assembly

The following were elected as the principal officers of the General Assembly at the third session:

President: Dr. Herbert V. Evatt (Australia).

Vice-Presidents (7): The heads of the delegations of China, France, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, the United States, Mexico and Poland.

Officers of the Committees:

First Committee (Political and Security)

Chairman: M. Paul-Henri Spaak (Belgium)

Vice-Chairman: Dr. Adolfo Costa du Rels (Bolivia)

Rapporteur: Mr. Selim Sarper (Turkey)

Second Committee (Economic and Financial)

Chairman: Sr. Hernan Santa Cruz (Chile)

Vice-Chairman: Mr. Vasili P. Smoliar (Byelorussian S.S.R.)

Rapporteur: Mr. Finn Moe (Norway)

Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural)

Chairman: Dr. Charles Malik (Lebanon)

Vice-Chairman: Mrs. Bodil Begtrup (Denmark)

Rapporteur: M. Emile St.-Lot (Haiti)

Fourth Committee (Trusteeship)

Chairman: Mr. Nasrollah Entezam (Iran)

Vice-Chairman: Dr. Carlos A. Vasconcellos (Paraguay)

Rapporteur: Mr. Kristen Lannung (Denmark)

Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary)

Chairman: Mr. L. D. Wilgress (Canada)

Vice-Chairman: Mr. Andrei I. Galagan (Ukrainian S.S.R.)

Rapporteur: Mr. Olyntho Machado (Brazil)

Sixth Committee (Legal)

Chairman: Dr. Ricardo Alfaro (Panama)

Vice-Chairman: Prince Wan Waithayakon (Siam)

Rapporteur: Mr. Jean Spiropoulos (Greece)

Ad hoc Political Committee (created on November 16, 1948)

Chairman: General Carlos P. Romulo (Philippines)

Vice-Chairman: Professor Vladimir Prochazka (Czechoslovakia)

Rapporteur: Dr. Homero Viteri-Lafrente (Ecuador)

3. Elections to the Security Council

The General Assembly at its third session elected three non-permanent members of the Security Council to replace Belgium, Colombia and Syria, since their two-year terms of membership expired on December 31, 1948. The elections took place on October 8, 1948; Cuba and Norway were elected on the first ballot, and Egypt on the fourth ballot. Cuba, Norway and Egypt will retain their membership in the Security Council until December 31, 1950. Canada is a member of the Security Council until December 31, 1949.

4. Elections to the Economic and Social Council

The General Assembly, at its third session, elected six members to the Economic and Social Council to replace Canada, Chile, China, France, the Netherlands and Peru, since their three-year terms of membership expired on December 31, 1948.

The elections took place on October 8, 1948; Belgium, Chile, China, France, India and Peru were elected on the first ballot. Canada did not stand for re-election at the third session.

5. Elections to the International Court of Justice

The members of the International Court of Justice are elected by the General Assembly and by the Security Council from a list nominated by national groups appointed for this purpose by the governments of states members of the United Nations. Article 8 of the Statute of the International Court states that "the General Assembly and the Security Council shall proceed independently of one another to elect the members of the Court". Candidates must obtain an absolute majority of votes in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. Article 11 of the Statute of the International Court provides that, "if after the first meeting held for the purpose of the election, one or more seats remain to be filled, a second and, if necessary, a third meeting shall take place". On October 22, 1948, the third session of the General Assembly and the Security Council held meetings to elect judges for a nine-year term to the five positions on the Court becoming vacant on February 5, 1949.

At their first meetings the Security Council and the General Assembly both re-elected the following four judges:

Judge Abdel Hamid Badawi Pasha (Egypt)

Judge Hsu Mo (China)

Judge J. E. Read (Canada)

Judge Bogdan Winiarski (Poland)

The Security Council and the General Assembly failed, at their first meetings, to agree on the selection of a fifth member. The Security Council elected Sir Benegal Narsinga Rau (India) while the General Assembly elected Professor Jean Spiropoulos (Greece). The Security Council and the General Assembly therefore held second meetings. The Security Council selected Judge Milovan Zoricic of Yugoslavia. After three ballots, the General Assembly also chose Judge Zoricic, who was thereby named to fill the fifth vacancy. The Court was thus reconstituted with its original membership.¹

¹ For full membership of the Court see Appendix VI, p. 271.

6. Elections to the International Law Commission

On November 21, 1947, the General Assembly decided to establish an International Law Commission, to be composed of fifteen members, to promote the development and codification of public international law.¹ It was provided that these fifteen members should be "of recognized competence in international law" and should be elected by the General Assembly from a list of candidates nominated by Members of the United Nations.

Article 8 of the Statute of the International Law Commission provides that at the election "electors shall bear in mind that the persons elected to the Commission should individually possess the qualifications required and that in the Commission as a whole representation of the main forms of civilization and of the principal legal systems of the world should be assured." Candidates are elected for three years, but members of the International Law Commission are not expected to give their full time to this work.

Before making its nominations for election to this body, the Canadian Government consulted the National Group of Canada, a body set up in accordance with the Statute of the International Court of Justice to make nominations for membership on the Court. The Canadian Government nominated Sir Mahmoud Zafrullah Khan, the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan, and Professor Kenneth H. Bailey, the Solicitor-General of Australia, both of whom subsequently indicated that they were not available for election.

The first elections to the International Law Commission were held at the third session of the General Assembly on November 3, 1948. The following candidates were elected:

- Professor Ricardo J. Alfaro (Panama)
- Professor Gilberto Amado (Brazil)
- Professor J. L. Brierly (United Kingdom)
- Dr. Roberto Cordoba (Mexico)
- Professor J. P. A. Francois (The Netherlands)
- Professor Shuhsi Hsu (China)
- Judge Manley O. Hudson (United States of America)
- Judge Faris Bey el Khouri (Syria)
- Professor V. M. Koretsky (U.S.S.R.)
- Sir Benegal Narsinga Rau (India)
- Mr. Justice A. E. F. Sandstrom (Sweden)
- Professor Georges Scelle (France)
- Professor Jean Spiropoulos (Greece)
- Professor J. M. Yepes (Colombia)
- Dr. Jaroslav Zourek (Czechoslovakia).

¹ See *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, pp. 159-161 and pp. 244-250.

Reactions to the International Law Commission

In November 1947, the Council of the League of Nations decided to establish an International Law Commission, to be composed of seven members, to study the development and codification of public international law. It was provided that the Commission should be "a body of legal experts, drawn from various nationalities, and should be elected by the League of Nations from a list of candidates submitted by members of the League of Nations." Article 8 of the Statute of the International Law Commission provides that the Commission shall have as its task the preparation of a draft of a Convention which would gradually process the principles of international law into a single instrument, to be known as the "Convention for the Codification of the Principles of International Law." The Commission was elected for three years, but members of the International Law Commission are not eligible to be re-elected to the same year.

Before making its nomination for election to the first year, the Commission consulted the League of Nations Council of Experts, a body set up in accordance with the Statute of the International Law Commission, to advise the Commission for membership on the Court. The League of Nations nominated Sir Hersch Lauterpacht from the British Empire, and Professor Kenneth H. Rubin, an American-born Canadian, both of whom respectively indicated that they were not available for election. The first election to the International Law Commission was held at the first session of the Council of Experts on November 1, 1948. The following members were elected:

- Professor J. P. A. van Dijk (The Netherlands)
- Professor Sir John L. Brierly (Great Britain)
- Judge Max Huber (United States of America)
- Judge Paul Boya (Korea)
- Professor V. M. Kovalev (U.S.S.R.)
- Sir Benegal Krishna Rao (India)
- Mr. Justice A. E. F. Sandstrom (Sweden)
- Professor Georges Scelle (France)
- Professor Jean Sarrailh (France)
- Professor J. M. Ycaza (Colombia)
- Dr. Jaroslav Benes (Czechoslovakia)

The Council of the League of Nations, 1947, International Law Commission, Report of the Council of Experts, 1948, p. 17-18 and 19-20.

II. POLITICAL AND SECURITY QUESTIONS

I. Atomic Energy

The Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations was established by a unanimous resolution of the General Assembly on January 24, 1946. The Commission is composed of representatives of all States members of the Security Council, as well as of five States which are not members of the Security Council. The Commission has established a working plan for the purpose of the discovery of atomic energy and other related matters. It submits its reports and recommendations to the Security Council and the General Assembly, and also to the Commission's organs of the General Assembly and to the organs of the United Nations.

In December, 1946, the General Assembly recognized that the production of atomic weapons, and the control of atomic energy in general, should be placed under international control, and an essential part of any plan to control and regulate atomic energy, and called for "a universal instrument" by the General Assembly for the purpose of the control of atomic energy and other related matters, which would include the prohibition of atomic weapons.

When the Commission first met in June, 1946 it was organized in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and the Commission's first meeting was held in London, England, from June 24 to July 1, 1946.

II. Political and Security Questions.

The Commission's first report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1946, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1946. The Commission's second report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1947, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1947. The Commission's third report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1948, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1948.

The Commission's first report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1946, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1946. The Commission's second report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1947, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1947. The Commission's third report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1948, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1948.

The Commission's first report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1946, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1946. The Commission's second report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1947, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1947. The Commission's third report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1948, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1948.

The Commission's first report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1946, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1946. The Commission's second report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1947, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1947. The Commission's third report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1948, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1948.

The Commission's first report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1946, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1946. The Commission's second report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1947, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1947. The Commission's third report to the Security Council was submitted on October 24, 1948, and was adopted by the Security Council on November 1, 1948.

II. Political and Social Questions.

II. POLITICAL AND SECURITY QUESTIONS

1. Atomic Energy

The Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations was established by a unanimous resolution of the General Assembly in January, 1946. The Commission is composed of representatives of countries members of the Security Council, as well as Canada when Canada is not a member of the Security Council. The Commission was established to deal with "the problems raised by the discovery of atomic energy and other related matters". It submits its reports and recommendations to the Security Council, and the Security Council may transmit the Commission's reports to the General Assembly and to members of the United Nations.

In December, 1946, the General Assembly recognized that the prohibition of atomic weapons, and the control of atomic energy to ensure its use for peaceful purposes only, was an essential part of any plan to regulate and reduce armaments, and urged the "expeditious fulfilment" by the Atomic Energy Commission of its tasks. The Security Council was also to consider a draft treaty for the creation of an international system of control over atomic energy which would include the prohibition of atomic weapons.¹

When the Commission first met in June, 1946, it was presented with two different plans for the international control of atomic energy; one put forward by the United States Government, and the other by the Government of the U.S.S.R. The two plans differed fundamentally, and so far the Commission has been unable to carry out the responsibilities assigned to it mainly because no basis for agreement has been found between the views of the U.S.S.R. and of the majority of the members of the Commission on the main principles which are to govern a plan for the international control of atomic energy.

In its efforts to find a basis for such agreement the Atomic Energy Commission decided at the outset to defer consideration of the political aspects of the problem, until it had first determined whether control of atomic energy was practicable from a technical and scientific point of view. First of all a Scientific and Technical Committee composed of scientific and technical advisers examined the problem, and in September, 1946, reported unanimously that "we do not find any basis in the available scientific facts for supposing that effective control is not technologically feasible".

In its first report to the Security Council submitted on December 28, 1946², the Commission set forth a plan for the international control of atomic energy based upon proposals submitted by Mr. Baruch, (at that time the United States representative on the Atomic Energy Commission) which followed in its main concepts the Acheson-Lilienthal report³. Because of

¹ See also the *Report on the First Part of the First Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations*, Department of External Affairs Conference Series 1946, No. 1, pages 49-50, and *The United Nations 1946*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1946, No. 3, pages 29-40.

² Tabled in the House of Commons on March 26, 1947.

³ Acheson-Lilienthal "Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy", March 16, 1946.

the great knowledge of atomic energy gained by the United States in its wartime activities, this first plan put forward in the Atomic Energy Commission by Mr. Baruch was solely the product of thinking by those most experienced in the field of atomic energy in the United States. The Canadian Government, like other governments, was not consulted in the preparation of the United States Government's proposals for the international control of atomic energy. However, the Canadian government accepted the United States' proposals as a basis upon which to begin the discussions.¹

These proposals were then examined in detail by the Atomic Energy Commission to determine how they might work in practice, particularly in providing safeguards to countries complying with a system of international control against the dangers of non-compliance by any state through the diversion of materials or plants from peaceful to warlike uses. The result of this work was the subject of a second report of the Atomic Energy Commission, submitted to the Security Council on September 11, 1947,² which elaborated specific proposals showing how on many points control could be carried out. The report also considered the points of disagreement expressed by the U.S.S.R. The representative of the U.S.S.R. on the Atomic Energy Commission abstained from voting on the first report and voted against the second report.

The plan supported by the majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission would establish an international atomic energy authority, which would own all uranium and thorium in trust for the nations of the world from the time these substances are taken from the ground, and which would control the mining of all such ores. Production would be strictly related to consumption, and there would be no accumulation of stocks. The authority would own, operate, and manage all facilities handling dangerous amounts of these fissionable materials, and thus would control directly all the atomic energy activities in all nations which might become a potential menace to world security.

A licensing and inspection system is contemplated under the majority plan for activities of a less dangerous character, and it is provided that the authority would foster beneficial uses and research in nationally-owned establishments, limited to non-dangerous quantities. It is proposed that this system of control should be set up by stages, and after it is fully in operation, the manufacture of atomic weapons would cease, existing stocks would be disposed of, and the nuclear fuel would be converted to peaceful uses.

The Soviet Government's plans for the international control of atomic energy, which were presented originally in June, 1946, and elaborated upon in June, 1947, call for the immediate outlawing of the atomic bomb, and the destruction of all existing stocks of weapons "within a three-month period". The Government of the U.S.S.R. has admitted that international inspection and investigation is a necessary condition of any plan for international control, but it has been unwilling to accept any proposals providing for continuous inspection, and has also insisted that inspection be confined to such facilities and materials as it chooses to declare. In addition, the Soviet Government maintains that any international atomic energy authority must be subject to the jurisdiction of the Security Council, which

¹ See Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence No. 9, Standing Committee on External Affairs June 5-6, 1947.

² Tabled in the House of Commons on December 9, 1947.

would mean that the Permanent Members of the Security Council could use their veto to prevent any effective action, if it should be found that they were illegally producing nuclear fuel or otherwise seriously violating international atomic controls.

The discussions in the Atomic Energy Commission in 1948 were confined to a detailed examination of the Soviet Government's proposals of June, 1947, and to the study of the organizational structure of an international control agency.¹

An exhaustive examination of the Soviet Union's proposals led a majority of the members of the Commission to the view that they were inadequate to provide a basis for an international control of atomic energy which would give the nations of the world a sense of security. The views of the majority of the Commission are stated in the third report in the following terms:

"in the field of atomic energy, the majority of the Commission has been unable to secure the agreement of the Soviet Union to even these elements of effective control considered essential from the technical point of view, let alone their acceptance of the nature and the extent of participation in the world community required of all nations in this field by the first and second reports of the Atomic Energy Commission."

The majority of the governments represented on the Atomic Energy Commission were of the opinion, therefore, that the Soviet Union's proposals offered no real safeguard against the diversion of atomic materials to illegal uses or the concealment of atomic installations engaged in the production of nuclear fuel.

The third report of the Atomic Energy Commission, prepared in May, 1948, outlined the work of the Commission during 1948² and stated that the differences between the majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission and the U.S.S.R. had made it impossible for the Atomic Energy Commission to continue the preparation of a draft treaty for the international control of atomic energy. This report was adopted by the Atomic Energy Commission in May, 1948 by a majority of nine affirmative votes, the representatives of the U.S.S.R. and Ukrainian S.S.R. voting against it. In submitting its third report to the Security Council, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that this report and the two previous reports be transmitted to the General Assembly "as a matter of special concern".

In June, 1948, the Security Council approved a resolution submitted by the representative of Canada, that the three reports of the Atomic Energy Commission, together with the deliberations of the Security Council on this subject, be transmitted to the third session of the General Assembly "as a matter of special concern".

The three reports were considered in the First Committee of the General Assembly at its third session and a number of countries, including Canada, put forward resolutions containing proposals on atomic energy.

¹ For statement on the work of the Atomic Energy Commission made by the Canadian representative on the Commission in the First Committee of the General Assembly see Appendix II-B(1) pp. 208-210.

² See also *Third Report of the Atomic Energy Commission to the Security Council, 17 May, 1948*, Official Records of the Atomic Energy Commission, Third Year, Special Supplement, pp. 1-5.

The First Committee adopted a resolution with some amendments by a vote of 41 to 6 with 10 abstentions. This resolution upon the proposal of the Canadian delegate approved the general findings of the first report and the specific proposals of the second report and noted with concern the impasse which has been reached in the work of the Atomic Energy Commission as shown in its third report. It requested the permanent members of the Atomic Energy Commission to consult together "in order to determine if there exists a basis for agreement on international control" and called upon the Atomic Energy Commission to resume its sessions. The resolution as adopted represented an important modification of the original proposal put forth by Canada and supported by the United States, the United Kingdom, and France that negotiations in the Atomic Energy Commission be suspended indefinitely. In putting forward the original resolution the Canadian representative made it clear that it was designed only as a basis for discussion and that it would probably require amendment. It became clear in the course of debate that representatives of a number of countries were in favour of instructing the Atomic Energy Commission to renew its efforts. The Canadian representative accordingly agreed to amend the Canadian resolution to take account of the wishes of these members.

The amended resolution was approved by the General Assembly as its first major political decision on November 4, 1948, by a vote of 40 to 6 with four abstentions.¹

Canada has a special interest in the establishment of a practicable system for the control of atomic energy, which will protect the nations of the world from the dangers of atomic war, and which will give freedom to use atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Canada had an early start in the development of atomic energy as a producer of uranium ore and as an associate with the United States and the United Kingdom in the development of atomic energy during the war. In this way, Canadian scientists and engineers have acquired special skills and knowledge in the field. These conditions have enabled Canada to develop scientific research in the field of atomic energy on a national scale. At the same time, it has been realized that the full benefits of atomic energy will only be developed through the association of all nations in a system of international control, rather than through the development of atomic energy on a national basis.

The position of the Canadian representative on the Atomic Energy Commission, moreover, has been that atomic warfare cannot be prohibited, or international development of atomic energy assured, except on a basis which provides adequate security for all nations. Since the principles whereby these two objectives may be realized have been incorporated in the majority reports of the Atomic Energy Commission, Canada has supported these reports. It was for this reason that the Canadian delegation introduced a draft resolution, in the Security Council in June, 1948, directing the Secretary-General to transmit the reports of the Atomic Energy Commission to the General Assembly. The Canadian delegate also introduced a resolution in the Political Committee of the General Assembly in October, 1948, recommending the acceptance of the reports as a basis for further progress towards a solution of the complicated problems of preventing atomic warfare and freeing the world's resources of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

¹ For statement of the Canadian representative in the General Assembly on November 4 see Appendix II-B(2), pp. 210-212, and for the text of this resolution see Appendix II-B(3), pp. 212-213.

The Canadian delegation has also associated itself with every effort to explore the possibility of agreement between the Soviet Union and the other members of the Atomic Energy Commission. Therefore, the Canadian delegation agreed to the inclusion, in its original proposal submitted to the Political Committee of the General Assembly, of a provision that the Five Great Powers and Canada should meet to consult together in order to determine if there exists a basis upon which an agreed solution might be found to the problem of the control of atomic energy, in particular, by the removal of the political difficulties which, at present, constitute the main obstacle to agreement.

2. Berlin

The Berlin blockade was already three months old when, on September 29, the Governments of the United Kingdom, United States and France brought its existence to the attention of the Security Council as a threat to international peace and security. The three intervening months had been spent in trying to reach agreement by direct negotiation with the U.S.S.R. in fulfilment of the terms of Article 33 of the Charter.

The blockade itself was the outcome of extensive efforts on the part of the Western Powers to reach a basis for a general German settlement. In the absence of any substantial agreement with the Soviet Government, the Western Powers found themselves obliged from time to time to take measures for the economic rehabilitation of Germany. It was in reaction to these efforts that the Soviet Government withdrew its representative from the Allied Control Council on March 20, thereby eliminating the organ of supreme four-power control for all Germany. Later the Soviet representative similarly refused to take part in the work of the Kommandatura, the four-power organ of military government for all Berlin. These moves were accompanied by declarations that the Western Powers by their actions in Western Germany had forfeited the right to take part in the occupation and administration of Berlin and that their continued presence in the city was therefore unjustified.

This attitude of the Soviet Government culminated in the blockade of Berlin which began on June 19, the day after a currency reform was announced for Western Germany. The restrictions then placed on communications with Berlin were declared by the Soviet Union to be due in part to technical difficulties, and at the same time to the necessity of protecting the old currency which was then still valid in the Eastern zone. There was a series of conferences among the Military Governors where the possibilities were discussed of using a single currency, probably that used in the zone occupied by the U.S.S.R., subject to four-power control so far as Berlin was concerned. The Western Powers had originally excluded Berlin from the currency reform for Western Germany in the hope that a Four-Power agreement might be reached on the currency to be used in that city. Their insistence on Four-Power control over the Berlin currency arose from the conviction that otherwise the Soviet authorities would be able, if they chose, to stifle the economic life of Western Berlin or to manipulate the new currency for their own purposes. The Soviet authorities refused to agree to Four-Power control and announced a currency reform of their own to cover the Soviet zone and all of Greater Berlin. The Western Powers thereupon introduced a special currency into the Western sectors of the city in order to prevent the economic absorption of their sectors of Berlin into the Soviet zone.

Meanwhile additional restrictions on communications were imposed by the Soviet Government and, even after a currency reform had been effected in the Eastern zone, no measures were taken to lift the blockade. Since the blockade not only threatened the position of the occupation forces of the United Kingdom, United States and France in Berlin but also imperilled the discharge of their responsibilities as occupying powers to the German people, the Western Powers developed the Berlin airlift by which it was hoped that their position in Berlin could be maintained.

Further measures were taken in Berlin by the Soviet Government to render the position of the Western occupying powers (and of the Berlin leaders who supported them) at least uncomfortable, if not actually untenable. There were various provoked or inspired disorders on the part of the citizens of Berlin and displays of force by German police enlisted by the Soviet occupation authorities. In addition, the Soviet authorities have attempted to hinder the airlift by air manoeuvres, anti-aircraft fire, and by charges of violation of air safety rules in the air corridors connecting Berlin with the Western zones.

In an effort to reach agreement with the Soviet Union the Western Powers initiated a series of talks in Moscow. These talks began on July 30 and continued until August 30, when a directive was approved for transmission to the Military Governors in Berlin instructing them to arrange for the restoration of communications and for the use of Soviet-issued currency under Four-Power control in all sectors of Berlin; thereafter it was planned to resume Four-Power talks directed toward a settlement of outstanding problems in all Germany.

The Moscow directive was discussed by the four Military Governors in Berlin during the week ending September 7, when it became apparent that agreement on the technical arrangements necessary to implement the terms of the directive could not be reached. The Soviet Military Governor introduced the question of restricting air traffic, the control of licenses by the Soviet Military Government for trade between Berlin and the Western zones as well as foreign countries, and other provisions which would have nullified the agreement that currency in Berlin would be under Four-Power control.

The Western Powers made a further démarche in Moscow. The results of the meeting left the Western representatives in no doubt that the Soviet Government did not intend that an agreement should be reached. France, the United Kingdom and the United States then informed the Soviet Government of their misgivings and asked for assurance that the blockade would be lifted prior to further conversations on outstanding German problems. The Soviet Government in reply offered more proposals but did not give the assurance requested by the Western Powers.

The Western Powers, on September 29, presented identical notes to the Secretary General of the United Nations bringing the matter to the attention of the Security Council as a threat to the peace. After failing to keep the question off the agenda of the Security Council, the Soviet representative on the Council refused to take part in the discussions. From October 6 to October 25, members of the Security Council not directly parties to the dispute (including the Canadian representative), met to consider whether a basis for agreement existed. On October 22 they presented a draft resolution to the Security Council which called upon the Soviet Union to raise the blockade and at the same time suggested that the Governments of the United Kingdom, the United States, France and the U.S.S.R. meet to discuss arrangements for the unification of currency in Berlin on the basis of the directive of August 30. This resolution was supported by 9 of the 11 members of the Security Council. The U.S.S.R. and the Ukrainian S.S.R. voted against it, and the resolution was thus vetoed by the negative vote of the U.S.S.R.

It became apparent that the U.S.S.R. would not raise the blockade of Berlin until a unified currency based on the Soviet mark had been established

in all sectors of Berlin, and that the Western Powers in turn were unwilling to negotiate terms by which the Soviet currency might be introduced into Western Berlin while under the duress of blockade. The principle that Soviet currency under Four-Power control might be used in the Western sectors of the city had been accepted in the Moscow talks.

On November 13 the President of the General Assembly, Dr. Evatt, and the Secretary-General of the United Nations addressed joint notes to the Governments of the United Kingdom, United States, France and the U.S.S.R. This appeal referred to the General Assembly resolution calling upon the great powers to reach speedy agreement for the settlement of a German peace treaty¹. The joint note urged the Four Powers to seek a solution to the Berlin problem and suggested that conversations to this end be started immediately. In its reply the Soviet Government reiterated its position on Berlin and indicated a willingness to participate in direct negotiations for the settlement of the Berlin dispute and for the whole of Germany. The Western powers in their reply drew attention to the unsuccessful attempts that had already been made to negotiate a direct settlement and pointed out that the Berlin question was still on the agenda of the Security Council. The Western powers were of the opinion that it was in the Security Council that a solution was most likely to be found.

Meanwhile, on the initiative of Dr. Juan Bramuglia, the President of the Security Council during the Berlin discussions, the representatives of the members of the Security Council which were not directly involved in the dispute met to consider what further step they could usefully take to bring about a settlement of the dispute. As the resolution introduced into the Security Council on October 22 had failed to provide a basis for a settlement, the members of the Security Council not directly concerned in the dispute agreed that the Security Council should itself attempt to work out the essential conditions which might lead to agreement. The principal conditions to be met were the introduction of Soviet zone currency under Four-Power control in Berlin, and the simultaneous lifting of communications restrictions. A committee of experts composed of representatives of the six members of the Security Council not parties to the dispute was established. The countries directly concerned agreed to provide technical information and assistance on request.

While these negotiations were in train, the Soviet authorities permitted the establishment on November 30 of a "rump" government in the Eastern sector of Berlin, which claimed jurisdiction over the whole city. Later the Soviet Government recognized this government. On December 5, by an overwhelming vote, the Western sectors of the city elected a new government, in the face of a Communist boycott which was encouraged by the Soviet authorities. The Soviet authorities did not permit the residents of the Eastern sector to take part. The effect of these developments was to split the last authority with nominal jurisdiction over all of Berlin and thereby raise obvious difficulties for the unified control of currency and trade which the committee of experts had just undertaken to study.

Canada has been concerned with the Berlin dispute primarily as a member of the Security Council. The attitude of the Canadian Government toward the initial reference of the Berlin dispute to the Security Council was reflected in the vote of the Canadian representative on the motion to include

¹ See Section II, Chapter 12, Mexican Proposals for Peace, p. 72.

the Berlin dispute on the agenda on October 4. The delegation supported the view that the action of the Soviet Union in imposing the blockade gave rise to a situation likely to endanger international peace and security and that the dispute was a matter within the competence of the Security Council.

When the six members of the Security Council which were not directly parties to the dispute began their initial examination of the Berlin problem, the Canadian delegation participated fully in the discussions to find whether an area of agreement existed. The principle concern was to avoid the aggravation of a dangerous situation and to establish conditions under which the parties to the dispute could negotiate directly and thereby lessen the danger of conflict. The activities of the six members of the Security Council not parties to the dispute took the form of inquiries in the course of which it was hoped an area of agreement might be revealed.

In a statement before the Security Council on October 15 the Canadian delegate stated that the six delegations which were not parties to the dispute had as their purpose the gathering of fuller information on the points of view of the parties directly concerned and of clarifying the issues involved.¹

When the six members of the Council not directly involved in the dispute considered that they had obtained a sufficiently clear idea of the relative positions of the two sides they put forward a resolution which they hoped might be accepted by all parties. The Soviet veto of October 25, however, blocked this approach to a solution, although the Soviet representative did not at the same time reject the possibility that procedure being followed might lead to an acceptable solution. The six members of the Security Council not parties to the dispute therefore resumed their activities, but in the more technical field of currency unification and trade.

¹ For text of the Canadian statement see Appendix II-C, pp. 213-214.

3. Czechoslovakia

In March, 1948, Dr. Jan Papanek, at that time the permanent representative of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations, in a letter addressed to the Secretary-General, asked the Security Council to investigate a complaint on behalf of the Czechoslovak government that his country's independence had been violated by the threat of the use of force by the U.S.S.R. and that events in Czechoslovakia constituted a threat to international peace and security. The Secretary-General decided that Dr. Papanek's request could not be treated as coming from a member Government, since Dr. Papanek had severed his connections with the new Czechoslovak government. Thereupon, the Chilean representative in a letter dated March 12 asked that the matter be brought to the attention of the Security Council. In accordance with the request of Chile, the Security Council took up the question on March 17.

In support of Dr. Papanek's complaint, the representative of Chile stated that prima facie evidence existed that the coup by the Communist minority in Czechoslovakia in February, 1948 was actively encouraged by the Government of the U.S.S.R. He urged that the events in Czechoslovakia should be thoroughly investigated by the United Nations and formally asked the Security Council to invite Dr. Papanek to make a statement. The Security Council on March 22 granted this request on the proposal of Argentina and Canada by a vote of 9 in favour, with the U.S.S.R. and the Ukrainian S.S.R. voting against.

Dr. Papanek described in detail the political events leading up to the crisis in February, alleged that the U.S.S.R. had employed methods of indirect aggression and political infiltration in Czechoslovakia and urged that the Security Council make an investigation under Article 34 of the Charter. Dr. Papanek's statement was followed by outspoken comments on the events in Czechoslovakia from most of the Security Council members, some of whom, notably the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States, supported the proposal that an inquiry should be made into these events.

On March 23, the representative of the U.S.S.R. in the Security Council replied to those members who wished to have the allegations regarding events in Czechoslovakia further examined. He said that the Chilean communication was based upon a desire to interfere in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia. He accused the United States and the United Kingdom of attempting to establish control of Czechoslovakia's foreign and domestic policy through the European Recovery Plan.

In a statement on March 31,¹ the Canadian representative on the Security Council noted that no satisfactory answers had been received to certain pertinent questions asked in the Security Council by the delegates of the United Kingdom and the United States. He stated that

"The events in Czechoslovakia parallel all too closely early developments in other States in Eastern Europe so that they cannot be dismissed as pure coincidence . . . Having in mind the intimate associations between the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia, as in other countries and the

¹ For statement of the Canadian representative on this question see Appendix II-D, pp. 214-215.

Soviet Union, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Communist Party gained control of Czechoslovakia with the knowledge, approval and some help at least from the Soviet Union."

In April, 1948, by a vote of 9 to 2 the Security Council adopted a United States resolution inviting the Government of Czechoslovakia to participate without vote in the Security Council discussion. This invitation was declined by the new representative of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations.

In May, the Security Council considered a draft resolution submitted by the representative of Chile to the Security Council. This resolution proposed that the Security Council should appoint a committee to receive or hear evidence, statements, and testimony regarding the situation in Czechoslovakia. There were nine votes in favour, with the representative of the U.S.S.R. and the Ukrainian S.S.R. voting against. The resolution was not adopted, since it had been ruled a matter of substance and one of the opposing votes was that of a permanent member.

Late in May the Argentine representative submitted a draft resolution proposing that the Security Council's Committee of Experts be entrusted with the task of obtaining further evidence regarding events in Czechoslovakia, and that it report to the Security Council. The representative of the U.S.S.R. said that this proposal had the same purpose of investigation as the Chilean draft resolution, and that he would not acquiesce in any attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia. As it was apparent that the representative of the U.S.S.R. would use his veto if the resolution were put to a vote, the Security Council did not discuss the matter further. The question is still on the agenda of the Security Council.

4. Disarmament

The question of disarmament has now been before the United Nations for more than two years¹. At the second part of the first session of the General Assembly, a resolution on the principles governing the regulation and reduction of armaments was unanimously adopted. This resolution was only a first step, and it was left to the Security Council, with the assistance of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Commission for Conventional Armaments and the Military Staff Committee to draft concrete proposals for disarmament.

The Commission for Conventional Armaments was established by the Security Council in February, 1947 with the same membership as the Council. Canada therefore became a member of the Commission in January 1948 on assuming membership on the Security Council.

The first issue debated by this Commission was whether or not the question of the prohibition of atomic weapons should be considered together with the general reduction of armaments and armed forces, by the same body in drafting plans of disarmament. The Soviet Union wanted the two matters to be considered together. The majority of the other members of the Commission pointed out that the problems involved in the working out of a plan for the international control of atomic energy involved technical questions which were so essentially different from those relating to the question of disarmament and the so-called conventional weapons, that the work on the control of atomic energy should be left to the Atomic Energy Commission². In order to separate the work of the two Commissions a definition of "weapons of mass destruction" including atomic weapons was established.

The Commission for Conventional Armaments then undertook consideration of the general principles which would govern the regulation and reduction of armaments and armed forces. The majority of the members of the Commission took the view that adequate conditions of security must be established to enable disarmament to proceed safely and equitably.

Starting with the premise that disarmament by nations requires an atmosphere of international confidence and security, the following were the principal prior conditions which the majority of the Commission thought necessary to disarmament:—

- (a) The completion of agreements under Article 43 of the Charter which would place armed forces at the disposal of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.
- (b) The establishment of a system of international control of atomic energy.
- (c) The conclusion of peace settlements with Germany and Japan.

The majority of the Commission also laid particular emphasis on the need to establish an adequate system of international inspection and control, which would give assurance to all states that disarmament would

¹ See *The United Nations 1946*, Department of External Affairs Conference Series 1946, No. 3, pp. 29-40, p. 165 and pp. 168-200.

² See Section II, Chapter 1, Atomic Energy, pp. 37-41.

be on an equitable basis and that no state could take advantage of the disarmament of others.

The representative of the U.S.S.R., on the other hand, took the position that the immediate reduction of armaments and armed forces would in itself be "an essential condition for the creation of a sense of international confidence and security." The representative of the U.S.S.R. contended that the argument that conditions of international confidence and security must precede disarmament, was contrary to the General Assembly's resolution of December 14, 1946. The position of the Soviet representative on the question of international inspection and control has been that any control body must be established within the framework of the Security Council. This has been taken to mean by the majority of the Commission, that the veto exercised by the permanent members of the Security Council can apply at some stage to prevent effective inspection and control, which is so essential to a workable disarmament system.

The question of disarmament was debated at length at the third session of the General Assembly. The Soviet Union proposed that the following three steps be taken immediately towards general disarmament:—

- (1) The reduction by one-third during one year of the present strength of the land, naval and air forces of the five permanent members of the Security Council.
- (2) The prohibition of atomic weapons intended for "aims of aggression".
- (3) The establishment within the framework of the Security Council of an international control body for the purpose of supervision and control over the implementation of the above two measures."

The main issue again raised in connection with these Soviet proposals was whether the Soviet Union would itself permit effective international inspection to be carried out in its territory to determine both quantitatively and qualitatively the armaments and armed forces at its disposal. Without an undertaking by all countries concerned that they would open their frontiers to international inspection, it was clearly impossible to arrive at a plan of disarmament which might be directly related to the needs of international peace and security. The arbitrary arithmetical formula suggested by the Soviet Union would leave that country in a position of advantage in relation to those countries, which, like the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada, had already reduced their armaments and armed forces substantially since the conclusion of hostilities.

A counter resolution was submitted by the United Kingdom delegation asserting the principle already taken by the majority in the Commission on Conventional Armaments, that disarmament could only take place in an atmosphere of international confidence and security. The Canadian representative, in supporting this position in the First Committee, pointed out that no country would welcome more sincerely than Canada any progress towards effective measures of general disarmament. It was not possible, however, for Canada to support measures of disarmament at the cost of insecurity to Canada or to other nations desirous of maintaining international peace and security on the basis of the principles and purposes of the Charter. The Canadian representative emphasized in particular that the problem of inspection, verification and control lay at the root of the disarmament problem, and urged that the Soviet representative should declare

whether the Soviet Government was prepared to open its territory to international inspection.¹

The First Committee of the General Assembly, where the question of disarmament was discussed, rejected the Soviet proposals and adopted a resolution, based upon the United Kingdom proposal, that the Commission for Conventional Armaments should continue its work in formulating proposals for the general regulation and reduction of armaments, which would include provisions for the receipt, checking and publication by an international organization of their armed forces and their conventional armaments. This proposal was adopted by the General Assembly on November 19 by a vote of 43 (including Canada) in favour, 6 (Soviet Bloc) against, with one abstention.²

¹ For the statement of the Canadian delegate on Disarmament, see Appendix II-E (1), pp. 215-218.

² For the text of this resolution see Appendix II-E(2), p. 219.

5. Greece

The question of Greece has remained on the agenda of the United Nations for the third year as a result of the continued disturbed conditions on Greece's northern frontier. In 1946 the Greek Government requested the Secretary-General, under Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter, to give early consideration to a situation which was leading to friction between Greece and her northern neighbours. The Security Council considered the Greek Government's complaint and established a Commission of Investigation. The Security Council was unable to reach any decision, as the Soviet representative exercised his veto on three consecutive occasions. The Council then took the question off its agenda, but instructed the Secretary-General to place all the records and documents at the disposal of the General Assembly.

At its second session in 1947, the General Assembly considered the question and established the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans.¹ Canada is not a member of this Committee which is composed of representatives of Australia, Brazil, China, France, Mexico, the Netherlands, Pakistan, the United Kingdom and the United States. Seats are held open for Poland and the U.S.S.R. but both these countries have refused to take part in the Committee's work. The Special Committee was instructed to observe relations between Greece and her northern neighbours, and make recommendations for the establishment of frontier conventions between them, and also for the settlement of the refugee and minority problems. Observation teams were to proceed to Greek frontier areas to investigate complaints received from the Governments of Greece, Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia.

The Special Committee had been at work only three weeks when it was notified by the Greek liaison representative of the formation by General Markos of a "provisional government" which, it was alleged, aimed at imposing by force a Communist regime on the Greek people. The Special Committee issued a statement that any recognition and assistance given to this "government" would be contrary to the principles of the Charter and would endanger international peace and security.

The activities of the Special Committee have been described in three published reports. The first report, signed on June 30, 1948, describes in detail the work of the Committee and contains certain conclusions and recommendations. Two supplementary reports were prepared by the Committee covering events in the Balkans from June 30 to September 10, 1948 and from September 11 to October 22, 1948.

The report of June 30 stated that the Committee's work had been boycotted by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, and concluded that the Greek guerillas had received aid from Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. The report also stated that the guerillas had been using these three countries as a sanctuary as well as to initiate military operations from these territories. This assistance, the report continued, had been given to the guerillas with the knowledge of the Governments of Albania,

¹ For a full summary of the discussions concerning UNSCOB at the second session of the General Assembly, see *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, pp. 23-30.

Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. The Committee considered that this support constituted a treat to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece, and endangered international peace and security in the Balkans. The Special Committee recommended that an agency of the United Nations continue to observe the relations between Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Greece, and to attempt a peaceful settlement.

The two supplementary reports of September 10 and October 22, 1948, confirmed these conclusions and urged further that a warning should be issued by the General Assembly to Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania that their continued aid to the Greek guerillas endangers peace in the Balkans.

The Special Committee's supplementary report for the period June 30-September 10, 1948, made the following finding: "The Special Committee is of the opinion that the conduct of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia has been inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations." The report also explains that UNSCOB's failure to make the General Assembly's recommendations effective was caused by the refusal of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia to co-operate. The Special Committee has nevertheless had a limited success in dealing with the refugee problem, and also, when General Markos proclaimed his "Government", its prompt action no doubt prevented recognition of this administration by Greece's northern neighbours. Moreover, the testimony of UNSCOB's observation teams provided direct evidence of outside interference in the internal affairs of Greece.

The reports of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans were considered in the First Committee of the third session of the General Assembly. Representatives of Albania and Bulgaria were invited to make statements and to place themselves at the disposal of the First Committee to provide information. The First Committee decisively rejected proposals that representatives of the Markos "provisional government" be heard.

The representatives of China, France, the United Kingdom and the United States sponsored a proposal (in which amendments suggested by the representatives of Australia and France were incorporated) approving the conclusions of the Special Committee's reports and instructing the Committee to continue its work of assisting the governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Greece and Yugoslavia in implementing the resolutions of the second and the third sessions of the Assembly on this subject. This proposal also contained provisions for consultation with the Interim Committee of the Assembly and provided for the headquarters of UNSCOB, its staff, and facilities for its work. This resolution was adopted by the First Committee.

The First Committee also gave unanimous approval to two other resolutions. The first recommended the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between Greece and Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria and the establishment of agreements for frontier and refugee problems. The second resolution recommended the return to Greece of Greek children who had been removed by the guerillas to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, if their closest relatives so desired. International and National Red Cross and Red Crescent societies were entrusted with the responsibility of returning these children.

The General Assembly in plenary session on November 27, adopted by a vote of 47 to 6 the Four-Power resolution which provided for the

continuance of UNSCOB, and adopted unanimously the resolutions on diplomatic relations and frontier agreements and on the return of Greek children to Greece. The Canadian delegation supported these resolutions.

While the Balkan question was being discussed by the General Assembly the President of the Assembly initiated efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement between Greece and Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. To this end the President, the Chairman of the First Committee and the Secretary-General of the United Nations carried on discussions in Paris with the representatives of the four Balkan States. It was not found possible however, in these discussions, to reach any satisfactory solution.

6. Guard Force

The establishment of a small United Nations Guard Force was first suggested by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in a public address at Harvard University on June 10, 1948. His suggestion was prompted by the failure of the Military Staff Committee to reach agreement on the implementation of Article 43 which would put national forces at the disposal of the Security Council under the terms of special agreements between Member States and the United Nations. The need for some protective force became apparent when the Security Council attempted to maintain a truce in Palestine. The assassination of Count Bernadotte and the killing of other United Nations officials in Palestine gave impetus to the Secretary-General's proposal.

Later, a detailed proposal, outlined in the Annual Report of the Secretary-General, was placed before the third session of the General Assembly as a recommendation. The proposal suggested the creation of a United Nations Guard Force to perform protective, control and administrative functions on behalf of the Security Council or the General Assembly. The Secretary-General recommended an initial Guard Force of 800 of whom 300 would be permanently mobilized, with 500 in reserve living in their own countries but ready for service on short notice. The Force would be equipped with light personal weapons only, such as revolvers, rifles, carbines or light automatic rifles. It would be recruited in accordance with the principles laid down in Chapter XV of the Charter for appointment to the staff of the Secretariat.

It is not the intention that the United Nations Guard Force should be a substitute for the armed forces which Member States of the United Nations are required to place at the disposal of the Security Council in accordance with Article 43 of the Charter. The duties of the Guard Force would not be combative, but protective and administrative only. Its essential duty would be to provide protection for the personnel and the property of United Nations missions established by the Security Council or by the General Assembly, particularly in disturbed areas where national or local authorities are unable to provide this protection. In elections or plebiscites supervised by the United Nations the Guard Force would supervise polling places and prevent fraudulent voting. A proportion of the Guard Force would include experts in transport and communication who might be called upon to operate technical services where these are not provided by national or local authorities.

This question of the establishment of a United Nations Guard Force was one of the last on the agenda at the third session of the General Assembly and was postponed until the second part of the third session in April 1949.

7. Indians in the Union of South Africa¹

There was no significant development on this question in the United Nations in 1948. Although it was placed on the agenda of the third session of the General Assembly, this was one of the matters postponed until the second part of the third session in April, 1949.

¹For a summary of discussions on this matter at previous sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, see *The United Nations, 1946*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1946, No. 3, pp. 59-63, and *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, pp. 36-40.

8. India-Pakistan Dispute

On December 30, 1947, India appealed to the Security Council of the United Nations to urge Pakistan to restrain its nationals from assisting the invaders of Kashmir, to prevent the entry of tribesmen into Kashmir from Pakistan territory, and to cease providing the invaders with military and other supplies. The Security Council considered the matter together with counter-complaints from Pakistan affecting other relations between India and Pakistan.

By the Indian Independence Act, which came into force on August 15, 1947, the suzerainty of the British Crown over the Indian States lapsed, and the States were left free to accede to the Dominion of India, to the Dominion of Pakistan, or to neither. In Kashmir the ruler was a Hindu, but the great majority of the population was Moslem. The Maharajah, wishing to put off a decision as to accession, approached India and Pakistan for a standstill agreement.

In October, 1947, disorders broke out in Kashmir. Pakistan asserted that Sikh extremists had come in from India to the Jammu Province of Kashmir and engaged in a campaign to exterminate Moslems, with the assistance of the Maharajah's Hindu Dogra troops. On October 22, there began an invasion by Pathan and other tribesmen into Kashmir from across the Pakistan border. India alleged that these tribesmen were officered by Pakistan army officers and equipped with Pakistan's connivance and assistance. Local insurgents, in conjunction with the invading forces, formed a "free" Kashmir government and the combined forces threatened Srinagar, the capital of Kashmir. The ruler and his Prime Minister fled to New Delhi and sought help from India.

As a legal basis for assistance, the Maharajah agreed to accede to India, and the Governor-General of India accepted the accession subject to the final decision of the people of Kashmir when law and order were restored. Pakistan has refused to acknowledge the validity of Kashmir's provisional accession to India, which was effective from October 26.

Indian troops were at once flown to Srinagar and succeeded in driving the forces of the invaders westward towards the Pakistan border and relieving the capital. They have not, however, succeeded in clearing the State of the forces opposed to the ruler and to the government subsequently set up under the leadership of the Kashmir National Conference, Sheikh Abdullah. While the Indian forces are in possession of the populous Vale of Kashmir and the Province of Jammu, they have not been able to occupy some of the western districts and the extensive regions of Gilgit and Baltistan.

During November and December, 1947, attempts had been made to settle the dispute by direct negotiation between India and Pakistan, but when these failed India appealed to the Security Council.

After efforts had been made through formal consultations over a period of some weeks, under the auspices of succeeding Presidents of the Council, including the Canadian representative, to have the parties reach an agreement as a basis of resolving the dispute, the Security Council on April 21, 1948, adopted a resolution which provided for the appointment of a commission of five members.¹ The Commission was to proceed to India and offer

¹ For text of this resolution see Appendix II-F. (1), pp. 219-223.

its good offices and mediation to India and Pakistan for the restoration of peace and order and for the holding of a plebiscite. The resolution provided for the appointment in due course of a special officer, the Plebiscite Administrator, nominated by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and confirmed in office by the Indian Government on behalf of Kashmir, to direct and supervise the holding of a free and impartial plebiscite to decide whether the State should accede permanently to India or to Pakistan.

This resolution was drawn up jointly by the four Presidents of the Council who had steered the negotiations (the representatives of Belgium, Canada, China and Colombia) and the United Kingdom and United States representatives, and was sponsored by this group in the Council. The Canadian delegate spoke in favour of the resolution on April 17.¹ The resolution was adopted by a vote of nine to none, with the Soviet Union and the Ukraine abstaining. In addition, Syria abstained from voting on certain paragraphs to which Pakistan had objected.

Both India and Pakistan made certain objections to the resolution, but indicated that they would confer with the Commission if it came to their capitals. Subsequently the Commission, known as UNCIP, consisting of representatives of Czechoslovakia, the Argentine, Belgium, Colombia and the United States, was constituted and met first in Geneva on June 14 before proceeding to India. It arrived in Karachi on July 7, and spent a short time there before going on to New Delhi. It then divided its time between the two capitals with visits to Srinagar, before returning to Geneva on September 26. Some of its officers have visited both fronts of the fighting.

On August 14, after several weeks of investigation and the hearing of evidence, the Commission made a proposal to both countries calling for an immediate cease-fire order together with a truce agreement. The proposal pre-supposed, as a basis of discussion for a more permanent cease-fire, the acceptance by Pakistan of the withdrawal of all Pakistan troops; and by India of the withdrawal of the bulk of her troops, to the extent that those remaining would not be sufficiently large to constitute a threat to the territory evacuated by Pakistan troops. It also assumed the consent of Pakistan and India, once hostilities had ceased, to discuss a permanent settlement in accordance with public feeling in Kashmir.

On August 20 India accepted the proposals subject to the conditions that there would be no recognition of the "free" Kashmir Government; that Pakistan would have no share in a plebiscite or in the internal administration of the State; and that the strength of the Indian forces remaining in the State should suffice to repel any external aggression. The Commission agreed to these conditions, provided there would be freedom of political activity for all inhabitants of the State.

Pakistan replied to the Commission on September 6 that it could not speak for the "free" Government; that the latter must be a party to any settlement; and that it alone could order a cease-fire for the "free" forces. It said that a plebiscite must be conducted according to the resolution of April 21, except as otherwise agreed between India and Pakistan. Pending final settlement, all territory in *de facto* control of the Pakistan and "free" Kashmir high commands should be administered by the authorities now in

¹ The full text of the Canadian representative's statement is given in Appendix II-F. (2), pp. 223-224.

de facto control, to the exclusion of Indian and Kashmir State officials. The Commission expressed regret that by attaching these and other conditions to its acceptance of the proposal, Pakistan had made impossible the immediate cease-fire as well as the beginning of negotiations for a final settlement.

After nearly three months of activity in India, the Commission returned to Geneva on September 26 to prepare an interim report to the Security Council on the present situation in Kashmir. This report was made to the Security Council in Paris on November 22. It is a factual account of the Commission's activities, in particular its efforts to obtain an agreement between India and Pakistan for a cease-fire, as described above. The report did not contain recommendations but made some observations.

The Commission then carried on private negotiations in Paris with Indian and Pakistan representatives who were attending the meeting of the General Assembly, with the aim of bringing the parties to an agreement, and sent one of its members to the sub-continent in the latter part of December to put the Commission's proposals before the Indian and Pakistan Governments.

At the end of the year the military authorities of India and Pakistan, following a truce agreement between the two governments, issued a cease-fire order to their forces, which took effect at midnight on January 1, 1949.

9. Indonesia

A year which opened with high hopes for a peaceful settlement of the critical Indonesian problem ended with Netherlands forces undertaking an extensive "police action" against the Indonesian Republic and the Security Council being called into a special session at Paris to discuss the situation. The outbreak of hostilities on December 19, 1948, followed months of negotiation between the Netherlands and the Republic during which both the good offices of a special Security Council committee and direct negotiations between representatives of the parties failed to bring a satisfactory settlement of the differences.

The dispute between the Netherlands and the Republic over control of Indonesia has been a primary concern of the Security Council ever since it was seized of the problem in August, 1947. Canada, as a member of the Council has been concerned with seeking a settlement of a situation which is not only a threat to the peace, but which is delaying the economic rehabilitation of the whole of Indonesia, whose products are highly important to world recovery.

The Republic of Indonesia proclaimed its independence on August 17, 1945. In the following interval of six weeks before the Allied Forces could land to reoccupy the Indies and to evacuate Allied internees and the Japanese forces, the new regime succeeded in consolidating its position and in taking over from the Japanese occupation forces all their administrative functions. The new Republic, sponsored by the Japanese, was strongly opposed to the return of the Dutch in their pre-war capacity.

It was not until the end of 1946 that the Netherlands Government despatched to the Indies sufficient forces to replace the British forces which had originally occupied the key areas on the islands. During that time, negotiations for the settlement of the dispute between the Netherlands and the Republican governments over the control of the Indies, dragged on and, although hostilities frequently interrupted the negotiations, an agreement was finally signed at Linggadjati in November, 1946, setting forth the basic principles which were to govern the settlement. Despite this agreement, no satisfactory settlement could be arrived at and in July, 1947, the Netherlands forces launched a military campaign against the Republic with the objectives of restoring law and order in Republican territories and of gaining control over some of the more productive areas.

The fighting in Indonesia led to a reference by Australia and India to the Security Council on the grounds that it constituted a threat to the peace, and the matter was fully discussed at the Council meetings in August, 1947. Two resolutions were adopted on August 25, the first providing for the supervision of a cease-fire order in Indonesia by a Consular Commission composed of the career consuls in Batavia of the states members of the Council. By the second resolution, the Security Council tendered its good offices to the parties in order to assist in the pacific settlement of the dispute. It had been previously decided that the Security Council lacked the jurisdiction to oblige the parties to submit their dispute to arbitration.

Both parties accepted the Security Council's offer, and a Committee of Good Offices was set up comprising representatives of three of the

Council members, the United States, Australia and Belgium who, late in October, arrived in Batavia and began their work. Earlier in the month the Consular Commission had reported to the Security Council on the non-observance of the cease-fire order, and indicated that it arose out of the very different interpretations placed upon the order by the armed forces of both parties.

After prolonged discussions the Committee of Good Offices proposed informally a detailed plan for a military truce, and also offered a set of twelve principles to serve as a basis for a political settlement. Accepted by both parties with certain modifications, and signed on January 17, 1948, these principles have become known as the "Renville Truce Agreement" and the "Twelve Principles forming an agreed basis for the political discussions". On January 19 the parties accepted "six additional principles for the negotiations toward a political settlement".

The most significant of the proposals in the Renville Agreements provided for the eventual independence of the Indonesian people and the establishment of a new federal system, the United States of Indonesia, with the Republic as one of the States. Sovereignty over the new federation would be retained for an interim period by the Kingdom of the Netherlands and would eventually be transferred to the United States of Indonesia after a democratic constitution had been drawn up and the boundaries of the individual states established. Other articles provided for the restoration of normal conditions, including the resumption of domestic and foreign trade.

Following the signing of these agreements, the Committee of Good Offices returned to report to the Security Council which discussed this report and the Renville agreements during the month of February while the Council was under the chairmanship of the Canadian delegate. On February 28 a Canadian resolution was adopted which noted with approval the report of the Committee of Good Offices, maintained the Security Council's offer of Good Offices, and requested the Committee and both parties to keep the Security Council directly informed of the progress of the political negotiations.¹ By and large, the provisions of the Truce Agreement were implemented successfully during the succeeding weeks, and about thirty-five thousand Republican Army soldiers were evacuated from behind the line delineating the areas claimed by the Dutch to be under their control.

The Committee of Good Offices was reconstituted after reporting to the Security Council and returned to Indonesia in March to resume negotiations on the basis of the Renville Principles. Discussions continued with indifferent success until June, when they were broken off temporarily as a result of a leakage to the press of a new compromise plan known as the Dubois-Critchley Proposals which had been submitted informally on June 4 by the United States and Australian members of the Committee, with a view to bridging the gap which separated the positions of the two parties. These proposals were not accepted as a basis for discussion by the Netherlands delegation. Other attempts to facilitate the settlement had also been made by the Lieutenant-Governor General of the Netherlands Indies, who held some talks with the Indonesian Republican Premier in the hope of expediting matters by direct action, without reference to the Committee of Good Offices.

¹ For text of Security Council resolution of February 28, 1948 see Appendix II-G, p. 224.

By this time the differences of opinion between the two parties were so marked that the situation had become deadlocked. Finally, the Republican delegate announced that, in view of the unwillingness of the Netherlands delegate to discuss the Dubois-Critchley Proposals or to offer any alternative program, they considered that no useful purpose could be served by continuing the political negotiations. One of the reasons why the Dutch delegation was unable to offer any alternative proposals was that general elections were held in the Netherlands on July 8, and for several weeks there was no government in power which could issue instructions to the delegate in Indonesia. This election was made necessary because the Government wished to amend the Constitution in order to provide for the future establishment of the Netherlands-Indonesian Union. A new Government was formed in the Netherlands in August.

In its Third Interim Report to the Security Council dated June 21, 1948, the Committee of Good Offices gave its estimate of the situation in Indonesia. The Report stated that, apart from the successful evacuation of thirty-five thousand Republican troops from behind the temporary demarcation line dividing the territories of the two parties, the "Truce Agreement has been largely a disappointment."

In particular, the failure to implement Article 6 of the Truce Agreement which provided that "trade and intercourse between all areas should be permitted as far as possible" was regarded with such seriousness by the Republican Government that its representative at the United Nations raised the issue before the Security Council, claiming that the Dutch were strangling the Republic by means of an economic blockade. As a result the Security Council on July 6 adopted a resolution, proposed by the representative of China, requesting from the Committee of Good Offices an early report on existing restrictions on trade in Indonesia and the reasons for the delay in the implementation of article 6 of the Truce Agreement. The Canadian representative supported this resolution.

One of the chief sources of misunderstanding between the Republic and the Netherlands has resulted from the activities of the Dutch authorities in sponsoring the setting up of numerous provisional states in those parts of Indonesia outside of the Republic, including some sections which had been Republican-held prior to the Dutch campaign of July, 1947. The Republicans, on the one hand, conceive the setting up of these States as an example of a "divide and rule" colonial policy, while the Netherlands authorities, on the other hand, consider these activities are justified under the terms of the Renville Agreement.

For many years a Communist faction in Indonesia had collaborated with the legitimate Nationalist movement. However, after the breakdown of negotiations in July political, economic and financial conditions continued to deteriorate and the situation became increasingly favourable for the spread of Communism. Finally, in August, a split in the ranks of the Republican Government led to a Communist bid to seize control over the whole of the Republican territories and an invitation to all left wing parties to merge with them in the formation of a new "Workers' Front".

Although the Communist leaders seized a number of centers and proclaimed a "National Government" at Maduin, the Republicans launched an energetic anti-Communist campaign which had quick successes. By October the Communist uprising in the Republican areas appeared to have been brought fairly well under control and the bulk of

the insurgent forces had either been driven into hiding or captured. For the time being at least, there appears to be no danger of further Communist disturbances on a large scale, although the possibility of a resumption of their activities in the future cannot be discounted.

A renewed attempt to reach a settlement in Indonesia was made in September when the United States member of the Committee of Good Offices, Mr. Merle Cochran, submitted a new set of proposals to the Netherlands and Indonesian parties. These proposals, which modified the terms of the Dubois-Critchley plan and called for general elections and the formation of a projected interim Government, were tentatively accepted by both sides as a basis for discussion and gave grounds for hoping that at last the outstanding difficulties in the way of a complete understanding could now be eliminated.

Despite the initial optimism to which the Cochran proposals gave rise, it was soon clear that agreement was still very distant. Faced again with prospects of deadlock, the Netherlands Government initiated direct negotiations with the Republicans and on November 22 a delegation headed by Foreign Minister Stikker, and including prominent members of the Dutch Cabinet and Government, went to Indonesia for further talks with Prime Minister Hatta and other Republican leaders. On December 5 this delegation returned to The Hague and a week later the Netherlands Government announced that peace talks had been discontinued and that further negotiations with the Republic would only delay final settlement of the Indonesian problem. In addition, the Netherlands authorities indicated they were prepared to go ahead with the plan to set up the Interim Government for all sections of Indonesia outside those areas controlled by the Republic.

Acting on the request of the Security Council in July, the Committee of Good Offices had returned to Indonesia to continue their efforts at mediation, investigate alleged restrictions on trade and prepare a report on economic conditions in the Islands. This report was finally submitted to the Security Council on December 2 and indicated that the economic situation in the Republic had become "critical". The report pointed out that there existed severe shortages of transport and reconstruction equipment, inadequate health services, food shortages, and neglected plantations, all of which factors were delaying the economic rehabilitation of Indonesia and adding to the internal political problems faced by the Republic.

On December 11 the Netherlands Government notified the Committee that it did not consider that further negotiations would serve any useful purpose and on December 14 Premier Hatta of Indonesia replied to this statement with a letter indicating the desirability of further discussion. The Netherlands Government informed Mr. Hatta on December 16 that they could delay no longer the steps they considered had to be taken toward the formation of a United States of Indonesia. Finally, on December 19 military operations were launched in Indonesia and the Netherlands Government announced the decision to take measures to re-establish conditions of peace and security in Indonesia. This announcement was made in the form of a memorandum transmitted to the president of the Security Council from the representative of the Netherlands.

The breakdown of negotiations and the exchange of correspondence between the Netherlands Government and Mr. Hatta were the subjects of special reports from the Committee of Good Offices on December 12 and

December 19. The latter report criticized the Dutch action and stated that the members of the Committee felt that the Dutch had not exhausted the resources of the Committee nor had they allowed for the possibility of resuming negotiations.

The Security Council discussed the Indonesian question in a special session which convened on December 22 and was brought to a close on December 29. General regret at the Dutch resort to armed force was expressed and a resolution was passed calling for an immediate cease-fire and for the release by the Dutch of President Soekarno and other Republican political prisoners. A United States draft resolution calling for a withdrawal of Netherlands forces to the positions they held prior to the resumption of hostilities was defeated.

The Canadian Government's policy, like that of the United Kingdom and the United States, has been to seek a just, permanent and satisfactory settlement to the Indonesian question, so that conditions of normalcy and prosperity may return to the East Indies as soon as possible. Among other things, Canada is concerned that free international trade with the area should be resumed in the near future. In considering the whole problem the Canadian Government has consistently borne in mind the long-standing traditions of friendship which bind the peoples of Canada and the Netherlands together. At the same time, the Government has endeavoured to reconcile these considerations with its desire to encourage and recognize the legitimate aspirations of Indonesian nationalism.

In the Security Council discussions of late December, Canada's representative stated that he deplored the breakdown of negotiations and resumption of military operations. This country supported the resolution calling for a cease-fire and for the release of political prisoners but opposed a United States resolution calling for a withdrawal of Dutch troops on the ground that this resolution would not be adhered to nor would it be enforced by the members of the Security Council.

10. Interim Committee

The Interim Committee of the General Assembly was established by the General Assembly in November, 1947¹. The Interim Committee was instructed to study the problem of voting in the Security Council, methods for the promotion of international co-operation in the political field and the advisability of establishing a permanent committee of the General Assembly. Accordingly the Interim Committee when it met early in 1948 set up three sub-committees to study and report on these matters. The sub-committees presented their reports, and the Interim Committee, completing its examination of them in August 1948, transmitted them to the third session of the General Assembly.

Article 27 of the Charter which governs the question of voting in the Security Council states that decisions on "procedural matters" are to be made by an affirmative vote of seven Members of the Security Council while decisions on "all other matters" are to be made by an affirmative vote of seven Members including the concurring votes of the permanent Members. The Charter does not make a clear distinction between procedural matters and "all other matters". The extensive use of the veto in the Security Council by the U.S.S.R. has frequently prevented that body from acting in matters of seemingly minor importance.

In considering ways in which the voting procedure in the Security Council might be liberalized, the Interim Committee drew up a list of Security Council decisions which should be regarded as procedural and, therefore, exempt from the rule of unanimity.

The Interim Committee further recommended that the permanent Members voluntarily abandon the unanimity rule in the case of decisions on a number of subjects, whether procedural or not, (e.g. decisions on applications for membership and the peaceful settlement of disputes). Included also in this type of question is the decision on whether or not a matter is procedural. This use of this "double veto" has greatly complicated and impeded the work of the Security Council.

The Interim Committee also recommended that the permanent members agree to exercise restraint in the use of their voting privileges.

In July the Argentine representative on the Interim Committee proposed a resolution that the General Assembly call a General Conference to eliminate the veto by amending the Charter. The resolution was amended so that the third session of the General Assembly was asked to consider only whether or not the time had arrived for such a conference. This resolution of the Interim Committee was approved by 19 votes in favour to 7 (including Canada) against, with 10 abstentions.

In commenting on the report of the Interim Committee on voting procedure in the Security Council, the Canadian representative stated on July 9, 1948, that the Interim Committee had had to decide whether it should consider the possibility of revising the Charter or whether a "more gradual approach should be taken by considering what should be done in existing circumstances to improve the voting procedure".² The Canadian repre-

¹ See *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series, 1947, No. 1, pp. 55-59 and pp. 208-216.

² For the text of the Canadian statement see Appendix II-H(1), pp. 224-226.

sentative pointed out that the problem was not simply one of voting procedure but a problem which arose whenever states of varying sizes and strengths are associated in a composite organization. He did not consider that more substantial progress could be made now by more radical measures such as the calling of a revisionary conference.

This matter was considered by the third session of the General Assembly which referred it to the Ad Hoc Political Committee. A resolution sponsored by China, France, the United Kingdom and the United States, endorsing the report of the Interim Committee on voting procedure, was approved by 33 votes in favour (including Canada), 6 against (the Slav bloc) and 4 abstentions. The Ad Hoc Political Committee rejected the Argentine proposal for a revisionary conference.

The Interim Committee also prepared a report on the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of peace and security, which was considered by the Ad Hoc Political Committee of the third session of the General Assembly. The report included the following recommendations:

- (a) A proposal that the General Assembly restore the General Act of 1928 for the Pacific Settlement of Disputes. The General Act provided for the reference of all disputes between signatory states to a Conciliation Commission, to the Permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations, or to an Arbitral Tribunal. The Ad Hoc Political Committee acceded to the request of the Interim Committee that the Secretary-General should incorporate certain changes in the General Act to make it compatible with the present framework of the United Nations, and that the Secretary-General should hold the Act open for accession by states.
- (b) A proposal that a panel of conciliators be established whose services would be available to any states involved in controversies as well as to the General Assembly and the Security Council. The panel would be composed of persons who "by reason of their training, experience, character and standing, are deemed to be well fitted to serve as members of Commissions of Inquiry or of Conciliation". Consideration of this resolution was deferred by the Ad Hoc Political Committee until the second part of the third session of the General Assembly in April, 1949.
- (c) A proposal that whenever a dispute is brought before the Security Council the parties should meet with the President of the Security Council and attempt to call upon a representative on the Council to act as conciliator who would report to the Security Council on the efforts made toward conciliation. Similarly, the Interim Committee proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, enabling the President of the General Assembly to act as a conciliator whenever a dispute is brought before the United Nations. The Ad Hoc Political Committee adopted the first of these proposals, but deferred consideration of the amendment of the Assembly's Rules of Procedure to the second part of the third session in April, 1949.

Canada voted in favour of the two resolutions adopted in Committee concerning the general principles of political co-operation and the maintenance of peace. The report of the Ad Hoc Political Committee on this

question will be considered at the second part of the third session of the General Assembly in April, 1949.

The Interim Committee recommended for further study a proposal for the creation of a permanent committee on conciliation and a proposal to submit to the International Court of Justice the question of the competence of the Security Council or the General Assembly to deal with problems claimed by a state to be within its own domestic jurisdiction.

It was also recommended to the General Assembly that the Interim Committee continue in being for a further period. The Interim Committee considered that its work had been effective although all the members of the United Nations had not participated. The representative of India, in opposing this recommendation in the Interim Committee, stated that the work of the Interim Committee could be carried on more efficiently by ad hoc Committees of the General Assembly. This view, however, was not shared by a majority of the members of the Interim Committee.

By a vote of 40 in favour, to 6 against, with 1 abstention, the third session of the General Assembly in plenary session decided to re-establish the Interim Committee for a further period of one year. The functions of the Interim Committee are substantially the same as those given to it by the second session of the General Assembly. In addition, the Interim Committee is now authorized to request advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice on legal questions arising within the scope of its activities.¹

In addition to these studies the Interim Committee considered the question of Korea. The account of the Interim Committee's work on Korea is contained elsewhere in this report.²

¹ The text of a Canadian statement in the Ad Hoc Political Committee on the question of the continuance of the Interim Committee is given in Appendix II-H(2), pp. 226-227.

² See below, Section II, Chapter 11, Korea, pp. 67-71.

11. Korea

The last act of the third session of the General Assembly before it adjourned on December 12 was to pass a resolution on Korea by 48 to 6 with one abstention. This resolution approved the conclusions of the Report of the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea and declared that the Government of the Republic of Korea had been properly established under the observation of the Commission in that part of Korea where the Commission had been able to function. In addition to a general interest in the establishment of Korean independence, Canada was especially concerned with the Korean question because of its membership on the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea. Dr. G. S. Patterson of the Department of External Affairs was the Canadian representative and took an active part in the deliberations and work of the Commission throughout 1948.

On November 14, 1947, the General Assembly of the United Nations approved the establishment of a United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea consisting of representatives of Australia, Canada, China, El Salvador, France, India, the Philippines, Syria, and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; the Ukraine, however, refused to participate in the work of the Commission. The purpose of the Commission was to provide a means by which early elections would be held and a National Government for Korea established under United Nations observation.¹

Dr. Patterson, the Canadian representative, attended the first meeting of the Commission on January 12 at Seoul, Korea, where the Commission first considered the approach to be made to the Soviet authorities in North Korea to secure their co-operation. The United States authorities had already indicated their readiness to co-operate. Letters in identical form were sent to the General Officers Commanding the forces in North and South Korea and the text of these letters was also sent by telegram to the Secretary-General of the United Nations with the request that the permanent Soviet representative to the United Nations be asked to transmit it to Moscow. In a reply of January 23 from the Soviet representative, which was relayed to the Commission, Mr. Gromyko reminded the Commission of the negative attitude taken by the Soviet Government towards the establishment of the Korean Commission. It soon became apparent that no response would be forthcoming directly from the Soviet Commander in North Korea.

On February 6, the Commission declared that the negative attitude of the Soviet Government made it impossible for the Commission to exercise for the time being the functions conferred upon it by the General Assembly in the part of Korea occupied by the Soviet armed forces. The Commission thereupon resolved that it should consult the Interim Committee of the General Assembly and adopted a resolution embodying the following questions on which consultation should take place:

- I. Is it open to or incumbent upon the Commission under the terms of the General Assembly Resolutions of November 14, 1947 and in the light of developments on the situation with respect to Korea

¹ The text of this resolution is given in *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, pp. 183-185.

since that date, to implement the programme as outlined in Resolution II in that part of Korea which is occupied by the armed forces of the United States of America ?

II. If not (a) should the Commission observe the election of Korean representatives to take part in the consideration of the Korean question as outlined in Resolution I of November 14, 1947 provided that it has determined that elections can be held in a free atmosphere and (b) should the Commission consider such other measures as may be possible and advisable with a view to the attainment of its objectives ?

On February 19, Mr. Menon, the Chairman and Indian representative on the Commission, made a full report on the work of the Commission to the Interim Committee. The United States representative stated that the first question put to the Interim Committee should be answered in the affirmative, thereby leaving no need for an answer to the second question. He introduced a resolution to this effect.

The Canadian representative, in presenting the view of the Canadian Government, said that of the two resolutions of the Assembly which governed the powers and duties of the Korean Commission, the second in paragraph 4 indicated that the Commission could not operate in South Korea only. The Commission could not violate its terms of reference and the Interim Committee was not competent to change them. Therefore the Commission was not in a position to carry out its mandate in Korea. Although the Canadian Government strongly supported the objective of a free, united and democratic Korea and felt that the policy of the U.S.S.R. in preventing its realization was to be condemned, it nevertheless thought it unwise to ask the Commission to take further action.

On February 26, the Interim Committee by a vote of 31 in favour to 2 against (Canada and Australia) with eleven abstentions, adopted the United States resolution.

The General Officer Commanding United States Army Forces in South Korea announced on March 1 that elections would be held in that zone on May 9, a date which was later changed to May 10. After deliberation, the Commission on March 12 by a vote of 4 to 2 with 2 abstentions decided to observe these elections provided that it was ascertained that they would be held in a free atmosphere wherein democratic rights of freedom of speech, press and assembly would be recognized and respected. Canada and Australia, in conformity with the position they had taken in the Interim Committee, again voted in the negative.

The greater part of the necessary preparatory work relating to the observation of the elections was done by sub-committees and other subsidiary bodies created by the Commission. One sub-committee, on which the Canadian representative served, was charged with devising ways and means to ensure free conditions for the elections and approved a list of recommendations which was subsequently adopted by the Commission and passed to the United States authorities in South Korea. The United States Commanding General, after receiving these recommendations issued on April 5, a "Proclamation on the Rights of the Korean People", concerning civil liberties in South Korea.

One of the recommendations of the Commission concerned the pardoning of political prisoners, and on April 8 the United States Commanding General

informed the Commission that 3,140 pardons had been issued in ample time for the former prisoners to register as voters or as candidates in the elections.

Another Commission sub-committee examined documents received from Korean sources and secured statements from prominent Korean personalities whose views might be helpful to the Commission in its observation of the elections.

A third sub-committee, of which the Canadian representative was a member, examined the electoral laws and regulations in force in Korea, and prepared draft recommendations for the Commission, for transmission to the authorities. These recommendations were designed to promote as complete and as free an expression of popular will as possible in the elections and the Commission approved them with certain amendments. In a memorandum of March 24, the United States Liaison Officer to the Commission stated that the election regulations had been redrafted on the basis of these suggestions.

To observe the preparations for the elections in the field, the Commission during April divided itself into groups for inspection tours into the various provinces of South Korea. Detailed inquiries were made into the existence of a free atmosphere for elections and when unsatisfactory conditions were encountered the Military Governor was later informed.

As a result of its observations and studies the Commission on April 28 confirmed its decision of March 12 to observe the elections and stated that it had satisfied itself that there existed in South Korea a reasonably free atmosphere. During the debate the Canadian representative indicated his appreciation of the United States efforts to secure free conditions for the elections.

The elections were duly held on May 10 under Commission observation.

In the middle of May the main body of the Commission proceeded to Shanghai to prepare the first part of its report. It returned to Seoul on June 7 after the newly-elected Korean National Assembly had been convened there.

On June 25, the Commission unanimously recorded its opinion that the results of the ballot of May 10 were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate in South Korea.

The Commission received formal notification on August 6 that the "Government of the Republic of Korea" had been formed. The letter containing this information requested Commission consultation "particularly with reference to paragraph 4 of Resolution II of November 14, 1947". Some members took the view that the Government could not be regarded as the Government envisaged in the General Assembly resolutions and that the Commission should not prejudice the position of the General Assembly by acceding to the request for consultation. The Commission, however, on August 14 voted, 4 to 2 with one abstention, to comply with the request.

Two days earlier the United States Government had announced its view that the new government "was entitled to be regarded as the Government of Korea envisaged by the General Assembly resolutions of November 14, 1947", and the Chinese and Philippine Governments also accorded provisional recognition. Canada, like most other states, reserved any decision on recognition pending the submission to the General Assembly of the report of the Korean Commission.

On August 15 a special United States representative arrived in Korea to carry on negotiations with the government there concerning the transfer of authority to it from the United States Government. These negotiations had only begun, when the Commission left Korea to complete its report at Lake Success, designating its Main Committee to remain in Seoul to conduct consultations with the new government. It was understood that no serious consultation would be requested before the meeting of the United Nations General Assembly in Paris.

When the Temporary Commission on Korea presented its report to the third session of the General Assembly the problem was referred by the Assembly to the Political Committee for consideration and report.

Before the item was reached on the agenda it was proposed by the representative of Czechoslovakia that the Committee, at that time, should consider his draft resolution proposing that a delegation of the Korean Peoples' Democratic Republic should be invited to participate in the discussion on the question. (The Korean Peoples' Democratic Republic was established in North Korea as a result of elections held in North Korea on August 25, in which, it was alleged, the people of South Korea had also participated). The Czechoslovak proposal was rejected by the Committee. Subsequently, when the Committee took up the Korean question, the Czechoslovak draft resolution itself was rejected by 34 votes to 6 with 8 abstentions. In opposing the Czechoslovak resolution, the Canadian representative said that statements had been made in the resolution regarding elections in North Korea and the establishment of a so-called Peoples' Democratic Republic. In default of verification of these statements by the United Nations Temporary Commission, the Canadian representative believed that the Political Committee should not give the elections any support, or the persons supposed to have been chosen by them any endorsement such as would be secured by passing the Czechoslovak resolution. He stated, however, that, once the representatives of the Government elected in South Korea under United Nations supervision had been heard, certain persons from that part of Korea occupied by the U.S.S.R. army, which had refused to admit the United Nations Commission, might, if they were present, be given an opportunity to state to the Committee their views on the problem of Korean unification, and then withdraw.

By 39 votes to 6 with 1 abstention, the Committee adopted a Chinese draft resolution inviting the delegation of the Government of the Republic of Korea to participate in the debate without the right to vote. It was also agreed, without objection, to invite the Rapporteur of the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea to present its report.

The general debate on the question was held at the 231st to 235th meetings of the Committee during which a draft resolution was proposed by Australia, China and the United States, and a second draft resolution by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution proposed by Australia, China and the United States approved the conclusions of the Report of the Temporary Commission; declared that a lawful Government (the Government of the Republic of Korea) had been established, having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the Temporary Commission was able to observe and consult, . . . and that this was the only such Government in Korea; recommended that the occupying Powers should withdraw their occupying forces from Korea as early as practicable; and, resolved that a Commission

on Korea should be established to continue the work of the Temporary Commission and to carry out the provisions of the present resolution. The draft resolution of Australia, China and the United States was adopted by 41 to 6 with 2 abstentions.

The draft resolution proposed by the U.S.S.R., resolving that the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea should be abolished, was rejected by 42 to 6 with 3 abstentions.

During the lengthy general debate in Committee the Canadian representative offered to forego the privilege of speaking and, in the interest of securing a decision on the question before the Committee adjourned its present session, proposed that the general debate should be closed. The proposal was adopted by 35 to 6 with 2 abstentions.

By a vote of 41 to 0 with 1 abstention, the Committee adopted a proposal by the representative of the United States of America that the Commission on Korea should consist of the same member states which composed the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea. The representatives of the Byelo-Russian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Yugoslavia did not take part in the vote. The representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, in addition, stated that his Government would not take part in any activities of the Commission provided for in the draft resolution. The Canadian, representative, while stating that Canada would not oppose, at that stage, the proposal regarding the composition of the Commission, suggested the desirability of a smaller Commission.

The General Assembly began discussion of Korea at midnight, December 11, and adjourned at 2 a.m. December 12 to meet at 3 p.m. December 12. At the latter session the Canadian representative presented a statement in which he said that the Canadian Government shared the confidence expressed by the Political Committee in the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea and in the validity of the process by which the Government of the Republic of Korea had been established. He stated Canada's preference for a smaller Commission. Recognition of the Ukraine's refusal to participate in the Commission would reduce the number to eight which would not be a convenient number. He indicated that Canada was prepared to withdraw from the Commission, thus reducing the number to seven¹. An amendment reducing the number of the Korean Commission to seven as proposed by the Canadian representative was carried 42 to 0 with 3 abstentions. The Soviet bloc did not participate in the voting. The resolution from the Political Committee with this amendment was then passed 48 to 6 with one abstention.²

¹ For text of Canadian statement see Appendix II-I(1), pp. 227-228.

² For text of this resolution, see Appendix II-I(2), pp. 228-230.

12. Mexican Proposals for Peace

Shortly after the opening of the third session of the General Assembly, the representative of Mexico submitted a draft resolution calling on the great powers to "determine their policy in the spirit of the declaration to which they subscribed in the Crimea, in which they reaffirmed their faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter, their pledge in the declaration by the United Nations, and their determination to build in co-operation with other peace-loving nations a world order under law dedicated to peace, security, freedom and the general well-being of all mankind". In addition, the Mexican proposal urged the great powers "to redouble their efforts in a spirit of solidarity and mutual understanding, to achieve in the briefest possible time the final settlement of the war and the conclusion of all the peace treaties", and in this task to associate with them either through the General Assembly or by means of a special conference, the states who signed or adhered to the Washington Declaration of January 1, 1942¹. Both the First Committee of the General Assembly and the General Assembly in plenary session unanimously approved this resolution with only minor revisions in the text.

¹ United Nations Declaration made in Washington on January 1, 1942 by the twenty-six allied states then at war with Germany, Italy and Japan, in which they agreed not to make a separate peace or armistice with their enemies.

13. The Military Staff Committee¹

The Military Staff Committee was established under Article 43 of the United Nations Charter. Section 2 of this Article provides that the Committee shall be composed of "the Chiefs of Staff of the Permanent Members of the Security Council or their representatives". In February 1946 the representatives of the Chiefs of Staff of China, France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the U.S.S.R. met for the first time in London to establish the Committee.

When it began its work the Military Staff Committee was directed by the Security Council as its first task "to examine from the military point of view the provisions in Article 43 of the Charter and to submit the results of this study and any recommendations to the Council in due course." In April 1947 the Committee submitted to the Security Council its report on "General Principles governing the Organization of the Armed Forces made available to the Security Council by Member Nations of the United Nations". The Security Council began discussions of this report in June 1947 and approved those recommendations of the report on which unanimous agreement had been reached by all five representatives of the Military Staff Committee. However, when the Council commenced consideration of the recommendations of the Military Staff Committee on which unanimous agreement had not been reached, the Security Council itself was not able to resolve the differences of opinion on the first recommendation so considered, namely, Article 11 of the report relating to the composition of the armed forces to be made available to the Security Council. On June 26, 1947, the Security Council requested the Military Staff Committee to submit to the Council an estimate of the overall strength of armed forces to be made available to the Security Council, including the strength and composition of the separate components and the proportions that should be provided by the five permanent members. The report and the estimate of the Military Staff Committee are still under consideration by the Security Council.

The Military Staff Committee, meanwhile, has undertaken a provisional consideration of the "overall strength and composition" of these forces as outlined in a programme of work adopted by the Military Staff Committee on May 16, 1947.

¹ See *Report on the United Nations Conference on International Organization*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series, 1945, No. 2, pp. 36-37.

14. Palestine

As a member of the United Nations, Canada has been called upon during 1948 both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly to deal with questions relating to Palestine. The work of these two bodies has been mutually supplementary, the General Assembly being concerned with working out a plan of settlement while the Security Council has directed its efforts to preventing or arresting armed conflict between Jews and Arabs by means of truce procedures.

When the Security Council took up the Palestine problem in March and April 1948, Canada participated from the outset in its efforts to persuade Arabs and Jews either to arrange a truce themselves or to accept a truce planned by the Security Council. After the majority of a Committee composed of the permanent members of the Security Council agreed on March 19 that developments in Palestine could not be expected to follow the course outlined in the General Assembly's partition plan of November 29, 1947, the Canadian delegate analysed the reasons for the difficulties which had arisen, pointed out the importance of Great Power unanimity¹ and supported the Security Council's decision to call a special session of the Assembly to give further consideration to the future government of Palestine. He also voted for the resolution adopted on May 14 at the close of the special session of the General Assembly, providing for the appointment of a United Nations Mediator, whose chief function was "to promote a peaceful adjustment of the future situation in Palestine"². This resolution relieved from the further exercise of its responsibilities the Palestine Commission which had been chosen to help carry out the Assembly's partition plan of November 1947.

In the months which followed Canada gave its full support to the work of the United Nations Mediator. On May 29 it voted in favour of the first truce resolution of the Security Council which actually took effect. This called for a four-week cease-fire, without prejudice to the rights, claims or position of parties to the conflict. It was provided that in case of non-compliance by either party, the situation in Palestine would be reconsidered by the Security Council with a view to taking enforcement action under Chapter VII of the Charter. The resolution specified also that neither fighting personnel nor war materials were to be introduced into Palestine or into neighbouring Arab states during the truce period. All governments were called on to help implement the resolution.³ The Canadian government accordingly refrained from authorizing the departure for the named areas of fighting personnel and discouraged persons of military age from proceeding there from Canada. It gave no approval for the export of war materials to Palestine or to neighbouring Arab states.

The four-week cease-fire lasted from June 9 to July 7. When it proved impossible to secure an automatic extension of the truce, Canada supported a resolution of July 15 defining the renewed hostilities in Palestine as a threat to the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter, which

¹ Text of the statement of the Canadian representative on the Security Council, March 24 is given in Appendix II-J, (1) pp. 230-232.

² The text of the resolution is given in Appendix II-J, (2), pp. 232-233.

³ The text of this resolution is given in Appendix II-J, (3), pp. 233-234.

authorizes the Security Council to proceed to the consideration of military or non-military sanctions. For the first time interested parties were now definitely ordered to desist from further military action. The Mediator was authorized to establish procedures for dealing with breaches of the truce. The truce itself was to remain in force until a peaceful adjustment of the Palestine situation was reached.¹

On August 19 Canada supported a supplementary resolution holding each party responsible for acts of irregular forces in territory under its own control and warning both parties that they must not resort to violations of the truce for purposes of reprisal.

The assassination of the United Nations Mediator by irregulars in the Jewish-held section of Jerusalem on September 17 led to the subsequent adoption of a further resolution providing for the greater safety of United Nations personnel and specifying the conditions under which truce observers were to work. Canada participated in this decision and in a series of resolutions in October and November dealing with a serious violation of the truce which occurred in southwestern Palestine in mid-October. It was first decided on November 4 that the Acting Mediator should establish in this region provisional lines beyond which no troop movements might take place. This he did on November 13. Permanent truce lines and neutral or demilitarized zones, under the November 4 resolution, were to be established subsequently by direct negotiations or through United Nations intermediaries or, failing agreement, by a decision of the Acting Mediator. On November 16 the Security Council went a step further when it adopted a joint Canadian, Belgian and French resolution calling on the parties to negotiate with a view to establishing an immediate armistice, which should include the delineation of permanent armistice demarcation lines and a withdrawal and reduction of armed forces sufficient to ensure the maintenance of the armistice during the transition to permanent peace.²

While the Acting Mediator and United Nations truce observers worked out gradually the practical application of the resolutions of November 4 and 16, the General Assembly gave further consideration to the stabilization of relations between the Arabs and the Provisional Government of Israel. This government was established by a proclamation issued in Tel Aviv on May 14, a few hours before the termination of the United Kingdom mandate, and had been recognized by seventeen Members of the United Nations, when the third session of the General Assembly opened.

The Assembly had before it a series of recommendations formulated by the United Nations Mediator just before his assassination in September. The chief features of these recommendations were as follows: The boundaries of the Jewish state, whose continued existence the Mediator felt there was no reason to doubt, should be fixed by agreement, or by the United Nations itself, on a more equitable and workable basis than that recommended by the Assembly on November 29, 1947. Western and northern Palestine might form the Jewish state, while southern Palestine and the eastern portion of central Palestine might be left to the Arabs to dispose of by agreement among themselves, although the Mediator believed the Assembly should recommend the transfer to Transjordan of the greater part of the Arab area. The United Nations should guarantee Arab-Jewish boundaries.

¹ The text of this resolution is given in Appendix II-J, (4), pp. 234-235.

² The text of this resolution is given in Appendix II-J, (5), pp. 235-236.

Haifa should be a free port, Lydda a free airport. The Jerusalem area should be placed under effective United Nations control. Arab refugees should be repatriated and rehabilitated under United Nations auspices. A conciliation commission should supervise these various arrangements during the period of transition to peaceful conditions. The Mediator's proposals were embodied in a draft resolution presented by the United Kingdom delegate. This was subjected to drastic revision, first in committee and later in the General Assembly.

The Canadian delegate took the position that the people living in the area concerned must bear the main responsibility for working out the terms of their own association even though this would involve difficult concessions for both Arabs and Jews. The Assembly resolution should embody three principles, all of which must be taken together: (a) recognition of the existence of a Jewish state committed fully to principles of peaceful settlement, as evidenced by acceptance and putting into effect of truce and armistice arrangements of the Security Council; (b) the creation of a small commission of good offices to facilitate the negotiation of a final settlement, in Palestine itself, within the framework of truce and mediation proceedings worked out since November 29, 1947; (c) a call to both Arabs and Jews to co-operate in implementing the plan for international control of Jerusalem.¹

A debate took place in committee on the questions of whether or not the existence of a State of Israel should be recognized by the Assembly and of whether or not the Mediator's proposals for the territorial division of Palestine should take precedence over the Assembly's partition plan of November 1947. The General Assembly finally adopted on December 11, 1948 a resolution whose chief features were as follows:

- (a) All references to the partition plan of November 1947 and the Mediator's proposals of September 1948 were deleted;
- (b) There was no direct allusion to the existence of a Jewish state in Palestine;
- (c) A Conciliation Commission of three members was to take steps to assist Arabs and Jews to reach a final settlement on all outstanding questions through direct negotiation or by negotiating with the Commission itself;
- (d) The Jerusalem-Bethlehem area was to be placed under effective United Nations control and the Security Council was asked to ensure its demilitarization as soon as possible;
- (e) Freest possible access to Jerusalem must be accorded to all inhabitants of Palestine;
- (f) The Conciliation Commission was to facilitate the repatriation and rehabilitation of refugees and the payment of compensation for loss of or damage to property;
- (g) It should also seek arrangements to facilitate the economic development of the area, prepare a detailed plan for a permanent international regime for the Jerusalem area, with local autonomy for distinctive groups, and call on Arab and Jewish authorities to give formal guarantees for the protection of holy places in the rest of Palestine, these guarantees to be submitted to the General Assembly for its approval.²

¹ For text of statement by the Chairman of the Canadian Delegation, in the First Committee of the General Assembly on November 22, 1948, see Appendix II-J, (6), pp. 236-240.

² The text of this resolution is given in Appendix II-J, (7), pp. 240-243.

An application for the admission of Israel to membership in the United Nations was submitted to the Secretary-General on November 29, 1948, with a request that the application be considered without delay. The question of Security Council procedure was discussed on December 2. Canada took the position—upheld by the majority in the Security Council—that it would be possible for the Security Council to judge the qualifications of Israel for membership only in relation to the resolution to be adopted by the General Assembly on Palestine. Until that resolution was formulated the Security Council would not know what it would be necessary for the Israeli authorities to do in order to fulfil their obligations to the Organization. Nor would it be possible until then to tell whether Israel would be able and willing to carry out these obligations.¹

The Security Council considered Israel's membership application on December 17, six days after the general Assembly resolution had been adopted. A suggestion that action be deferred for a month, offered by the French delegate, was supported by five other states, including Canada,² but since seven affirmative votes were required it failed of adoption. The Security Council therefore proceeded without further delay to vote on the application. Five states supported the application (Argentina, Colombia, Ukraine, the United States and the U.S.S.R.). Syria opposed it. Five states abstained (Belgium, Canada, China, France and the United Kingdom). The application consequently failed of acceptance, but is expected to be renewed at a later date.³

On December 22 military activity was resumed in southern Palestine, where Israeli forces hemmed in the main Egyptian force based on Gaza and crossed the border into Egyptian territory after suspending normal arrangements for the observation of troop movements by United Nations representatives. On December 29 the Security Council dealt with the resulting situation in a resolution supported by eight members, including Canada. The resolution called for an immediate cease-fire, the provision of facilities for complete supervision of troops by United Nations observers and the implementation without further delay of the Security Council's November 4 resolution. A committee of seven was to meet on January 7 to consider the extent to which the resolutions of November 4 and 16 had been carried out. The Security Council expressed the hope that the Conciliation Commission would be established with as little delay as possible. When the year ended the Acting Mediator in New York and United Nations truce observers in Palestine were actively engaged in efforts to secure the co-operation of the parties concerned in putting an end to the conflict.

¹ For text of statement by the Canadian representative on the Security Council on December 2, 1948 see Appendix II-J (8), p. 243.

² For text of statement by the Canadian representative on the Security Council on December 17, 1948 see Appendix II-J (9), pp. 244-245.

³ For an account of Canada's *de facto* recognition of Israel on December 24, 1948 see *Report of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, 1948*.

15. Spanish Question¹

There were no significant developments on the Spanish question in the United Nations during 1948.

The second session of the General Assembly in 1947 passed a resolution which expressed confidence that the Security Council would "exercise its responsibilities under the Charter as soon as it considers that the situation in regard to Spain so requires". As a consequence, in June 1948 the Security Council reviewed the question, and because no new developments had occurred which would justify the Security Council in taking up the matter, it was decided not to include the question of Spain on the agenda. Canada supported this decision, pointing out that if the situation in Spain did become a threat to international peace, there was nothing to prevent any member of the United Nations from again placing the matter on the agenda of the Council.

The Government of Poland proposed the following item for the agenda of the third session of the General Assembly:

"The question of Franco-Spain—Implementation of the resolutions and recommendations of the General Assembly of 12 December, 1946, and 17 November, 1947."

This was one of the matters postponed until the second part of the third session of the General Assembly in April, 1949.

¹ For a full summary of the discussions at the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning Spain, see *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, pp. 63-66.

16. Trieste: Governorship

As a compromise between the rival claims of Italy and Yugoslavia to the city of Trieste, the Peace Treaty with Italy, signed at Paris on February 10, 1947, provided for the setting up of a Free Territory of Trieste and entrusted the integrity and independence of the Territory to the Security Council of the United Nations. The Council of Foreign Ministers submitted the proposed arrangements for Trieste to the Security Council for its prior approval, and on January 10, 1947, the Council accepted the responsibility for the Free Territory, on a motion by the United States.

The Security Council is required by the Peace Treaty to appoint a Governor for the Free Territory. Until this has been done, the Permanent Statute for the Territory remains in abeyance and the area is under military occupation by the military forces of the United Kingdom, the United States and Yugoslavia. The Governor is to be appointed by the Security Council, after consultation with Italy and Yugoslavia, for a term of five years, and his salary is to be borne by the United Nations. He is to have wide discretionary powers in the administration of the Territory and must, therefore, be a man with exceptional qualifications.

The Security Council first discussed the appointment of a Governor for the Free Territory on June 20, 1947, at the request of the United Kingdom. A number of candidates for the post were nominated in subsequent meetings by various members of the Security Council, but none was acceptable to all five permanent members. On December 18, 1947, at the suggestion of the United States, the Council asked Italy and Yugoslavia to consult upon a nomination and to report the results of their consultations. On January 23, 1948, the Security Council met to consider this report. The two Governments had each submitted the names of several candidates, but none was acceptable to both Italy and Yugoslavia. The five permanent members of the Security Council were therefore asked to make a further attempt at agreement on a candidate, in informal discussions. The Security Council reconsidered the question on March 9, 1948. No progress toward agreement had been made by the five permanent members, and the Security Council agreed to suspend discussions and to take up the question again at the request of any member of the Security Council.

On August 19, in the discussion of a Yugoslav complaint regarding the military administration of the United Kingdom-United States zone of Trieste¹, the Ukrainian S.S.R. raised the question of the appointment of a Governor and submitted a resolution to the effect that the Security Council should regard the appointment of a Governor as an urgent matter. The United Kingdom representative pointed out that the only item on the agenda of the Council at that moment was the Yugoslav complaint, and therefore, a resolution on the Governorship was out of order. Most of the members of the Council, including Canada, abstained from voting on the resolution which, therefore, failed of adoption; the Security Council has not resumed discussion of the appointment of a Governor.

Canada, as a signatory to the Peace Treaty with Italy, was concerned that the provisions of the Treaty with regard to Trieste should be carried

¹ See also Section II, Chapter 17, p. 81.

out as soon as possible. It has been the Canadian view, however, that it was undesirable for the Security Council to consider candidates for the Governorship who had been rejected by either of the two parties directly concerned — Italy and Yugoslavia. So far it has been impossible to find a candidate acceptable to both states. On March 20, 1948, the Governments of the United Kingdom, the United States and France addressed notes to the Government of the U.S.S.R. suggesting that, as the arrangements for the establishment of a Free Territory of Trieste had proved unworkable, and the Security Council had been unable to agree upon a Governor, a protocol to the Italian Peace Treaty should be negotiated by which Trieste would be returned to Italy. In a statement made in the House of Commons on April 5, 1948, the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that Canada supported this proposal to revise the Italian Peace Treaty.

17. Trieste: Yugoslav Complaint

Pending the appointment of a Governor for the Free Territory of Trieste by the Security Council, the Territory is administered by the military forces of the United Kingdom, the United States and Yugoslavia. On July 28, 1948, the Government of Yugoslavia addressed to the Security Council a complaint regarding the administration of the joint United Kingdom-United States Zone.

The Yugoslav complaint centered on four agreements on economic and financial matters concluded between the administration of the Anglo-American Zone of Trieste and the Government of Italy. It was the contention of Yugoslavia that these agreements, by which Italy supplies currency and foreign exchange for the Anglo-American Zone and finances its administration, and which provide for the absence of customs barriers between Italy and the Free Territory, have virtually incorporated the Zone into Italy. Since the Security Council is charged, by the Terms of the Italian Peace Treaty, with the responsibility for the integrity and independence of the Free Territory of Trieste, the Yugoslav Government asked the Council to declare the agreements with Italy to be a violation of the Treaty and to take the necessary steps to nullify them.

The Security Council discussed the Yugoslav complaint at meetings during August 1948. The delegates of the United Kingdom and the United States maintained that the Yugoslav charges were based on an unsound legal position, since they referred to the Permanent Statute of the Free Territory embodied in the Italian Peace Treaty; whereas the present arrangements in Trieste were governed by the Instrument for the Provisional Regime. Both delegations pointed out that the Provisional Statute required Italy to provide currency and foreign exchange for the Territory and argued that the disputed agreements simply carried out these provisions, pending the appointment of a Governor and application of the Permanent Statute.

On August 19, 1948 the Ukrainian representative on the Security Council moved a resolution endorsing the Yugoslav complaint, declaring the agreements with Italy illegal, and calling upon the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States to refrain from future action in violation of the Peace Treaty. The representatives of the U.S.S.R. and the Ukrainian S.S.R. voted for this motion, but the remainder of the members of the Security Council abstained. The resolution therefore failed to be approved.

The Canadian representative on the Security Council did not participate in the discussion of the Yugoslav complaint and abstained from voting on the final resolution. It was the Canadian view that the question involved was one of conflicting interpretations of the legal rights and obligations under the Peace Treaty with Italy, and that the International Court of Justice, rather than the Security Council would be the appropriate body to determine the correct legal interpretation of a Treaty.

11 - The Yaglaya Complaint

The Security Council discussed the Yaglaya complaint at its meeting on August 19, 1948. The complaint was presented by the Canadian representative on the Security Council. The Council decided to refer the matter to the International Court of Justice for its decision. The Council also decided to request the Government of the United States to provide information on the situation in the Yaglaya region. The Council also decided to request the Government of the United States to provide information on the situation in the Yaglaya region. The Council also decided to request the Government of the United States to provide information on the situation in the Yaglaya region.

The Security Council discussed the Yaglaya complaint at its meeting on August 19, 1948. The complaint was presented by the Canadian representative on the Security Council. The Council decided to refer the matter to the International Court of Justice for its decision. The Council also decided to request the Government of the United States to provide information on the situation in the Yaglaya region. The Council also decided to request the Government of the United States to provide information on the situation in the Yaglaya region. The Council also decided to request the Government of the United States to provide information on the situation in the Yaglaya region.

On August 19, 1948, the Canadian representative on the Security Council moved a resolution and urged the Yaglaya complaint. The resolution called for the Government of the United States to provide information on the situation in the Yaglaya region. The resolution also called for the Government of the United States to provide information on the situation in the Yaglaya region. The resolution also called for the Government of the United States to provide information on the situation in the Yaglaya region.

The Canadian representative on the Security Council did not participate in the discussion of the Yaglaya complaint and abstained from voting on the final resolution. It was the Canadian view that the question involved was one of conflicting interpretations of the legal rights and obligations under the Peace Treaty with India, and that the International Court of Justice, rather than the Security Council, would be the appropriate body to determine the correct legal interpretation of a Treaty.

III. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS

1. The First Three Years of the Economic and Social Council

With the close of 1948, Canada's original three-year term as a member of the United Nations Economic and Social Council was completed. Although as Canada was one of the nations elected at the first Council session for a full three-year period, it has had a unique opportunity to observe the work in which the Council has been able to give its assistance and effectiveness throughout its brief existence.

The record of the Council during this period, particularly the first two years, has been remarkably free of organizational difficulties and controversies. This during the last few sessions has led the members of the Council to give more and more attention to the development of programs of economic and social assistance, to the development of technical assistance, and to the development of international organizations. The work has been especially characterized in the Economic and Social Council by the fact that the program of studies has been a very timely and effective one, and that the Council has been able to give its assistance in a very effective manner.

III. Economic and Social Questions.

III. Economic and Social Questions.

III. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS

1. The First Three Years of the Economic and Social Council

With the close of 1948, Canada's original three-year term as a member of the United Nations Economic and Social Council was completed. Inasmuch as Canada was one of six nations elected at the first General Assembly for a full-three-year period, it has had a unique opportunity to observe the manner in which the Council has been able to grow in strength and effectiveness throughout its brief existence.

The record of the Council during this period, particularly the first two years, has been essentially one of organizational growth and development. Only during the last few sessions have the questions of organization, procedure and structural development begun to give way gradually to more fundamental, substantive discussions of economic and social questions. This is perhaps inevitable in the development of international organizations, but it has been especially characteristic of the Economic and Social Council which has had to face the problem of relating itself to a wide variety of other international bodies with special responsibilities in the economic, social and cultural fields.

The Council serves as the focus of activities of a host of special commissions, sub-commissions, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations, all of which interest themselves in some particular phase of international economic and social effort. With such a multiplicity of organizations, it is obvious that the effectiveness of each agency's programme depends in large degree on the extent to which its own activities are satisfactorily co-ordinated and integrated with those of other agencies. It has been the difficult and unenviable task of the Economic and Social Council to try to bring some order out of this confusing array of organizations and to develop an even and balanced pattern of international collaboration in respect to economic and social questions.

Such an assignment would, in the best of times, be difficult of successful achievement; and while it is only fair to say that a certain measure of success has attended the Council's efforts in the period under review, it must also be admitted that the conflicts and divided counsels of the United Nations membership on larger political issues have reflected themselves in the Council's work and prevented it from achieving as satisfactory a measure of progress as might otherwise have been possible. If it was ever the hope of those who framed the United Nations Charter that, by establishing a separate and independent Council to deal with international economic and social questions, they would be able to insulate the discussion of such matters from the political tensions and schisms of the times, those hopes have now been proven to be illusory.

When the Council first began to operate in the early part of 1946, it found itself faced with a variety of problems. Foremost among these in terms of urgency were those relating to the resumption of tasks in the economic and social fields which had at one time been undertaken by the League of Nations. Perhaps more pressing still were the urgent problems

of reconstruction and rehabilitation arising out of the aftermath of World War II. The economic problems of the devastated areas of Europe demanded immediate attention, and the plight of hundreds of thousands of refugees and displaced persons presented a social and humanitarian problem of equal urgency and magnitude. Because of these demanding pressures, the Council found itself in a position where it had to postpone consideration of longer-range economic and social problems until it could develop an emergency structure through which immediate measures of reconstruction and development could be undertaken in the areas of the world which found themselves in greatest need.

Accordingly, the Council, in its first year of operation, charted a course of action along several parallel lines. First of all, it began to develop its own organizational pattern, to establish its own rules of procedure, and to provide for the creation of subsidiary bodies to which it could delegate tasks in a number of specialized fields. By the end of 1946 it had established no less than nine special commissions. These commissions were the following:

- Commission on Human Rights
- Commission on Narcotic Drugs
- Commission on the Status of Women
- Economic and Employment Commission
- Fiscal Commission
- Population Commission
- Social Commission
- Statistical Commission
- Transport and Communications Commission

In addition to these bodies, a number of subordinate sub-commissions were also created, the most important of these being the Sub-commission on Economic Stability and Employment, the Sub-commission on Economic Development, the Sub-commission on Freedom of Information, and the Sub-commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities.

With the establishment of these permanent commissions, it became possible for the Council to delegate to appropriate permanent organs of the United Nations certain continuing responsibilities which had at one time been borne by various agencies of the League of Nations, but which, in the years following the outbreak of the Second World War, had received little or no international attention. The continuing machinery established by the Council through the creation of such bodies as the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Social Commission made it possible for the supervisory authority over a number of international conventions, which had previously been vested in the League of Nations, to be transferred to appropriate United Nations organs in such a way as to make possible the resumption and the continuation of international control and supervision in the areas covered by these Conventions.

Coincident with this development of its own organizational pattern, the Council also initiated action which led to the establishment of a number of new intergovernmental organizations known as specialized agencies. One of the most urgent responsibilities facing the Council had to do with the establishment of some international machinery to carry on those social and humanitarian functions which had been, up to 1946, the responsibility of UNRRA. With the liquidation of UNRRA at the end of 1946, it was

realized that continuing provision would have to be made on a modified basis for international relief needs, and in particular for the needs of refugees and displaced persons. Perhaps the main achievement of the Council in the year 1946 was the establishment of the International Refugee Organization which was given the approval of the General Assembly, at the end of 1946, and eventually achieved the status of a fully constituted specialized agency in August of 1948. The International Refugee Organization has continued in the years following the liquidation of UNRRA to carry the main burden of responsibility for finding an adequate solution to the post-war refugee problem.

At the same time, the Council took the initial steps which resulted in General Assembly approval of the creation of the International Children's Emergency Fund. This agency was charged with the continuation, in modified form, of work previously entrusted to UNRRA in connection with international relief for children.

The Council was also responsible for taking the first steps, in the early part of 1946, to convene a World Health Conference which led to the establishment of the Interim Commission of the World Health Organization. The World Health Organization has, in 1948, achieved permanent status as a specialized agency. The Council likewise set up the Preparatory Committee which began the task of organization leading to the formation of the International Trade Organization.

A number of specialized, intergovernmental agencies had already been established prior to the first meeting of the Economic and Social Council. Some of these were of fairly recent origin, like the Food and Agriculture Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Monetary Fund. Others were of longer standing, such as the International Labour Organization which had come into being after the first World War, and which had achieved in the years between the wars an outstanding record of international accomplishment. In accordance with the provision in the Charter of the United Nations which calls upon the Economic and Social Council to effect agreements with these intergovernmental organizations and to work out a satisfactory basis for co-ordinating their activities one with the other, the Council spent a great deal of its time in the first year of its existence in negotiating model agreements with a number of organizations, such as ILO, UNESCO and FAO. These agreements have been used in subsequent years as working models for the negotiation of similar agreements with other intergovernmental organizations, such as the International Telecommunications Union and the Universal Postal Union. At the present time some eleven intergovernmental organizations have entered into similar agreements with the United Nations through the Economic and Social Council and have thus acquired the status of specialized agencies, co-ordinating their activities through the machinery established by the Council for this purpose.

Perhaps the most important of all the tasks facing the Council from its inception was that of assisting in the economic reconstruction of those areas of the world which had been tragically devastated by the war. The economies of most of the countries of Europe had been distorted and in some cases almost completely wrecked in the six-year struggle. Many Asiatic countries found themselves in a similar plight at the conclusion of hostilities with Japan; and the problem so far as the Asiatic areas were

concerned was aggravated by the fact that their economies, even before the outbreak of war, were impoverished and underdeveloped in relation to the more intensely industrialized economies of Western Europe and of North America. The Council took prompt action at its first session, in 1946, to deal with these complex situations by establishing a temporary sub-commission on the problems of devastated areas. Working parties were sent to visit the areas in Europe and in Asia which had been most directly affected. As a result of the reports submitted after these survey teams had done their work, the Council, at its first meeting in 1947, established an Economic Commission for Europe, and followed this up in August of the same year by the establishment of an Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. To these regional commissions was entrusted the formidable task of working out co-operative plans and methods by which the economies of all the countries in the regions affected would be restored as speedily as possible to normal health.

While recognizing that there were certain dangers inherent in any narrowly regional approach to the solution of the economic ills of particular areas of the world, the Council considered that, for a number of years at least, such an approach was necessary if the nations most seriously affected by the ravages of war were to be restored speedily and successfully to their normal place in the world's economy.

The establishment of these two regional commissions has, of course, focused attention equally on the problems of other areas of the world which, while not devastated by war, are handicapped by backward or poorly developed economies in their efforts to promote the fullest possible measure of world-wide economic prosperity. The Council consequently took steps to establish, early in 1948, an Economic Commission for Latin America and, at the close of 1948, had under consideration a proposal to establish an Economic Commission for the Middle East.

The problems presented by this regional approach to the solution of the world's economic problems have caused the Council some concern, and Canada has on a number of occasions added its voice to those of other countries which have pointed out the dangers to the development of a satisfactory world economy if too much emphasis is laid upon a narrowly regional approach to the solution of economic problems in particular areas. At the same time, it should be stated that the establishment of these regional Economic Commissions has not to date presented any serious problems. In fact, the Economic Commission for Europe has proved to be probably the most outstandingly successful of all the undertakings which the Economic and Social Council has been responsible for initiating since it began its operations in 1946.

In the course of the year 1948, the Council also brought to successful completion two important and fundamental undertakings in the social and humanitarian field. When the General Assembly gave final approval to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, these actions marked the culmination of two efforts which had engaged the attention of the Council almost from the beginning of its existence. Both of these tasks had been placed upon the shoulders of the Council by the General Assembly itself. In both undertakings the Council was moving in largely uncharted areas. The Declaration of Human Rights and the Genocide Convention have passed during the last two years through successive stages of study,

drafting and review, and stand today in their completed form, as approved by the General Assembly, as impressive landmarks, indicating the fact that, even in the midst of the storms of political dissension and economic rivalry, nations can still join together in a common respect for and insistence on the social decencies which should be the right of all mankind. Through slow and quiet accomplishment of tasks such as this, the Economic and Social Council is gradually gaining strength and fulfilling, as it gains in years and the sure touch of experience, some part, at least, of the high hopes that were held out for it when the Charter of the United Nations was framed in San Francisco in 1945.

As the various bodies established by the Council or brought into relationship with it from time to time have increased in number, the problem of co-ordination among these many international organs has naturally assumed progressively greater importance. With twelve commissions and the same number of specialized agencies, a number of sub-commissions and other temporary special-purpose bodies, and a whole host of non-governmental agencies occupying themselves with the entire international economic and social field, the Council has found it necessary to face the responsibilities placed upon it by the United Nations Charter and has attempted to develop adequate machinery for the co-ordination of these manifold activities.

It has had to keep an alert and watchful eye on the activities of the various divisions of the United Nations Secretariat and the commissions of its own creation. It has had to work out by delicate negotiations with the specialized agencies, each one alertly conscious and sensitive of its own "sovereign" rights, a pattern of co-operative action which would ensure adequate consideration for the total economic and social field with a minimum of overlapping. It has had to struggle at times with confusion verging on chaos as it tried to cope with a multiplicity of problems and a welter of agencies, many of which are too recent in origin to have established their programmes on clear-cut, practical lines.

There is little doubt that one of the problems facing the Council in the future will be that of simplifying this structure of international organization through the elimination of some bodies, through amalgamation and absorption of others into larger units or organs, and through more perfect co-ordination of the main international organs in the social and economic field. This will be a time-consuming, unspectacular task; but it is one in which the Council has already acquired a modest amount of experience and success. There is little doubt that a continuation and intensification of the Council's efforts to achieve a better degree of co-ordination will increase its own stature and prestige and contribute in a major way to the effective solution of the many important international economic and social problems with which the Council and its related agencies are called upon to deal.¹

¹ For text of Canadian statement at the third session of the General Assembly on the work of the Economic and Social Council see Appendix III-A, pp. 246-247.

2. Commissions of the Economic and Social Council

a. Commission on Human Rights

The Human Rights Commission, which was formally established in June, 1946, by the second session of the Economic and Social Council, consists of representatives of eighteen members of the United Nations. Canada is not represented on this Commission.

In December, 1947, at its second session, the Commission on Human Rights prepared a draft International Bill of Human Rights. This consisted of a draft Declaration (a statement of fundamental principles), a draft Covenant (the basis for an international treaty) and a third section discussing the manner in which both the draft Declaration and the draft Covenant could be made effective. The draft Bill of Human Rights was circulated to Member Governments for their comments and the Declaration was then redrafted by a small Drafting Committee and submitted to the third session of the Commission on Human Rights, held at Lake Success, New York, May 24 to June 18, 1948. The third session of the Commission then made further revisions in the draft Declaration and transmitted it to the seventh session of the Economic and Social Council, meeting during July and August, 1948, in Geneva.

The Declaration gives a statement of fundamental political, civil, economic and social rights. As submitted to the seventh session of the Economic and Social Council and afterwards to the third session of the General Assembly, it contained 28 articles. The rights set forth in the Declaration were to be exercised subject only to "such limitations as are necessary to secure due recognition and respect for the rights of others and the requirements of morality, public order and general welfare in a democratic society." Owing to lack of time the Commission on Human Rights did not at its third session discuss in substance the two remaining parts of the international Bill of Human Rights, (that is, the draft Covenant on Human Rights and the measures for implementation). However, it recommended to the Economic and Social Council that the Commission should meet early in 1949 to complete its work on these sections. The Economic and Social Council at its seventh session did not debate the report of the third session of the Commission on Human Rights, but referred it to the third session of the General Assembly without comment.

The draft Declaration was considered in Canada in 1948 by a Special Joint Parliamentary Committee on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms which was first constituted in 1947. The terms of reference of both Committees were "to consider the question of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the manner in which those obligations, accepted by all Members of the United Nations, may best be implemented;

"And, in particular, in the light of the provisions contained in the Charter of the United Nations, and the establishment by the Economic and Social Council thereof of a Commission on Human Rights, what is the legal and constitutional situation in Canada with respect to such rights, and what steps, if any, it would be advisable to take or to recommend for the purpose of preserving in Canada respect for the observance of human rights and

fundamental freedoms." The Parliamentary Committee discussed each article in general terms and concluded that the Declaration would be more effective if stated in a shorter, more concise form. The Parliamentary Committee was opposed to certain articles which seemed unnecessary, and considered that the Declaration, as opposed to any Covenant that may later be developed, should contain statements of general principle rather than specific mandatory articles.

The Third Committee of the General Assembly began its study of the draft Declaration of Human Rights on September 30, and completed it on December 1. A very large number of amendments to the various articles of the Declaration was submitted and each article was discussed in detail. The attempt to reconcile different social, constitutional, economic and political ideologies made it difficult to reach an agreed text. However, in spite of the prolonged debate, the Declaration, as eventually accepted by the Third Committee, did not differ radically from the original draft submitted to it, except for the addition of a new clause extending the force of the Declaration to non-self-governing territories. Certain of the original articles were divided, so that the Declaration as finally adopted contains thirty rather than twenty-eight articles.

When the draft Declaration as a whole was put to the vote in the Third Committee, the Canadian delegation abstained from voting. In the plenary session, however, where the draft Declaration was approved by 48 votes in favour to none with 9 abstentions (Byelorussian S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, Honduras, Poland, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia), the leader of the Canadian delegation, in announcing the Canadian intention to support the Declaration, explained that the earlier Canadian abstention was intended to emphasize Canadian misgivings on certain inadequacies and ambiguities in its drafting, and particularly to make clear the position of the Government of Canada in relation to a Declaration of Human Rights which dealt, in several important clauses, with matters within the competence of the provinces under the Canadian constitution. This position having been made clear, the Canadian delegation voted in favour of the Declaration¹.

b. Commission on the Status of Women

One of the problems which the United Nations is attempting to solve concerns the inferior position of women in many of its member states. In some countries women do not have the franchise, or are granted it on a limited basis only, and even in countries where women enjoy political equality with men they are frequently barred from certain professions, such as medicine and law. In the application of nationality laws and laws concerning the ownership of property, as well as regards employment opportunities, married women are frequently at a greater disadvantage than single women.

In the preamble of the Charter, the Members of the United Nations have reaffirmed faith in the equal rights of men and women and in Article I it is stated that the purposes and principles of the United Nations are, among others, to achieve co-operation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinc-

¹ The text of the Canadian statement is given in Appendix III-B, pp. 247-249; and the text of the Declaration as adopted is given in Appendix III-C, pp. 249-255.

tion as to sex. Accordingly, in June, 1946, the Economic and Social Council established a Commission on the Status of Women which consists of one representative from each of fifteen members of the United Nations selected by the Economic and Social Council. Canada is not represented on this Commission.

The function of the Commission is to prepare recommendations and reports to the Economic and Social Council on promoting women's rights in political, economic, civil, social and educational spheres. The Commission is also to make recommendations to the Council on urgent problems requiring immediate attention in the field of women's rights. The immediate task of this Commission is to examine the existing legal and customary disabilities of women in political and social rights, educational opportunities and, in consultation with the International Labour Organization, economic rights.

The Secretariat, in accordance with a resolution of the second session of the Economic and Social Council, has prepared a comprehensive questionnaire on the status of women based on a similar survey prepared by a Committee of Experts of the League of Nations. The first part of this questionnaire, covering the field of public law affecting the status of women, was sent to member states in 1947. The Canadian government submitted replies to all sections of Part I of the questionnaire on January 14, 1948.

The second session of the Commission on the Status of Women was held in January, 1948. In its report, the Commission made recommendations to the Economic and Social Council on several aspects of women's rights, devoting much attention to women's rights to vote and hold office. Of twenty-three resolutions dealing with political, educational and social rights, seven were submitted by the Commission on the Status of Women for the urgent consideration of the sixth session of the Economic and Social Council, February-March, 1948, so that action on them could be initiated immediately. At this session, the Economic and Social Council requested the Secretary-General to prepare reports on the franchise of women and their eligibility for public office in the various member states, and on their educational opportunities. The Economic and Social Council called upon Member States to implement the principle of equal pay for equal work for men and women workers.

The sixth session of the Economic and Social Council also transmitted to the Commission on Human Rights two suggestions of the Commission on the Status of Women for amendments to the draft Declaration on Human Rights. These were later included in the Declaration in a modified form.

At its seventh session, July-August, 1948, the Economic and Social Council considered the sixteen remaining resolutions on rights of women submitted by the Commission on the Status of Women. The consideration of these resolutions in the Human Rights Committee of the Economic and Social Council gave rise to a confused and acrimonious debate that extended through thirteen sessions of the Human Rights Committee and two plenary sessions, seriously dislocating the Economic and Social Council's time-table of work.

Since the nationality of women is affected in various ways by domicile, marriage and divorce, and since national laws conflict on many of these points, one of the resolutions which the Commission on the Status of Women submitted to the seventh session of the Economic and Social Council

requested the Secretary-General to obtain from Member States an account of their laws on nationality so far as they affect women married to husbands of different nationality and children born to parents of different nationalities, and to report to the Commission on the Status of Women on this and on existing treaties and conventions on nationality. The resolution also requested the Secretary-General to obtain the views of various United Nations organs on this subject and to forward to Member Governments the request that married women should have the same rights as regards nationality as are enjoyed by men and single women. However, as a result of persistent opposition by the delegation of the U.S.S.R., which contended that there were only a few isolated cases of discrimination against married women arising from conflicting nationality laws and that a resolution on the subject implied interference with the domestic jurisdiction of the governments concerned, the resolution which was finally approved merely requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the replies to the questionnaire on the Legal Status and Treatment of Women and on the relevant existing Treaties and Conventions and to draw up a suitable questionnaire which might be required for any future information.

The third session of the General Assembly decided to postpone until the second part of its session in April, 1949, consideration of the resolutions submitted by the Economic and Social Council on the status of women.

c. Economic and Employment Commission

Canada is one of the fifteen countries nominated by the Economic and Social Council to appoint an expert to the Economic and Employment Commission for a three-year term of office. Mr. John J. Deutsch of the Department of Finance is the Canadian representative for the term ending December 31, 1949.

Under its terms of reference, this Commission, which was set up at the second session of the Economic and Social Council, has broad responsibilities for advising the Council on economic questions in order to promote higher standards of living. In particular, it advises on:

- (a) the prevention of wide fluctuations of economic activity and the promotion of full employment by the co-ordination of national full employment policies and by international action,
- (b) problems of the reconstruction of devastated areas and other urgent problems arising from the war so as to help various members of the United Nations whose territories have been devastated as a result of the war, and
- (c) the promotion of economic development and progress, with special regard to the problems of less developed areas.

The Commission draws the attention of the Council to the probable influence of policies and activities of the other Commissions of the Council, the specialized agencies, or other international organizations on these matters.

Two sub-commissions have also been established, each consisting of seven members elected for three-year terms by the Economic and Employment Commission. The first of these, the Sub-commission on

Employment and Economic Stability, is to study national and international full employment policies and fluctuations in economic activity; analyze the causes of these fluctuations, and advise the Commission on the most appropriate methods of promoting full employment and economic stability. The second, the Sub-commission on Economic Development, is to study and advise the Commission on the principles and problems of long term economic development, with particular attention to the inadequately developed parts of the world with the object of promoting the fullest and most effective utilization of national resources, labour and capital, raising the level of consumption, and studying the effects of industrialization and changes of a technological order upon the world economic situation.

At its first two sessions held during 1947, the Commission attempted to define and delineate its field of interest, developed detailed instructions for its sub-commissions and indicated the types of data and analyses which it expected the United Nations Secretariat to provide. Special attention was devoted to the question of technical assistance to Member Governments. Consideration was also given to the activities of the regional commissions and to the potential role of the Commission in the co-ordination of its work with that of the specialized agencies.

The reports of the Commission on these sessions were subsequently examined by the Economic and Social Council which approved a number of resolutions giving effect to many of the recommendations. In particular the Council created machinery for the provision of technical assistance for the purpose of advising Governments in connection with development programs. It also approved the recommendations regarding studies by the Secretariat. As a result of these latter recommendations a number of studies including the first periodic survey on world economic trends, "Economic Report on Salient Features of the World's Economic Situation 1945-47" as well as a "Directory of Economic and Statistical Projects" were published in early 1948.

The Commission held one session during 1948. At this session it dealt mainly with problems of economic development and economic stability, especially inflation. In the course of these discussions, the work of its two sub-commissions was examined carefully. Two major resolutions were approved: the first, dealing with technical and expert assistance, drew attention to facilities of this kind already available to Member Governments through the United Nations; the second attempted to set forth certain principles for assisting the economic development, and especially the industrialization, of underdeveloped countries. The discussion leading to approval of these resolutions was lengthy and contentious, with the industrialized countries of the west usually in disagreement with the representative of the U.S.S.R., and to a lesser extent with the representatives of "underdeveloped countries". A number of members contended that the Commission was dealing in generalities and that its recommendations were too academic. The feeling was that more specific suggestions were essential. As a result, a Committee on Organization (of which Canada is a member) was established to examine the question of future organization and terms of reference of the Commission and its sub-commissions. This Committee is to consider the matter and to formulate recommendations on it during the fourth session of the Economic and Employment Commission.

The report of the third session of the Economic and Employment Commission was considered by the Economic and Social Council at its seventh session in July, 1948. The Council approved the draft resolution on "technical assistance" but felt that the other resolution on "economic development" was too general. Although it agreed that this resolution represented a "useful interim formulation of the principles which should guide the Commission in its consideration of the problems of underdeveloped areas", it requested the Commission to give further consideration to these problems and to "make recommendations which bear more explicitly" on them.

As a further result of these criticisms, the Council also decided to examine the organization of the Economic and Employment Commission at a future session in order to determine "the most effective way to fulfil the purposes for which the Economic and Employment Commission and its sub-commissions were established". The understanding was that this examination should be held as soon as the Commission had been able to consider the views of its Committee on Organization.

The Canadian delegation took an active part in the discussion of all these questions. The final text of the resolution on economic development was based on a Canadian draft, and a Canadian amendment was incorporated into the resolution on organization. In the course of the discussion, both in the Commission and the Economic and Social Council, the Canadian representative pointed out that the difficulties the Commission was experiencing were not entirely of an organizational or technical character but reflected the wide disagreement on political and economic aims and objectives which existed between the countries of the West and those in the Soviet orbit. He also emphasized the necessity for a closer integration of the activities of the Economic and Employment Commission with those of the regional Commissions.

d. Fiscal Commission

The Fiscal Commission was established by a resolution passed by the third session of the Economic and Social Council in October, 1946. The Fiscal Commission's main work is the collection of information on figures of public debt from 1914, on public finance from 1937, and on international tax treaties. It consists of representatives of fifteen members of the United Nations.

While not a member of the Fiscal Commission, Canada has taken an active part in the field of international tax treaties, and has always recognized the desirability of codifying sound international tax practices.

The Fiscal Commission has given consideration to the possibility of compiling material on national tax laws and regulations insofar as they concern foreigners or have an extra-territorial implication. The Commission also proposes that governments should be consulted on model tax treaties prepared by the League of Nations in 1943 and 1946, which might serve as a basis for the negotiation of bilateral treaties.

Basically, there can be no one model that properly fits the views of the two groups of nations which have differing status in their international accounts, namely, the creditor nations and the debtor nations. The League of Nations' model Conventions were drawn up primarily from the point of view of creditor nations and technically followed the "European system"

of eliminating double taxation by dealing with individual kinds of income, one nation giving up its right to tax this particular kind of income. Canada has generally maintained the principle that a nation has a prior right to tax at the source on incomes flowing abroad and, at the same time, to accept the responsibility of granting relief from double taxation to its own residents by allowing a tax credit in respect of taxes at the source levied by foreign governments.

The Commission has shown an interest in the tabulation of material on laws and regulations under which mutual assistance is undertaken between national tax administrations in the assessment and collection of taxes. As far as Canada is concerned, provisions of this nature are not found in the ordinary tax laws but are contained in international tax treaties. Generally speaking, Canada has refrained from undertaking to provide an automatic international flow of tax information.

e. Narcotics Control

The most noteworthy achievement during 1948 in the international control of narcotic drugs was the signature on November 19 at the Palais de Chaillot in Paris by representatives of 47 nations of a new protocol to bring under international control dangerous drugs, particularly synthetic drugs developed during the war, not covered by previous international conventions. The fact that this new protocol was drafted, considered by member governments, revised, passed through the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly and opened for signature all within a period of 18 months is a gratifying indication that where there is an international will to co-operate, the United Nations can and does supply the way.

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs held its third session at Lake Success, New York from May 3 to May 22. Colonel C. H. L. Sharman continued to be the Canadian representative on this fifteen member Commission. The functions of the Narcotics Commission are to advise and assist the Economic and Social Council in applying and supervising the application of the various international conventions relating to narcotic drugs and to draft any new conventions needed. A part of the session was therefore devoted to the consideration of annual reports of governments, new laws and regulations passed by various governments, a study of the illicit traffic, discussion of the problem of abolition of opium smoking in the Far East and a review of questionnaires completed by governments on the subject of drug addiction.

The Commission recommended to the Economic and Social Council that it ensure that the proposed Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide cover the use of narcotic drugs as a powerful instrument of committing the crime of genocide. This recommendation was based on information submitted by the United States representative on the use by the Japanese occupation authorities in Manchuria of narcotic drugs for the purpose of undermining the resistance and impairing the physical and mental well-being of the Chinese population.

The Commission appointed Colonel C. H. L. Sharman, the Canadian representative, to be its representative on the Drug Supervisory Body.

Much of the session was devoted to discussion of preparations for a conference on the limitation of the production of raw materials. The

Director of the Division of Narcotic Drugs in the United Nations Secretariat reviewed some of the problems to be taken into account in bringing into focus again the draft convention on limitation of the production of opium drawn up in 1939 by the Opium Advisory Committee of the League of Nations. The Commission finally recommended that the Economic and Social Council request the Secretary-General to begin work on the drafting of a new single convention to codify the previous conventions and in which provision would be made for a single body to perform all control functions (i.e. consolidation of the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Drug Supervisory Body) excepting those which are now or may later be entrusted to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. The new draft convention was to include provisions for limitation of the production of narcotic raw materials.

Pending the adoption of the new codified convention the Commission by a vote of 6 to 5 with four abstentions decided to recommend that studies be initiated on the desirability of convening a conference of the opium-producing countries and of countries using opium in the manufacture of drugs for medical and scientific needs for the purpose of reaching an interim commodity agreement limiting the production and export of opium to these needs. The results of these studies and enquiries were to be submitted to the fourth session of the Commission in May, 1949.

Another matter of general interest dealt with was a recommendation that the Economic and Social Council approve the issue of a United Nations Narcotic Bulletin to make available information on the control of narcotics. The Commission passed a resolution regarding the initiation of a joint programme of research for establishment of scientific methods of determining the origin of raw opium. The early despatch of a Commission of Enquiry to Peru to study the effects of the habit of coca leaf chewing among the Indians of the Andes was also urged. After reviewing the observations made by governments on the draft protocol to bring under control drugs outside the scope of the 1931 convention, the Commission recommended that the revised text should be sent forward urgently so that it could be approved by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly at their next sessions.

The Economic and Social Council at its seventh session at Geneva, July-August, approved the various recommendations of the Narcotics Commission. The only difference of view arose over the question of whether ratification of the new protocol on synthetic drugs by a metropolitan power would automatically apply the convention to the territories for whose foreign relations the power is responsible. The majority voted for inclusion of the so-called colonial escape clause as its deletion would have greatly delayed ratification by certain metropolitan powers.

The General Assembly itself approved unanimously on October 8 the Protocol to bring under International Control Drugs outside the scope of the 1931 Convention. The Protocol was signed on behalf of Canada without reservation as to approval. Provision already exists in the Canadian Opium and Narcotic Drug Act for new drugs to be added by Order-in-Council to the schedule of dangerous drugs appended to the Act.

The Permanent Central Opium Board

This Board is empowered by a Protocol dated December 11, 1946, whereby a majority of the Contracting Parties to the Conventions of 1925 and 1931 transferred the powers formerly possessed by the Council of the League of Nations to the Economic and Social Council of the United

Nations; the latter body, on March 2, 1948, appointed as Members of the Permanent Central Opium Board:

Mr. Herbert May
(United States of America)
Sir Harry Greenfield
(United Kingdom)
Professor P. Reuter
(France)
Professor S. Tavat
(Turkey)

Professor H. Fischer
(Switzerland)
Dr. P. Pernambuco Filho
(Brazil)
Dr. M. Ristic
(Yugoslavia)
Dr. Y. N. Yang
(China)

The Board, which is an independent and quasi-judicial body established under the 1925 Convention, held sessions in Geneva during June, September and November, during which the various problems of administration of the Narcotic Conventions were examined, including (1) control questions affecting 17 countries; (2) export and import discrepancies affecting 23 countries and territories; (3) import excesses; (4) stock excesses; (5) excess manufacture. Study was also devoted to the synthetic drug situation, particularly as affecting the work of the Board when the new Protocol becomes effective, as expected early in 1949. Cases in which it had been necessary to embargo further shipments to certain countries were also examined. Joint sittings with the Supervisory Body were held in relation to subjects common to both bodies such as excessive heroin consumption in certain countries. The Board is now receiving 80% of all returns due under the Conventions. The opium situation in Iran also received special attention, and steps were taken to collaborate with the U.N. Narcotics Commission and Secretariat in the drafting of one overall Narcotic Convention which would tighten up the present conventions where necessary and also cover the complicated subject of limitation of production.

The Drug Supervisory Body

In accordance with the 1931 Narcotic Convention, and the Protocol of December 11, 1946, the four members of the Drug Supervisory Body were appointed during 1948. One member (Mr. May) was appointed by the Permanent Central Opium Board for one year, two members by the World Health Organization (Professors Fischer and Tavat) for five years and one member finally, by the U.N. Narcotics Commission, which appointed Colonel C. H. L. Sharman, the Canadian representative on the Commission, for a period of five years. It will be seen therefore that 3 members of the Drug Supervisory Body are also members of the Permanent Central Opium Board, an arrangement which makes both for efficiency and economy.

The Supervisory Body held meetings, each lasting a week, in September and November, and several joint meetings with the Permanent Central Opium Board. The Supervisory Body examined and passed upon 93 annual, revised or supplementary estimates of narcotic requirements for 1948 received from 41 countries and 52 territories. The Supervisory Body also examined and passed upon estimates for 1949 received from 66 countries and 83 territories. Many of these were returned for further details and in some instances it was necessary to take exception to the enormous quantities involved, particularly in relation to heroin. Estimates were also framed by the Supervisory Body for 7 countries and 5 territories. The Supervisory Body also considered estimates for synthetic drugs received from 21 countries and 8 territories.

f. Population Commission

The Population Commission was established by a resolution passed by the Economic and Social Council at its third session in October, 1946. The Council instructed the Commission to arrange for studies and advise it on all population problems.

The Commission is composed of twelve representatives nominated by the member states. Liaison with other organs and agencies concerned with population problems is maintained by representatives from the Economic and Employment Commission, the Statistical Commission, the International Labour Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the Social Commission, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; all of these take part in the Commission's work but have no vote. Canada is represented on this Commission and has nominated Mr. J. T. Marshall of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics to serve until December 31, 1949.

The subjects dealt with so far by the Population Commission may be divided into two main groups: the development of population data and estimates; and the analysis of population data and of their relationships to economic and social factors.

Clearly, the collection of international population statistics cannot be an end in itself. Having laid the ground work, the Commission has also made plans for the analysis of a number of major population problems. These include the study of the interplay of the economic, social and demographic factors which may hinder both the attainment of an adequate standard of living and the cultural development of the population of countries; and migration and population problems in trust territories.

On these topics of theory and analysis, there naturally arise substantial differences of opinion. Canada faces no immediate danger of a declining population, and at the same time the relationship of population to resources is unusually favourable. Thus, Canada is in a position to study population problems and present its view without being under the pressure of urgent population problems felt by some other countries.

The Commission has so far held three sessions, in February and in August, 1947, and in May, 1948. Much preliminary work has been accomplished, and a comprehensive programme to be carried out by the Secretariat has been drawn up. At its future sessions, the Commission is likely to concern itself mainly with reviewing and discussing the reports prepared in accordance with this programme. In this way, fundamental issues of theory and analysis will be worked out by the Commission.

g. Social Commission

The Social Commission was established by a resolution of the second session of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in June, 1946. Its duties are to advise the Economic and Social Council on social problems in general, on programmes to improve social conditions, on the co-ordination of United Nations measures to deal with social problems and on related international agreements and conventions. This Commission consists of one expert from each of eighteen members of the United Nations selected by

the Economic and Social Council. The term of office of members of the Commission is three years. Canada is a member of this Commission and has nominated Dr. George Davidson, Deputy Minister, Department of National Health and Welfare (Welfare) to serve on it until December 31, 1950.

The Advisory Committee of the Social Commission on Planning and Co-ordination, of which Canada was a member, met in March, 1948. This Committee in its report to the third session of the Social Commission recommended priority topics for consideration by the Social Commission, and dealt also with the possibility of unco-ordinated activity by the Secretariat or by the specialized agencies. It reported that subjects to be given priority should be: (a) social welfare services; (b) prevention of crime and treatment of offenders; (c) the suppression of prostitution, traffic in women and children, obscene publications; (d) standards of living; (e) housing; (f) migration; (g) child welfare. At the seventh session of the Economic and Social Council held in Geneva during July and August, 1948, it was decided that the fourth session of the Social Commission should give priority to the consideration of the 1937 draft Convention on Prostitution.

Recognizing that there were other means provided both by the Secretary-General and by ECOSOC for ensuring co-ordination in the field of social welfare, members of the Social Commission at its third session did not press for the continuance of its Committee on Planning and Co-ordination. However, it was felt that the committee had served a useful purpose, not only in the study and co-ordination of programmes, but also as an advance agenda committee. It was proposed by the Canadian representative that an advance agenda committee be constituted to meet before the fourth session of the Social Commission in 1949. This proposal was accepted, and Canada was appointed a member of this agenda committee.

The Secretariat presented an extensive report on the progress made in housing and town and country planning, a report favourably received by various members of the Social Commission at its third session held in April, 1948. The Canadian representative, however, questioned the value of the meeting of experts on tropical housing held at Caracas. The Canadian view was that tropical housing is a matter of local and regional concern, rather than a problem requiring international action.

The third session of the Social Commission also discussed the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders; much of the discussion turned on the relationship between the Social Commission and the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission.

The Secretariat presented to the third session a preliminary study on relative standards of living. The Commission agreed to request the Secretariat to prepare a further report for the fourth session of the Social Commission, a report to include an account of the work of all United Nations organs concerned with standards of living.

A resolution summing up the conclusions of the third session of the Social Commission on advisory social welfare services was submitted to the seventh session of the Economic and Social Council. The resolution recommended to the Economic and Social Council that it in turn propose to the General Assembly that the advisory social welfare services be continued during 1949, that the programme include the same basic services as in 1948, and that the policies and procedures of 1948 be continued. It was further recommended that the Secretary-General continue his efforts to bring about increased financial participation by recipient governments, and that the

funds to be provided for these services in 1949 should be at least equal to those appropriated for 1948. This resolution was adopted by the third session of the General Assembly in plenary session on December 8, 1948.

The Social Commission recommended the transfer to the United Nations of the functions formerly exercised by the French Government (under the International Agreement of May 18, 1910), for the Suppression of White Slave Traffic and (under the International Agreement of May 4, 1910), for the Suppression of Obscene Publications. The Economic and Social Council placed a resolution to this effect on the agenda of the third session of the General Assembly which adopted it in plenary session on December 3, 1948.

It was decided to recommend to the Secretary-General that the subject of family, youth and child welfare be studied further, and that while following the 1924 Geneva Declaration of the Rights of the Child, the Secretary-General should consider more recent concepts of child welfare when drafting a United Nations Charter of the Rights of the Child. This study would be pursued in consultation with governments and interested organizations, and a report would be presented to the fourth session of the Social Commission.

The delegation of Argentina placed on the agenda of the third session of the General Assembly a resolution concerning a Declaration of Old Age Rights. The resolution was referred to the Economic and Social Council for a detailed study of old age rights.

h. Statistical Commission

The Statistical Commission was established by the Economic and Social Council at its second session in June, 1946. The Commission assists the Council in advising on national statistical methods and on measures to improve, on an international basis, the standards of comparison between national statistics. The Commission advises the United Nations on the interpretation and publication of statistical information, promotes the improvement of statistics and of statistical methods generally, co-ordinates the statistical work of the specialized agencies, and is responsible for the development of the Central Statistical Services of the Secretariat of the United Nations.

The Commission is composed of representatives from sixteen States, including Canada which has nominated Mr. H. Marshall, Dominion Statistician, who is to serve on the Commission until December 31, 1949. Canada has taken an active part in the work of the Commission which has been formulating a system of statistical processes to be used internationally. From its own thirty years experience of centralized statistical organization, Canada has been able to advise in establishing an efficient international system.

One of the noteworthy achievements of the Statistical Commission is the establishment of an International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities. This classification was accepted by the Economic and Social Council at its seventh session and recommended to Governments as a basis for achieving international comparability of basic industrial statistics.

As part of its programme, the Statistical Office of the United Nations publishes *The Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, *The Statistical Year Book* and *The Demographic Year Book*. Annual statistics of external trade are also being prepared. The Statistical Office also publishes studies on specific research projects.

In accordance with the decision taken in 1946 by the General Assembly to continue the exercise of the technical and non-political functions of the League of Nations under international conventions, the Statistical Commission, at its second session, in September, 1947, drew up a draft Protocol and Annex for the transfer to the United Nations of the functions and powers exercised by the League of Nations under the international convention relating to economic statistics, signed at Geneva on December 14, 1928.

The Economic and Social Council, at its sixth session, in March, 1948, approved a draft resolution transmitting this Protocol to the third session of the General Assembly. The Assembly approved the Protocol and Annex with certain technical amendments on November 17, 1948 and the representative of Canada signed it on behalf of his government on December 9, 1948.

i. Transport and Communications Commission

A permanent Transport and Communications Commission was set up by the Economic and Social Council in June, 1946, to replace a temporary body which had been established in February, 1946.

The Transport and Communications Commission consists of one representative from each of fifteen members of the United Nations, selected by the Economic and Social Council and with a term of office of three years. Canada is not a member of the Transport and Communications Commission.

The Commission assists the Economic and Social Council in matters relating to transportation and communication problems. The Commission has held two sessions since its formation. The first session, held from February 6 to 18, 1947, was concerned with telecommunications, and a proposal for an inter-governmental organization in the field of shipping and inland transport.

The report of the second session of the Transport and Communications Commission, held from April 12 to 20, 1948, was considered at the seventh session of the Economic and Social Council held from July 19 to August 28, 1948. On the basis of the Commission's recommendations the Economic and Social Council adopted nine resolutions. These provided for:

- (i) the initiation of a study of the competence of various international bodies to deal with barriers to the international transport of goods.
- (ii) the convening of a conference not later than August, 1949, to conclude a new world-wide Convention on Road and Motor Transport.
- (iii) the study of problems of inland transport in Asia and the Far East and in Latin America, and of problems of maritime shipping in Latin-America.
- (iv) the transmission of the report of the Preparatory Committee of Experts on safety of life at sea to the organizations represented at the Committee, as an initial basis for co-operation amongst them.

- (v) the initiation of a study of the requirements and comparability of statistics in the transport field.

The Economic and Social Council also requested that the Secretary-General report to the Transport and Communications Commission on the progress made by Member Governments to reduce, simplify and unify passport and frontier formalities "to the extent consistent with national security."

j. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East

Canadian interest in the work of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East—ECAFE—arises from Canada's concern as a Pacific nation that economic recovery should contribute to the restoration of peaceful conditions in the region, and Canada's desire as a major trading nation of the world to participate in the expansion of trade and commerce in the Pacific basin.

ECAFE was established by a resolution of the Economic and Social Council on March 28, 1947, to initiate and participate in measures for facilitating concerted action for the economic reconstruction of Asia and the Far East, for raising the level of economic activity there, and for maintaining and strengthening the economic relations of these areas both among themselves and with the other countries of the world. The geographic scope of the Commission extends from China to Pakistan. Nepal was brought within the scope of the Commission in 1948. Original members of the Commission were: Australia, China, France, India, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Siam, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States. Subsequently Burma, New Zealand and Pakistan became members. Canada did not seek membership in the Commission; it was satisfied that provision had been made for interested countries to be associated with the work of the Commission when matters of concern to them arose.

Associate memberships carrying full privileges except the right to vote in plenary session have been extended to Hong Kong, Ceylon, the Malayan Federation, Cambodia, Laos, the Indonesian Republic and the rest of Indonesia. Representatives of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers in Japan have attended sessions of the Commission to be available for consultation regarding Japanese economic matters in their relation to economic development plans in the other East Asian countries. In this connection it is interesting to note that Canada is the only member of the eleven nation Far Eastern Commission, the policy making body for Japan during the occupation period, that is not a member of ECAFE. The work of ECAFE also brings it into close touch with the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Labour Office and the International Monetary Fund.

The first two meetings of ECAFE in 1947 were necessarily organizational and exploratory in character. While the countries of East Asia have many historical and cultural links their economies have never been closely interrelated on a regional basis except during the short period of Japanese exploitation of its so-called East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere. Economic statistics have never been fully available for the countries of the Far East. With the dislocation of the war years and continuing civil disturbances in

several of the countries data on which economic reconstruction and development plans could be based remained difficult to secure. And yet the collection of this information was an essential preliminary to a realistic discussion of programmes that might be undertaken jointly by the countries of the region. The Secretariat set about collecting the needed information. This fact finding is not yet complete by any means, but it is possible now to record that progress has been made. The "Economic Survey for Asia and the Far East" for 1946 and 1947 show the progress already made. The survey for 1948 is expected to show a further striking improvement.

The third session of the Commission held at Ootacamund, India, from June 1 to June 12, 1948, brought ECAFE to the end of its planning stage. From these first three meetings of the Commission emerged a programme for concerted action in the spheres of food production and distribution, flood control, industrial development, inland transportation, technical training, trade promotion and finance. It was also noted that the economic future of Japan and its relationship to the rest of Asia and the Far East would have to be held constantly in view.

The Commission had recognized that food shortages in certain areas within the region represented its most pressing and immediate problem. At Ootacamund resolutions were adopted calling for close and continuous co-operation between ECAFE and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and for the creation of an ECAFE-FAO Working Party to deal with the question of food shortages. It was recommended that a primary aim should be the reduction of prices of essential foods. Flood control was recognized as a pre-requisite to the attainment of full agricultural production. To this end the Commission recommended to the Social and Economic Council the establishment of a Bureau of Flood Control.

With regard to industrial development, the Commission set certain short and long-term objectives. The short-term objectives were established with a view to increasing the production and availability of consumer goods in order to satisfy immediate requirements. Established industries dislocated as a result of the war were to be rehabilitated. Local industries were to be developed to reduce imports requiring foreign exchange, to provide materials needed to increase agricultural production, to augment transportation facilities, to provide power for industries, and to further the exploitation of agricultural and mineral wealth. The long-term industrial objectives set by the Commission envisaged full utilization and development of natural resources, the establishment of key industries, and the creation of balanced and diversified economies. An appeal was made to the more industrially advanced countries of the world to make available to Asia and the Far East supplies of capital goods. Countries within the region were requested to specify their needs in this respect.

Intra-regional trade was to be fostered by the establishment of a Trade Promotion Section within the Secretariat and the exchange of information between governments regarding import needs and export possibilities. Trade arrangements with Japan were advocated, and the Commission resolved that Japanese trade and industrial plans should be adjusted to the needs of the ECAFE countries, within the limits set by the Far Eastern Commission and the Japanese peace treaty to be concluded.

The Economic and Social Council at its seventh session in August considered the report of ECAFE. Discussion arose over Soviet proposals urging the "elimination of colonial and semi-colonial dependence" in the

economic development of the countries of the ECAFE region. The majority in the Council could see no direct connection between the fact that some territories in the region were non-self-governing and that all of them were economically under-developed. The Council took action on the creation of a Bureau of Flood Control.

The fourth session of ECAFE was held at Lapstone, Australia from November 29 to December 11. Discussion followed the pattern of previous meetings. A Report on Food and Agricultural Conditions in the Far East during 1948 prepared by FAO was praised and it was recommended that the Secretariat continue co-operation with FAO in the preparation of studies on the economic aspects of the agricultural problems of the region. Further, suitable steps were to be taken to make known the needs of the region to countries in other parts of the world who produce agricultural requisites. An early conference of agricultural officials jointly sponsored by FAO and ECAFE was also advocated. A resolution on technical training commended the International Labour Organization for its comprehensive report on technical training and took note of the ILO's proposals to appoint a tripartite committee on manpower and to set up an information, advisory and operational field office in Asia.

A comprehensive report was received from the Commission's Working Party on Industrial Development. It consisted of a survey of the condition and needs of the ECAFE countries with regard to fuel and power, agricultural implements, irrigation and drainage, basic materials, textiles and heavy industrial equipment. The importance of this report was acknowledged and it was resolved that a Committee of the Whole should study the report, make concrete proposals upon it, and set up the machinery to implement the proposals.

A Committee of the Whole was also to continue the study of trade and finance, including the possible utilization of Japan's productive capacity to aid the economic development of the ECAFE countries. ECAFE members requiring external aid in financing the import of capital goods were advised to formulate specific development projects with a view to obtaining assistance from private investors as well as from the International Bank and other agencies. They were urged to consult such agencies about anti-inflationary measures and problems of foreign exchange.

The Commission's fifth session will be held at Singapore at some time during the first half of 1949.

k. Economic Commission for Europe

In December, 1946, the United Nations General Assembly recommended that in order to give effective aid to the countries devastated by war, the Economic and Social Council should "give prompt and favourable consideration to the establishment of an Economic Commission for Europe." In accordance with this recommendation, a resolution was passed by the Economic and Social Council at its fourth session in March, 1947, establishing an Economic Commission for Europe, with a membership comprised of the European members of the United Nations and the United States of America. In addition to the permanent members, European nations not members of the United Nations or any United Nations members may be invited to participate, in a consultative capacity, in the work of the Com-

mission. Provision is also made for the participation, in a consultative capacity, of representatives of specialized agencies and inter-governmental organizations when matters of particular concern to them are under consideration. Canada is not a member of this Commission but has followed closely the work of the main body and has sent observers to meetings of the Commission and of some of its Committees.

The terms of reference of this Commission state that, acting within the framework of the United Nations, and subject to the general supervision of the Economic and Social Council, it should initiate and participate in measures for facilitating concerted action for the reconstruction of Europe, for raising the level of European economic activity, and for maintaining and strengthening the economic relations of the European countries both among themselves and with other countries of the world. While the Commission is not empowered to take any action with respect to a country without that country's agreement, it may, with the consent of the Government concerned, carry out investigations on technical and other matters within any member nation.

The Economic Commission for Europe has had three sessions at Geneva, the first from May 2 to 14, 1947, the second from July 5 to July 16, 1947, and a third from April 26 to May 8, 1948. As a result of these sessions, technical committees have been established by the ECE to deal with a wide range of commodity problems.

A Coal Committee has assumed the functions of the former European Coal Organization in recommending the allocations of available European coal supplies. A fertilizer sub-committee and a timber sub-committee have met to make recommendations for increasing the production of nitrogenous fertilizers and timber respectively. A Steel Committee, with the co-operation of the Coal Committee has actively discussed the possibilities of increasing European steel production.

As an exporter of substantial quantities of steel to Europe, and as a nation vitally interested in obtaining adequate supplies of commercial steel scrap, Canada has been interested in the work of the Steel Committee and has provided the Committee with valuable statistical information on Canadian steel production.

In addition to the work carried out by the Commodity Committees of the ECE special committees, such as the Inland Transport Committee and the Electric Power Committee, have made important contributions towards the restoration of the European economy. The Inland Transport Committee has taken over and expanded the work formerly performed by the European Central Transportation Organization. The Electric Power Committee has been conducting a survey of European large scale power resources, examining the possibilities of an international high-tension network, and the desirability of further standardization of electrical equipment.

An effort was made towards improving economic relations between the countries of Eastern and Western Europe at the last session of the Commission which concluded on May 8, 1948. A European Trade Committee was established with broad terms of reference, including the exchange of information and the study of East-West, and extra-European trade. Another Committee on Agriculture was set up to study agricultural problems of joint concern to ECE and the Food and Agriculture Organization, and in particular the means of increasing food supplies. The Economic Survey, compiled by the ECE Secretariat, was examined at the last session of

the Commission. This survey disclosed that, while Europe is making good progress, there are still serious obstacles in the way of attaining full economic recovery. Some of these obstacles are the diminished volume of intra-European trade compared with the prewar period; diminished production relative to population, accompanied by monetary inflation; and inability, for various reasons, to resume export trade.

1. Economic Commission for Latin America

The Economic Commission for Latin America was established in February, 1948, by the sixth session of the Economic and Social Council. By its terms of reference, the Commission is to initiate and to participate in concerted action designed to deal with urgent economic problems arising out of the war; to raise the level of economic activity in Latin America; and to maintain and strengthen the economic relations of the Latin American countries among themselves and with other countries of the world. Its membership is open to members of the United Nations in North, Central and South America and in the Caribbean area; and to France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Canada is not a member of this Commission.

The Commission's first session was held in Santiago, Chile, in June, 1948. It was attended by representatives of all Latin American countries, representatives of France and the United States, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, because of their colonial possessions in the Latin American and Caribbean region, also attended. The Inter-American Economic and Social Council and seven specialized agencies of the United Nations were also represented.

The principal purpose of this first session was to define the scope of the Commission's activities within its terms of reference, and to give its secretariat detailed instructions for immediate projects of documentation. The Commission agreed upon the preparation of an economic survey of Latin America which is to be completed in time for the second session of the Commission scheduled to be held in Havana in 1949. It was agreed by all delegations that the preparation of this survey was an "urgent and essential need" and that it would be the means of providing the Commission with the necessary statistical and economic data on which to base its future work. The Commission also agreed to establish a joint Working Group with the Food and Agriculture Organization to study means of increasing food production through the elimination of supply shortages and the improvement of transport. The Commission also agreed upon the scope of its activities in order to avoid duplicating the work of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council of the Organization of American States.

The report of the first session of the Economic Commission for Latin America was approved by the seventh session of the Economic and Social Council and the conclusions of the report were incorporated in the report of the Economic and Social Council to the third session of the General Assembly.

3. Freedom of Information

From its first session, the General Assembly of the United Nations has regarded freedom of information as a fundamental human right.

In a resolution passed on February 13, 1946, the General Assembly observed that "the United Nations cannot achieve the purpose for which it has been created unless the peoples of the world are fully informed of its aims and activities." Freedom of information, the General Assembly further declared on December 14, 1946, "is the touchstone of all the freedoms to which the United Nations is consecrated.

"Freedom of information implies the right to gather, transmit and publish news anywhere and everywhere without fetters. As such it is an essential factor in any serious effort to promote the peace and progress of the world . . . Understanding and co-operation among nations are impossible without an alert and sound public opinion which, in turn, is wholly dependent upon freedom of information."

By the same resolution, the General Assembly instructed the Economic and Social Council to arrange a conference on freedom of information which would be guided by the following principles:

"(a) The purpose of the Conference shall be to formulate its views concerning the rights, obligations and practices which should be included in the concept of the freedom of information;

(b) Delegations to the Conference shall include in each instance persons actually engaged or experienced in press, radio, motion pictures and other media for the dissemination of information;

(c) The Conference shall be held before the end of 1947, at such place as may be determined by the Economic and Social Council, in order to enable the Council to submit a report on the deliberations and recommendations of the Conference to the following regular session of the General Assembly."

The Economic and Social Council subsequently informed the General Assembly that it was not practicable to hold the Conference in 1947 and decided that it should be held in Geneva, commencing March 23, 1948. The Economic and Social Council further approved a provisional agenda for the Conference prepared by the Sub-commission on Freedom of Information, composed of experts nominated in their individual capacity. This group included Mr. G. V. Ferguson, editor of *The Montreal Star*.

Delegations from fifty-four governments attended the Conference which met in Geneva, Switzerland, from March 23 to April 21, 1948. Observers were present from the governments of Bolivia, Iran and Ireland and from a number of inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations.

The Canadian delegation consisted of representatives of the daily and periodical press, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the Department of External Affairs.

The Geneva Conference adopted three draft conventions, articles for the proposed Declaration and Covenant on Human Rights and forty-three resolutions.

The first draft convention originated with the United States. Contracting states undertake to encourage the maximum freedom of movement

of foreign correspondents in the performance of their functions, and to expedite in a manner consistent with their respective laws and procedures, administrative measures necessary for the entry, residence, movement or travel of foreign correspondents. Contracting states also undertake to permit the widest possible access to news for all correspondents on the same basis as for national correspondents.

The second draft convention, which originated with the French delegation, makes provision for an international right of correction. Under it an attempt is made, on the international level, to check false or distorted reports, sent from one country to another, and likely to injure friendly relations between states.

The third draft convention, which originated with the United Kingdom delegation, lays down basic freedoms of information. It provides that each contracting state shall encourage the establishing and functioning within its territory of one or more non-official organizations of persons employed in the dissemination of information to the public in order to promote the observance by such persons of high standards of professional conduct.

The forty-three resolutions adopted by the Geneva Conference relate to: general principles; measures to facilitate the gathering and international transmission of information; measures concerning the free publication and reception of information; continuing machinery to promote the free flow of information.

The Canadian delegation held that free access to sources of information and freedom of expression are indispensable to the democratic process. Without a precise knowledge of the facts, the chief Canadian delegate argued, the people could not intelligently exercise their powers of direction and control over their governments.

Applying these general principles, the Canadian delegation, while approving as a whole the three draft conventions and the draft article 17 for inclusion in the Covenant on Human Rights, made reservations on provisions which might open the way to peacetime censorship of news.

The Geneva Conference referred the conventions and resolutions to the Economic and Social Council for study at its seventh session which opened in Geneva on July 19, 1948. With the exception of Resolution 39 (which proposed to extend the Sub-commission on Freedom of Information and the Press for three years) the Economic and Social Council referred conventions and resolutions, without recommendation, to the General Assembly. Consideration of Resolution 39 was postponed until the eighth session of the Economic and Social Council.

The three draft conventions came before the Third Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris on December 7. The third session of the Committee on a vote of 28 to 8 decided, however, to defer consideration of the conventions till the second part of the third session of the General Assembly in April, 1949. The decision of the Third Committee was subsequently confirmed at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

4. International Children's Emergency Fund

The International Children's Emergency Fund was established by a resolution of the General Assembly in December, 1946, primarily to care for the children and adolescents of countries which were victims of aggression. The Fund, which operates under an Executive Board of representatives of twenty-five countries including Canada, is now conducting feeding or health programmes in twelve countries in Europe, and in China, India and in Pakistan.

Twenty-eight countries have made donations to the Fund amounting to about \$70,000,000, and the Fund has also received more than \$30,000,000 from the residual assets of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA). The Fund will also be receiving about \$30,000,000 as the result of campaigns conducted in most countries of the world during 1948. The United States made an appropriation to ICEF of \$75,000,000, but this sum will become available to ICEF only as payments are received from other donating countries; for every \$28 thus donated the United States will contribute \$72. Canada contributed \$5,200,000 in 1947, but has made no contribution in 1948. The Fund's total resources at the end of 1948 amounted to approximately \$110,000,000 of which about \$78,000,000 will be spent in 1949. Available funds, however, fall far short of needs.

The ICEF programme consists mainly in providing one supplementary meal a day to children and to nursing and pregnant mothers, a meal for which the Fund furnishes the protective foods (milk, meat or fish, fruits and cod liver oil). As the world supply of powdered milk is inadequate for present needs, the ICEF arranged a conference with the Food and Agriculture Organization and with the European receiving countries to consider means of increasing the milk supply in countries receiving aid from the Children's Emergency Fund.

Certain countries wishing to contribute to the work of the Children's Fund, but unable to provide food, have made available such surplus raw materials as they possess, notably hides, wool and cotton. These have been accepted by the Children's Fund and have been allocated to countries which are prepared to undertake the necessary processing into shoes, clothing and bedding.

The Programme Committee of ICEF, of which a Canadian will again be Chairman in 1949, extended its operations this year to include all occupied zones of Germany. The United Kingdom, United States and French zones had earlier made application for assistance from the Fund and a survey of conditions in those zones was undertaken. A request from the Soviet authorities that ICEF undertake a programme in the Soviet zone of Germany was received early in October of 1948. Children of Germany are to receive cod liver oil together with clothing and shoes which will be manufactured from wool and hides donated by other countries. The ICEF has also undertaken a health programme in India and Pakistan because of the emergency resulting from refugee problems in both areas.

The International Children's Emergency Fund has undertaken several programmes of medical aid in co-operation with the World Health Organization. At present the ICEF has undertaken anti-tuberculosis projects

including vaccination of children with the new BCG Vaccine¹, anti-syphilis campaigns, demonstrations on malaria control and a number of medical programmes in the Far East where adequate large scale feeding programmes are impracticable since the need is limitless.

The World Health Organization has been consulted regarding medical projects undertaken by the ICEF; and the Health Organization urged the two bodies to establish a joint committee to consider all medical proposals. This committee is now in operation. The Children's Fund retains the right to decide whether or not it will spend money on any suggested project, but has undertaken that its medical programmes will be put into effect in accordance with medical policy approved by the joint committee.

During 1948, the Programme Committee, including its Canadian Chairman, visited Poland, Czechoslovakia and Italy to see the feeding and health programmes in operation. The Committee was gratified with the manner in which the various programmes were being conducted in spite of many difficulties, and its members were satisfied that the food is reaching the children for whom it is intended. It was also unhappily apparent to the Committee that the need was much greater than could be met with the resources at the disposal of the Children's Fund.

At the third session of the General Assembly which met in Paris from September to December, 1948, it was decided that the United Nations Appeal for Children, which during 1948 had conducted campaigns for public support in most countries of the world, should be put under the direction and administration of the International Children's Emergency Fund. It was agreed, moreover, that all countries conducting campaigns for funds in aid of the United Nations Appeal for Children must agree, in using the name "United Nations Appeal for Children" to assign the entire proceeds of their campaigns to the International Children's Emergency Fund. It is expected that many countries will conduct campaigns for this purpose in 1949.

The third session of the General Assembly also accepted the financial report and accounts of the International Children's Emergency Fund for the year ended December 31, 1947.

From the resources which are now available to the Children's Fund allocations have been made to continue the feeding programmes in Europe until June 30, 1949. Additional programmes elsewhere than in Europe will be made as resources permit. It is the hope of the International Children's Emergency Fund that permanent national plans for maintaining and improving child welfare and nutrition will be put into effect in the countries now receiving aid under the stimulus of the programmes which have hitherto been conducted by the Children's Fund.

Late in the year 1948, in response to urgent requests from the United Nations Assembly, the Children's Fund made two allocations totalling \$6,411,000 to establish emergency feeding programmes for children and mothers in Palestine and the neighbouring territories.

Elections for 1949 resulted in the re-election of the representative of Poland as Chairman of the Executive Board, and of the representative of Canada as Chairman of the Programme Committee.

¹ Bacillus-Calmette-Guerin (named for its discoverers).

5. Migration

The question of migration came before the third session of the General Assembly when its Joint Second and Third Committee considered a resolution put forward by Ecuador and Colombia during the discussion on the report of the Economic and Social Council. This resolution recommended that the Economic and Social Council should initiate surveys of undeveloped regions in order to evaluate the possibilities of their development by systematic migration from the over-populated countries of Europe; that technical assistance should be made available to governments for the preparation of such programmes and that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development should give special consideration to loans to implement them. In introducing the resolution the representative of Ecuador said that its purpose was to provide for the development of under-developed areas of South America and at the same time to provide permanent homes for the surplus population of Europe. A similar Peruvian resolution was considered at the same time by the Joint Second and Third Committee.

In the Joint Committee there was an inconclusive discussion on undeveloped areas. Some delegates said that migration should be treated as a world-wide problem, not confined to the over-populated areas of Europe. Others contended that the Economic and Social Council had already produced a well-co-ordinated plan of studies on migration and economic development and that, in any case, the main problem in Europe was not over-population but rather a lack of capital resources.

Various resolutions and amendments were considered. The Joint Second and Third Committee finally voted on a compromise proposal submitted by the representative of India, to the effect that the General Assembly deemed it inexpedient to decide on new recommendations on economic development and migration, but that the Assembly should transmit to the Economic and Social Council the resolutions and amendments together with the records of the discussion on this subject which had taken place in the Joint Committee. This resolution was unanimously approved by the General Assembly in plenary session.

6. United Nations Appeal for Children

The United Nations Appeal for Children (UNAC) was authorized by a resolution of the General Assembly in December, 1946. An international Committee was created for UNAC, consisting of the Chairman or a representative of each existing national Committee, and of one representative of each of the United Nations non-governmental consultative organizations, to conduct a campaign for funds. National Committees, some governmental and some under voluntary direction, were established during the autumn of 1947 in some forty-five countries; and by June, 1948, campaigns were completed in thirty-five countries.

Although the original intention of UNAC was to collect funds by voluntary subscription which would be put at the disposal of the International Children's Emergency Fund (ICEF), in only a few countries (China, Iceland, New Zealand, the Philippines) were the entire proceeds given to ICEF. Some of the larger contributing countries (the United States, Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom) arranged joint appeals in which voluntary relief agencies, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and other organizations participated in varying degrees.

In December, 1947, the National Council for UNAC in Canada found it advisable to combine its appeal with an appeal which had been organized earlier by the Canadian Council for Reconstruction through UNESCO (CCRU), an association representing some fifty or sixty educational, cultural, and scientific organizations in Canada. An agreement was made whereby all expenses of the joint campaign would be pooled and the contributions would ultimately be divided, in the ratio of 60-40 to UNAC and to CCRU respectively.

The official campaign was launched in Canada on February 1, 1948. By the end of September, 1948, the total public contribution, together with a grant of \$400,000 from the Canadian Government, amounted to \$2,847,163. When the net funds of the campaign are finally divided, it is expected that the National Council for UNAC in Canada will be able to put at the disposal of the ICEF, for purchase in Canada of relief supplies, approximately \$1,350,000. The total proceeds of the world-wide UNAC amounted to about \$31,000,000 at the end of November, 1948, with reports still outstanding from a few countries.

At the seventh session of the Economic and Social Council, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Appeal for Children was considered. Resolutions from the International Labour Organization, the World Health Organization and the Non-Governmental Organizations Conference held in Geneva in May were presented, expressing the hope that UNAC would be continued.

The Economic and Social Council decided, however, that the UNAC section of the Secretariat should be dissolved and that the Secretary-General should be relieved of further responsibility for conducting a second appeal. Where National Committees have been set up and are prepared to conduct a second appeal, the Economic and Social Council considered that the National Committees should be encouraged to renew their campaigns,

but that the essential direction and administrative functions of the United Appeal for Children might be assumed by the International Children's Emergency Fund.

The third session of the General Assembly approved the principle of the decision by the Economic and Social Council. It was agreed further that national campaigns using the name "United Nations Appeal for Children" must be conducted for the benefit only of the International Children's Emergency Fund and that the ICEF should assist in the conduct of national campaigns and should provide international co-ordination of government and non-governmental appeals for the benefit of children.

7. Co-ordination of the Work of the Economic and Social Council

At the United Nations Conference on International Organization held at San Francisco in 1945, Canada took a leading part in proposing that the Economic and Social Council should have authority to co-ordinate the activities of the specialized agencies. This proposal was adopted and was included in the Charter of the United Nations as Article 63(2).

A committee was established by the Economic and Social Council at its third session, in September, 1946, "for the purpose of taking all appropriate steps under the leadership of the Secretary-General to ensure the fullest and most effective implementation of the agreements entered into between the United Nations and the specialized agencies." This committee is composed of international officials including the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the appropriate officers of the specialized agencies.

The committee has discussed co-ordination in budgetary, organizational and administrative matters; in programmes of work; in the conduct of regional activities and in various substantive questions which are of interest to more than one agency. The Directors-General of the International Labour Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the President of the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization, the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Assistant Secretaries-General of the interested Departments of the Secretariat have been present at some or all of the meetings held by the committee during the calendar years 1947 and 1948.

During 1947 the question of co-ordination, in addition to being dealt with by the committee of officials, was discussed by national representatives at the fourth session of the Economic and Social Council, at a joint meeting of the co-ordination committee and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, and at the second session of the General Assembly.

At the sixth session of the Economic and Social Council, February 4 to March 19, 1948, the whole matter of co-ordination of international activities in the economic and social field was recognized to be of such urgency that a special *ad hoc* committee composed of government delegates, of which the Canadian representative was chairman, was set up to study and report on further steps to be taken to ensure the most effective co-ordination of the work of the various organs of the United Nations. Particular reference was made, during the debates of the Council, to the authority which could properly be delegated to a co-ordination committee. Canada, together with China, New Zealand and the United States, was of the opinion that there were certain weaknesses in the existing arrangement which, in effect, gives most of the Council's responsibility for co-ordination to a committee of administrative officials or to the Secretary-General himself. Accordingly these nations supported the establishment of a committee of national representatives, rather than officials, to study the revision of existing co-ordination arrangements.

Five resolutions on co-ordination, recommended by the *ad hoc* committee, were approved by the Council. These resolutions:

- (i) requested specialized agencies to submit annual reports, including specifically requested information;
- (ii) asked the Secretary-General to report on the co-ordination measures taken with the specialized agencies, on the existence of inter-governmental organizations similar to any United Nations bodies, and on personnel and work programmes of the economic and social departments of the Secretariat;
- (iii) requested the committee of officials to make suggestions to the Council at its next session on the form and content of specialized agencies' reports;
- (iv) requested commissions to establish priorities of work in their respective programmes;
- (v) provided for the appointment of a committee to consider co-ordination in general at the next session of the Economic and Social Council.

The report of the *ad hoc* committee which was also adopted at the Council at its seventh session, contains the following main points on which agreement was reached:

(a) the principles, machinery and techniques for co-ordination developed during the past two years had proved adequate to date and that, as more experience was obtained in applying them with flexibility, they should provide an appropriate basis for dealing with those co-ordination problems which might arise in the immediate future;

(b) formal machinery should be kept to a minimum and informal consultation and other forms of co-operation at the working level should be further developed;

(c) although it was recognized that many problems might arise in the future, as the United Nations and specialized agencies expand their activities into new areas involving potential duplication, it would not be wise to attempt to anticipate these future requirements on a purely theoretical basis;

(d) co-ordination problems should be dealt with on a priority basis, in connection with which a wide measure of discretion should be given to the Secretary-General and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination to select and prepare studies on specific topics which the Council should consider at future sessions; and

(e) although the Council should maintain the leading role in the field of co-ordination assigned to it by Article 58 of the Charter, all arrangements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies should, to the greatest possible extent, be based on co-operation in order to permit the functional autonomy of each organization to be maintained.

The Canadian delegation supported these views and drew attention to the responsibility of Member States, commissions and other subsidiary organs of the Council to be vigilant in watching for co-ordination problems and in bringing these to the notice of the Council. Stress was laid on the

value of informal consultation and other forms of co-operation at the working level, rather than a reliance on formal machinery. Concerning the Economic and Social Council's procedure for dealing with co-ordination matters, the Canadian delegate suggested that, in the future, the Economic and Social Council might wish to deal with the volume of documentation some time before the session. It was suggested this might be arranged by expanding the Agenda Committee and increasing its responsibilities to include examination of co-ordination problems. This Agenda Committee could submit, in addition to the usual report on the agenda, a report listing those co-ordination problems to which the Council should give its attention. The Canadian delegation was of the opinion that, in this way, the work of the Council might be expedited with resulting economies, and that it might then be possible to dispense with the *ad hoc* committee on co-ordination.

IV. Specialized Agencies.

IV. SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

I. Food and Agriculture Organization

The Food and Agriculture Organization, which came into existence in 1945 as a result of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture held in May, 1945 at the Farmlands, Quebec, was established for the purpose of raising levels of nutrition and standards of living and improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products and resources. Its functions are to coordinate and bring coordinating agencies in cooperation with national governments and international organizations in the field of food and agriculture.

The Organization collects and disseminates information on these subjects and promotes and encourages international cooperation and international action. Special efforts are made to assist countries which are unable to meet their own requirements for food and agriculture. The Organization has been instrumental in preparing a world survey of the state of food and agriculture. The survey, which is being completed by the Food and Agriculture Organization, is being carried out in the form of a series of studies on the world's major agricultural products and is being carried out in the form of a series of studies on the world's major agricultural products and is being carried out in the form of a series of studies on the world's major agricultural products.

IV. Specialized Agencies.

The specialized agencies of the United Nations are the International Labour Office, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Maritime Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, the World Meteorological Organization, the World Intellectual Property Organization, the World Bank, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

The specialized agencies of the United Nations are the International Labour Office, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Maritime Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, the World Meteorological Organization, the World Intellectual Property Organization, the World Bank, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

The specialized agencies of the United Nations are the International Labour Office, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Maritime Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, the World Meteorological Organization, the World Intellectual Property Organization, the World Bank, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

IV. SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

1. Food and Agriculture Organization

The Food and Agriculture Organization, which came into existence in 1945 as a result of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture held in May, 1943, at Hot Springs, Virginia, was founded for the purpose of raising levels of nutrition and standards of living, securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products, and bettering the condition of rural populations and thus contributing towards an expanding world economy.

The Organization collects and disseminates information relating to these subjects, and promotes and recommends to governments national and international action directed toward achieving the objectives outlined. It also offers advisory technical assistance to individual member governments when requested to do so. Since the third session of the FAO Conference, held in Geneva in August, 1947, one important task of the Organization has been to prepare a yearly survey of the state of food and agriculture. This survey, which is based upon a series of National Progress Reports prepared by member governments, combined with statistical information compiled by the FAO Secretariat, is intended to indicate the major current problems in food and agriculture, and to suggest ways in which solutions may be found.

Beginning January 1, 1948, FAO also took over the functions of the International Emergency Food Council. That is to say, it now considers the submissions made by participating governments of their estimated export availabilities and import requirements of certain essential agricultural products which are still in short supply. It also recommends what it regards as the best and most equitable world distribution. It has no powers of binding allocation and participating governments are free to comply or not with its recommendations.

Canada, as an important agricultural producer, has a considerable interest in FAO and has contributed a great deal to its work. It was at Quebec that the constitution of the Organization was drawn up in October, 1945. A Canadian was a member of the original committee of independent experts which served as the Executive of the Organization, and Canada is at present a member of the eighteen-nation Council which has replaced this Committee. Since agricultural producers in Canada are usually abreast of modern and efficient techniques in production, this country will in all probability draw less than some others upon the direct technical assistance afforded by the FAO; but on the other hand it will benefit from the scientific and statistical work and, in a more general way, from participation in a forum where much national and international policy relating to agricultural production and distribution is discussed and developed. Canada's yearly contribution to this agency is approximately \$191,000 (Can.).

During 1948, much of the work of FAO was carried on in regional conferences and committees. Conferences devoted to an examination of the agricultural problems of specific regions were held in Cairo for the Near East and in Baguio, Philippines, for the Far East. Recommendations arising out of the Cairo Conference included an instruction to the Director-

General to take all possible steps to assist the respective governments to carry out projects (in this case chiefly irrigation projects) for bringing new land into cultivation and for increasing the productivity of land already in use. A temporary regional office for the Near East was set up. As a result of the Baguio Conference, the initial steps have been taken to assist governments in extensive projects for increasing the productivity of rice lands and improving methods of production, storage, and handling of basic foodstuffs. A regional office was set up for South and East Asia, and the establishment of a Rice Council, which would enable governments to deal cooperatively with problems of production and distribution, was recommended. This recommendation was later adopted by the fourth session of the FAO Conference in 1948. Other regional and special conferences have taken similar steps to deal with the particular problems before them. These special conferences included one on forestry problems held at Teresopolis, Brazil, and one on nutrition in Montevideo, Uruguay. In addition, an FAO European Commission on Forestry and Forest Products was organized in accordance with the recommendation of the Marianske Lazne Conference held in 1947.

At its fourth session, held in Washington, November 15-29, 1948, the Conference of FAO adopted a report on the state of food and agriculture which urged that, in spite of the generally good crops of 1948, there should be no over-optimism regarding future levels of nutrition and living standards. World reserves of food were found to be still low, and the tendency continued to be too dependent upon exports from the Western Hemisphere. It was also found that in some areas, particularly in the East and Near East, rapid increase in population continued to diminish the per capita supply of food and other agricultural products. Other decisions taken by the Conference included an instruction to the Council to arrange for a review, at each session of the Conference, of commodities as they are affected by agreements, international trade, and distribution. A preliminary review of commodities within the purview of the FAO is to be completed and submitted to member governments early in 1949, together with any suggestions that the Council of FAO may see fit to make, in the light of its analysis, for further governmental action in respect of any other commodity or group of commodities. Other action by the fourth session of the Conference, apart from that relating to constitutional and administrative questions, was concerned chiefly with a review of the technical work of the Organization for the year 1948. The question of the world food supply was placed on the agenda of the third session of the General Assembly by the delegation of Poland which requested that the Assembly consider the problem of food wastage in certain countries, and by the delegation of Cuba which recommended the reduction of taxes on food stuffs. These two resolutions initiated a long general discussion in the course of which many resolutions and amendments were submitted to the Second Committee which considered the question. Finally by a vote of 22 in favour, 7 against with 11 abstentions (including Canada) a lengthy resolution was recommended to the General Assembly for adoption.

When this resolution was considered in the plenary session of the General Assembly, amendments jointly sponsored by the Canadian, the United Kingdom, the New Zealand and the United States delegations, which deleted specific references to high profits of middlemen and speculators and which

put into general terms a recommendation to the Economic and Social Council concerning its continuing study of the problem, were adopted. The resolution as amended:

- (a) invited member states to accord high priority to measures to avoid food losses from wastage and to other measures designed to raise to a maximum the effective quantity of food available for consumption and export, to review existing taxes on food and to eliminate profiteering on food stuffs;
- (b) called upon the Economic and Social Council in consultation with the Food and Agriculture Organization and the other specialized agencies concerned, to continue to consider the problem of increasing the world's food supply and the international trade in food products.

The resolution as amended was adopted by 35 votes in favour (including Canada) 1 against and 2 abstentions.

2. Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organization

The aim of the proposed Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) is to promote co-operation among governments on issues of international shipping and to encourage widespread adoption of the highest safety standards.

It is proposed that IMCO will have, when organized, an Assembly of all members, a Council of sixteen members, including a Maritime Safety Committee of fourteen members, a Secretariat and such subsidiary organs as may be found necessary. Its headquarters will be in London. Normally the Assembly is to meet every two years. The Council is to meet as often as necessary and the Maritime Safety Committee at least once each year. The Council will have exceptional powers which include in certain cases the power of veto over the Assembly of IMCO. It will deal with discriminatory and restrictive practices of governments and of shipping companies. Only the operation of ships will come within its province; ship building is excluded. IMCO's functions will be purely consultative and advisory.

The first step toward the formation of IMCO was taken in June, 1946, when the United Nations asked the United Maritime Consultative Council, the international shipping control body which succeeded the wartime United Maritime Authority, to give its views on "the question of establishing a world-wide inter-governmental shipping organization to deal with technical matters". The United Nations Maritime Conference, meeting in Geneva in February and March, 1948, approved a Convention to establish an Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) as a specialized agency of the United Nations. When twenty-one nations, of which seven shall each have a total tonnage of not less than one million gross tons, have ratified the Convention, this international body to deal with shipping will come into being within the framework of the United Nations. In this regard Canada has taken the lead and is the first and, to date, the only country to have ratified the Convention. It is hoped that within the next six months the ratifications of the required number of states will be deposited. A recommendation that the United States join IMCO should be considered early in the next session of Congress.

The Conference in Geneva prepared and adopted a resolution relating to the Safety of Life at Sea Conference held in London under United Kingdom auspices in April, 1948, and adopted a resolution relating to the report of the Preparatory Committee of Experts on Co-ordination of Safety at Sea and in the Air.

Since then the Preparatory Committee established by the Conference as a "caretaker" until the Convention comes into effect has met twice, in March, 1948, in Geneva immediately following the United Nations Maritime Conference and again in November at Lake Success. The Committee consists of the representatives of twelve states, including Canada, which has been elected to the chairmanship. Its task has been to prepare for the first meeting of the Assembly of IMCO and to arrange for IMCO's formal relationship with the United Nations. The draft Agreement drawn up by the Committee was approved by the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The Committee adopted a draft budget for the Organization totalling £20,000 annually for the first two years, to be submitted to the IMCO Assembly. It is proposed that all member nations contribute equal shares, with the proviso that those less able to contribute or having smaller interests in the Organization may, on application to the IMCO Assembly, have their contribution reduced by one half. The balance would then be covered by those members contributing full shares. As IMCO's permanent headquarters will be in London, future contributions will be largely in sterling. The initial budget provides for the salaries of a Secretary-General of the Organization, a Secretary of the Maritime Safety Committee and a Deputy for each. The Committee is in the meantime asking the United Nations for a loan of not more than \$50,000, to be advanced from the United Nations Working Capital Fund, payable within two years.

A draft of Rules of Procedure and a provisional agenda for the first Assembly were adopted. The Preparatory Committee will hold one more session at the time the Assembly is convened.

The states represented on the Preparatory Committee are Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Greece, India, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States.

3. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

The purpose of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is to assist in the reconstruction and development of the productive resources of member countries by promoting the international flow of long-term capital. It is designed to raise the standard of living in member countries by assisting them to finance improvements in their productive equipment.

The constitution of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was drawn up by the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference which met at Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, in July, 1944. By November 1, 1948, 47 countries had become members of the Bank. These include all the larger countries except the U.S.S.R., Spain, the Argentine, Germany and Japan.

Responsibility for the operation of the International Bank rests with a Board of Governors made up of one Governor appointed by each member country. The powers of the Board of Governors are for the most part delegated to the Executive Directors, of whom there are 14. Five countries — the United States, the United Kingdom, France, India, and China — each name one Executive Director; the other nine are elected by the other countries. To date there has always been one Canadian Executive Director. Under the direction of the Executive Directors the President and staff of the Bank conduct its business.

The capital of the Bank, which at November 1, 1948, was the equivalent of \$8,336 million, is made up of the subscriptions of members. Members' subscriptions to the Bank range from \$200,000 for Panama to \$3,175,000,000 for the United States. Canada's subscription is \$325,000,000. The subscription of each member is payable 2% in gold or United States dollars and 18% in national currency. The remaining 80% constitutes a surety fund against moneys borrowed or obligations guaranteed by the Bank.

The Bank has three ways of making long-term capital available to its members. First, it may (with the consent of the country whose currency is involved) make direct loans out of its own subscribed capital resources; second, it may guarantee loans raised through the private investment market; third, it may make loans out of funds raised through the issue of its own obligations. Loans are to be made or guaranteed only if the Bank is satisfied that they increase the productive capacity of the borrower and are within the capacity of the borrowing country to service. Only economic considerations are to be relevant in the Bank's decisions. Each loan must be guaranteed by the government or central bank of the country in which the project is located.

From the commencement of operations in June, 1946, to the end of 1947 the International Bank made loans totalling the equivalent of \$497 million. Except for a relatively small amount the currency lent was United States dollars. The loans were to France, the Netherlands, Denmark and Luxembourg and were for general reconstruction purposes. In 1948 a loan of 12 million United States dollars was made to four Netherlands shipping companies to finance the purchase of six merchant vessels for the Dutch mer-

chant marine. Arrangements are almost completed for a loan of 16 million United States dollars to two Chilean concerns, mainly for hydro-electric developments. A number of other loan applications are currently being investigated by the Bank.

Since the currency that is most in demand by borrowers is of course United States dollars the amount of United States dollars that the International Bank can command is an important measure of the help which it can give. The 20% paid-in portion of the United States subscription and the 2% portions of subscription of other countries paid in gold or dollars total about \$733 million. The only other large receipt of United States dollars by the Bank has been the proceeds of the sale for \$250 million of two issues of its own bonds in the United States market. The Bank has done a relatively small amount of borrowing outside the United States and it is currently working on means whereby it might increase such borrowing. In addition the Bank is known to be desirous of arranging with other member countries to consent to the use of their national currency subscriptions in lending operations. But, for the foreseeable future at any rate, it appears that the ability of the Bank to lend will depend very largely on its ability to persuade private and corporate United States investors that its bonds are good investments. The Bank has done a good deal to widen the market for its securities in the United States.

Compared with the figures of inter-governmental loans and grants in the post-war years, the volume of International Bank lending has been small. It is generally agreed that the role played by the Bank up to date has been less significant than was anticipated at the time of the Bretton Woods conference in 1944. At that time it was not possible to estimate in any concrete fashion the degree of post-war assistance which Europe would require, but to the extent that some general conjectures were made, it is probably true to say that both the magnitude and character of the aid that would be necessary were considerably underestimated. The European countries have needed help more for the purpose of financing large over-all deficits in their balance of international payments than for obtaining supplies for specific projects. It is reasonable to expect that over the next few years the operations of the Bank in the European field are bound to be overshadowed by those of the European Recovery Programme. That programme will presumably carry the main weight of extraordinary international financing. Nevertheless, the Bank may find opportunities to finance certain useful projects in Europe as well as in a number of non-European countries, particularly the less highly developed countries which need outside assistance in order to progress. The Bank may be able to do a good deal to help such countries over a long term of years, not only by making loans but also by providing, in one form or another, technical assistance and advice.

4. International Civil Aviation Organization

The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) came into being in April, 1948, replacing the Provisional Organization which had been set up following the Chicago Conference on International Civil Aviation in 1944. The total number of member states is now 51. Canada is a member of the Permanent Council of 21 nations, which is the executive body of the Organization. The headquarters of the Organization are in Montreal.

The purpose of ICAO is to promote the development of international civil aviation; more specifically, to establish regulations for the international observance of the Five Freedoms of the air;¹ to create and maintain a system of international air transport wherein certain basic privileges of air transport are mutually exchanged by all states adhering to the Organization.

ICAO standards and recommended practices for greater safety and uniformity in international air operations have been prepared for airports, air routes, navigation aids, rules of the air and air traffic control, meteorological communication system, search and rescue, maps and charts, personnel licensing, operational procedures and airworthiness.

Two General Assemblies of the Organization have been held, the first in May, 1947, in Montreal, and the second in June, 1948, in Geneva. In addition, in November, 1947, a Special Conference was convened in Geneva to draw up a multilateral agreement for commercial rights in the air.

At this Conference, although Canada had always considered that a satisfactory multilateral agreement should be the objective of ICAO, the agreement proposed was not acceptable to the Canadian delegation since it did not guarantee to the smaller states equality of opportunity with the major air powers. The Canadian attitude was shared by the majority of nations in attendance, and as a result, no agreement was reached. However, further study of this problem is now being made in the Council, and it is expected that within a few years a second effort will be made to draft a multilateral agreement on commercial aviation rights.

A special Conference of member states operating over the North Atlantic was convened by ICAO in Geneva in 1948, when a Final Act was signed providing for the joint support of air navigation facilities in Iceland. Canada's initial contribution to the expenses of this plan will amount to approximately \$100,000, with annual assessments thereafter of approximately \$50,000.

In addition to these Assemblies and special Conferences, meetings of the various geographical regions and technical divisions sponsored by the Organization are continually held. Within these specialized fields the Organization has made its most substantial achievements.

-
- ¹(1) The privilege of flying across the territory of another state without landing;
 - (2) The privilege of landing in the territory of another state for non-traffic purposes;
 - (3) The privilege of putting down passengers, mail and cargo taken on in the territory of the State whose nationality the aircraft possesses;
 - (4) The privilege of taking on passengers, mail and cargo destined for the territory of the States whose nationality the aircraft possesses;
 - (5) The privilege of taking on passengers, mail and cargo destined for the territory of any other contracting State and the privilege of putting down passengers, mail, and cargo coming from any such territory.

The 1947 General Assembly of ICAO unanimously approved a draft agreement with the United Nations to bring the two organizations more closely together, provided that the autonomy of ICAO was not impaired. At the 1948 Assembly of ICAO, the relations with the United Nations under the terms of the Agreement were reviewed, and approved. The Council was directed to continue to maintain close relations with the United Nations; in particular, attention was drawn to the need for co-operation with the United Nations in common personnel problems.

To Canada, the orderly progress of air navigation and air transport is of great importance, and Canada has made important contributions to the success of the Organization to date. The cost to Canada of membership in ICAO for the year 1948 was approximately \$130,000 (Can.).

5. International Labour Organization

The International Labour Organization, founded in 1919 under Article XIII of the Treaty of Versailles, was brought into official relationship with the United Nations in December of 1946. It is now one of the United Nations specialized agencies associated with the work and purposes of the Economic and Social Council, although retaining its autonomy.

There are at present 59 states which belong to the ILO. The Soviet Union is the only country of industrial importance which has not become a member. Canada has been a member and a supporter of the ILO since its establishment. During the war, the headquarters of the ILO was moved from Geneva to Montreal, but on September 1, 1948, the central office resumed its functions in Geneva and the Montreal office has become one of the branch ILO offices now maintained in Washington, London, Paris, Rome, New Delhi and Chungking.

The International Labour Organization is composed of three principal bodies:

- (a) The General Conference of representatives of member States (composed of Government, Employers' and Workers' delegates) known as the International Labour Conference, which meets normally once each year and is the legislative body of the Organization;
- (b) The International Labour Office (the permanent Secretariat);
- (c) The Governing Body (the executive council, composed of thirty-two members, meeting quarterly).

Canada has been represented at all sessions of the General Conference which have been held to date. The principal duty of the annual sessions of the Conference is to prepare and approve international conventions and recommendations for minimum standards governing working and labour conditions. International Labour Conferences have so far adopted 90 conventions or treaties, and 83 recommendations covering a very wide range of labour subjects. Of these, Canada has ratified 11 conventions and has accepted one recommendation. The ratification of conventions and the acceptance of the recommendations of International Labour Conferences has been difficult for many countries with federal constitutions such as Canada, in which competence in labour matters rests very largely with the constituent provinces or states.

Canada's contribution to the ILO for 1948 was \$176,434.39 (Can.)

As one of the world's eight states of chief industrial importance, Canada holds one of the eight non-elective seats on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office. The Governing Body is composed of thirty-two members, sixteen representing governments, eight representing employers and eight representing workers. The Governing Body is the executive of the ILO and exercises general control over its activities, preparing the budget and drafting the agenda for International Labour Conferences.

The ILO holds periodic regional conferences designed to deal with problems of special interest to particular groups of countries. Special conferences are also arranged to deal specifically with problems affecting some particular class of workers, such as seamen. Eight special industrial

tripartite committees have also been established to provide technical advice to the Governing Body on matters affecting these particular industries. Canada is represented on all eight of these which include committees on coal mining, metal trades, textiles, petroleum refining, and chemicals. Two other committees have been proposed to cover the timber and wood-working and the metal-mining industries.

In August, 1948, the Economic and Social Council considered the annual report of the International Labour Organization to the United Nations. Consideration of this report by the Economic and Social Council provided occasion for the representative of the U.S.S.R. to voice strong criticisms of the ILO and of labour conditions in the states of the western world. The report of the ILO, however, was accepted by the Council which expressed its appreciation both of the report and of ILO activities during the year.

As in previous years, Canadian representatives have taken an active part in the work of ILO throughout 1948. To the annual Conference, which was held in San Francisco in June, Canada sent a delegation including officials of the Departments of Labour and of External Affairs, together with representatives of Canadian employers and workers. Canadian representatives have also been present at meetings of the Governing Body and of all the special industrial committees. Throughout 1948 the ILO has been particularly concerned with the problems of safeguarding the freedom of association of workers and their right to organize, of employment service organization, of vocational guidance, of wages, of the night work of women and of young persons, and of migratory labour whether for temporary employment or for permanent settlement.

6. International Monetary Fund

In July, 1944, the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference, held at Bretton Woods, U.S.A. and attended by delegates from 44 states including Canada, produced the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund and also the Articles of Agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. By the end of 1945 the Articles of Agreement were accepted by the requisite number of countries, and the Fund was established in March, 1946, with its principal office in Washington, D.C.

As set up in March, 1946, the International Monetary Fund had 38 member countries with quotas aggregating 7,330.5 million U.S. dollars. As of September 30, 1948 there were 47 members whose quotas totalled 8,036 million U.S. dollars. Each member is required to subscribe to the Fund an amount equal to its quota, subscriptions being payable partly in gold and the balance in the national currency of the member. Canada's quota amounts to \$300 million, the sixth largest of the members' quotas. In accordance with the Articles of Agreement Canada has subscribed \$75 million in gold and \$225 million in Canada dollars.

In addition to determining subscriptions, the quotas also determine the extent to which a member can purchase foreign currency from the Fund in exchange for its own currency. Such purchases are not to exceed 25 per cent of the member's quota in any 12-month period and the Fund's holdings of a member's currency (resulting from its subscription and from its purchase of foreign currencies) are not to exceed 200 per cent of that member's quota. The Fund may, however, waive these conditions if it deems such waiver desirable. Exchange purchased from the Fund must be needed for making payments which are consistent with the provisions of the Agreement. Generally speaking, the Fund's resources are to be used for exchange stabilization purposes, by helping countries to overcome temporary balance of payments deficits on current account. The Fund's resources are not to be used for relief or reconstruction or to finance large-scale capital transfers.

All powers of the Fund are vested in the Board of Governors, consisting of one Governor appointed by each member country. Voting power is distributed among the Governors more or less in accordance with the relative size of the quotas of the members which they represent.

The general operations of the Fund are the responsibility of the Executive Directors who are in continuous session and to whom the Board of Governors delegates all but certain specified powers. Of the fourteen Executive Directors, five are appointed by the five members having the largest quotas (the United States, the United Kingdom, China, France and India) and the rest are elected by the other members. While Canada is not entitled to appoint an Executive Director, a Canadian has twice been elected to this position and thus has been a member of the Executive Board of the Fund since it began operations in May, 1946.

The International Monetary Fund's activities have been diverse. They include the establishment of par values; considerations of changes in par values; exchange transactions with member countries; consultation with member countries on multiple currency and other exchange practices; collection of data in the international monetary field; and the publication

of such data in forms useful to member countries and others. Much, if not most, of the work of the Fund is necessarily of a confidential nature, and much of its achievement therefore consists of helping the international economic community to function more smoothly and efficiently, without however, attracting public attention to its activities.

From March 1, 1947, to September 30, 1948, the Fund has sold foreign exchange amounting to \$640 million. Twelve member countries have, in exchange for their own currencies, purchased 622.4 million U.S. dollars, 500 million Belgian francs and 1.5 million pounds sterling. The volume of exchange transactions of the Fund may not appear large when compared with the world's needs for foreign exchange, particularly for U.S. dollars. Nevertheless, these transactions have been of considerable assistance to the member countries involved, especially as they were concentrated in a period when such assistance was most urgently needed. At the same time as it has given this very real assistance, the Fund has avoided the dissipation of its resources in the recovery period. The Fund's efforts have been continuously directed towards the promotion of exchange stability and the maintenance of orderly exchange arrangements among members.

The Fund has also been able to afford technical assistance to many of its members faced with present or potential balance of payments problems. In addition to regular consultation, technical missions have been sent to a number of countries at the invitation of the members concerned. The Fund is becoming an increasingly important source of information on international financial and economic matters, and is making much of this information available to member countries. Canada, which has a vital interest in the expansion of world trade, has always given strong support to the International Monetary Fund.

7. International Refugee Organization

On the conclusion of hostilities in Europe more than seven million persons, who had been uprooted during the war from their homes and from their countries, became one of the primary responsibilities of the United Nations, as an immediate consequence of the allied victory. With the assistance of UNRRA and the Inter-governmental Committee on Refugees, about six million of these displaced persons returned to their places of origin during the course of the first year following the war. By the summer of 1946, however, there were still more than a million persons who had been brought to Germany by the Third Reich, or who had fled the advance of the U.S.S.R. armies and who, at the end of the war, had remained largely in Germany and Austria. There were smaller numbers of refugees elsewhere in the world, some in the Near East and some in Eastern Asia; but the vast majority of the homeless and of those without protection were in Germany and in Austria.

The United Nations recognized as one of its responsibilities the re-establishment of these displaced persons; as a consequence, the International Refugee Organization was created late in 1946 and began its operations on July 1, 1947, when it took over the responsibilities for refugees formerly carried out by the Displaced Persons Branch of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and by the Inter-governmental Committee on Refugees.

The International Refugee Organization operated as a preparatory commission until August of 1948; its General Council met for the first time as the executive of a specialized agency of the United Nations on September 13, 1948. The formal agreement between the United Nations and the International Refugee Organization was approved at the third session of the General Assembly in November, 1948. The IRO is now, therefore, operating as a fully constituted agency of the United Nations.

When the International Refugee Organization began its operations on July 1, 1947, the total number of refugees receiving care and maintenance in IRO camps was about 700,000. In addition there was a number (estimated at from 400,000 to 500,000) of displaced persons entitled to the protection and help of IRO, living outside the IRO camps, working and supporting themselves as best they could in the shattered German and Austrian economies.

In the first sixteen months of its activities (July 1, 1947, to October 30, 1948), IRO was able to re-establish 334,743 persons, of whom rather more than four-fifths were resettled in Western Europe and abroad, with about one-fifth returning to their original homes. Practically all the refugees who are now under the care of IRO are political refugees who are unwilling to return to their countries of origin, and it is apparent that the principal work of IRO must lie henceforth in the re-establishment of these refugees abroad.

It has been the policy of IRO, a policy approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations, that political refugees should not be forced to return to their countries against their will, and that they are entitled to IRO care unless it can be clearly established that they have been war criminals or traitors.

As the majority of displaced persons now in the IRO camps or under IRO legal protection in Central Europe are Poles, Yugoslavs and Baltic peoples whose countries have been absorbed into the Soviet Union, the U.S.S.R. and the Slavic states generally have given no support whatsoever to the work of IRO. Indeed they have claimed that the Organization should be dissolved, and that these displaced persons should be compelled to return to their countries of origin. This view, however, has not been shared by the majority of the members of the United Nations, and the IRO is to continue its policy of establishing either in Western Europe or overseas those displaced persons who are unwilling or unable to return to their former homes. It is very unlikely that IRO will receive any help whatsoever from the Eastern European states.

Until August of 1948 the work of the International Refugee Organization was severely handicapped by the necessity of having to work as a preparatory commission which was not intended to serve as an executive body for an indefinite period. The Organization also was under serious disadvantages because of lack of funds, since it had to be financed by voluntary contributions from those member states which were willing to make advance contributions. The shipping problem was also very acute until the early summer of 1948, and during the earlier months of the Organization's operations, resettlement opportunities abroad were very few. As a consequence of these various factors, the Organization has had to devote a higher ratio of its expenditures to maintaining refugees in camps than to resettling them abroad. Many of these difficulties, however, have now been resolved, and in the coming year the Organization will be able to spend more of its resources on resettlement and less on maintenance within the camps in Germany and Austria.

The annual budget of the Organization for 1948 was approximately \$150,000,000 of which Canada's contribution was about \$5,415,000. The budget for the next year is likely to remain at the same figure, with a similar contribution for Canada.

The United Nations has given IRO a period of three years to fulfil its responsibilities, (that is, until June 30, 1950), and IRO is now well into its second year of operations. During this second fiscal year (July 1, 1948, to July 1, 1949), the Organization is planning to resettle 380,000 refugees; and by June 30, 1950, to conclude its responsibilities by re-establishing approximately 500,000 more.

It is extremely unlikely, however, that all displaced persons now under the mandate of IRO, whether in displaced persons camps or working as best they can in Germany and Austria, will be acceptable to countries prepared to receive a certain number of these emigrants. When all acceptable displaced persons have been approved for emigration to new countries, there will still remain about 180,000 who will be ineligible on various grounds for migration abroad. This problem will have to be considered shortly, and it seems probable that this final group of displaced persons (consisting of the aged, the orphans, widows with young children, the physically and mentally handicapped), will have to be established in Germany and Austria and be supported by the German and Austrian economies as part of the reparation settlement.

The financial problem of IRO, though still unresolved, is much less serious than one year ago; and the IRO is now receiving larger and more regular contributions since it has become a recognized specialized agency of

the United Nations. In spite, too, of the continued shortage of ocean shipping, IRO has been able to assemble its own fleet of thirteen ships and to charter considerable space on commercial ocean lines. An air transport service has been established to Venezuela, and the extension of this air service to other countries is now being considered. The success of displaced persons in establishing themselves in new countries and in making a contribution to the economic life of the countries of their adoption has created a more favourable attitude on the part of the receiving countries toward increasing the numbers of displaced persons authorized for admittance.

Canada has contributed generously toward the ultimate solution of the refugee problem both by providing financial support and by accepting very large numbers of refugees and displaced persons. The Canadian Government has authorized for entry into Canada 40,000 refugees, together with an unspecified number of displaced persons who are near relatives of Canadian citizens. So far, some 44,000 applications for the admission of near relatives have been approved in Canada, although not all of these will be found eligible when examined by Canadian immigration and medical authorities in Europe. Altogether, including displaced persons admitted to Canada for employment and settlement together with their relatives, and including also the near relatives of Canadian citizens who are eligible for admission into Canada, the Canadian Government has undertaken to accept more than 100,000 displaced persons, of whom 51,000 had already arrived in Canada by December 1, 1948.

Canada's readiness to accept refugees and displaced persons compares very favourably with that of other countries of the world. At present the United States has undertaken to accept 200,000, although it is understood that this figure may be doubled during the course of the next year. The following figures are available showing the numbers of displaced persons received by the principal admitting countries by July 1, 1948, (at which time Canada had received 25,244); Great Britain 69,788; Belgium 19,147; United States 16,836; France 16,216; Argentina 12,163; Palestine 6,741; Venezuela 5,666; Australia 5,632; Brazil 3,491; The Netherlands 3,048; Paraguay 2,892; Sweden 1,943; Chile 1,473; Peru 1,282.

In the various United Nations meetings which have dealt with IRO matters since December, 1946, Canada has been a strong supporter of this Organization. As one of the larger contributors to the IRO budget and as one of the most important receiving countries, Canada has been especially concerned with IRO policies and programmes. At the General Council of IRO which met in September, 1948, for the first time, Canada was elected as one of the nine states of the Executive Committee, and the Canadian delegate was elected Chairman. It can now be expected that the IRO, constituted as a specialized agency of the United Nations, will make more rapid progress toward the permanent resettlement of refugees made homeless by the last war. The question of willingness to receive refugees still remains the major problem to be solved if the responsibilities of IRO in re-establishing displaced persons are to be completed before its mandate expires on June 30, 1950.

8. International Telecommunications Union

The International Telecommunications Union came into existence in 1932 when the International Telecommunications Convention was signed at Madrid. This Convention was revised in 1947 and a new Convention will come into effect on January 1, 1949.

The aims of the International Telecommunications Union are to organize and regulate international exchanges of telecommunications by telegraph, telephone and radio. At the present time, emphasis is being placed on an attempt to regulate more effectively the frequency bands amongst the nations of the world.

The International Telecommunications Union held three important conferences in Atlantic City during the period May to October, 1947: a Plenipotentiary Conference to revise the 1932 Madrid Convention of the International Telecommunications Union; a Radio Administrative Conference to revise the Cairo Radio Regulations of 1938 (annexed to the International Telecommunication Convention); and a High Frequency Broadcasting Conference to make a preliminary survey of the international regulations needed in the field of high frequency broadcasting. At the conclusion of these Conferences, the head of the Canadian delegation signed the new Convention and annexed Radiocommunication Regulations, subject to ratification by the Canadian Government. The Canadian Instrument of Ratification was forwarded to the Swiss Government on November 1, 1948.

Among the clauses of the Madrid Convention which are substantially altered in the Atlantic City Convention, are those governing membership, conference voting rights, finances, and obligations in respect of the annexed Radio, Telegraph and Telephone Regulations. An Administrative Council, consisting of eighteen member governments elected by the Plenipotentiary Conference, has been added to the Union's organization to provide for the making of policy decisions between Plenipotentiary Conferences. Canada was elected to this Council. The Plenipotentiary Conference also approved an agreement, drafted by negotiation with a Committee of the Economic and Social Council, to make the International Telecommunications Union a specialized agency of the United Nations in the field of telecommunications. This agreement was approved by the second regular session of the General Assembly in 1947. Canada's contribution to this agency is approximately \$30,000 yearly.

The Radio Administrative Conference established an International Frequency Registration Board which will maintain a world frequency register but which has no power either to assign frequencies or to deny them to any member of the Union. This Conference also set up a permanent international radio consultative committee (C.C.I.R.) and drafted a Frequency Allocation Table which allots all available frequencies to the various services, such as broadcasting, marine navigation and air navigation. However, the Conference was unable to complete the further task of allocating these frequencies among member countries of the Union by drawing up an International Frequency List. This will be the responsibility of a Provisional Frequency Board, established by the Radio Conference, which meets in Geneva.

A second High Frequency Broadcasting Conference opened its meetings in Mexico City in October, 1948, to complete the work left unfinished by the Atlantic City High Frequency Broadcasting Conference. This Conference, which seeks to allot short-wave frequencies amongst the member states of the ITU, should complete its work by February, 1949.

9. International Trade Organization

The year 1948 brought substantial progress toward the general lowering of long-standing barriers to international trade, and toward the establishment of a code of law for the conduct of international economic relations. When the Charter for the International Trade Organization comes into force, (a Charter signed in Havana in March 1948 by fifty-four nations representing ninety per cent of world trade) it will become an international agreement on trade and employment of a kind which has never before existed. A General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was also concluded at Geneva in October, 1947. This General Agreement was applied provisionally by nine countries, including Canada, at the beginning of the year¹. It is now being applied provisionally by twenty-two of the twenty-three original signatories of the Agreement who together represent over seventy per cent of the world's total international trade.

To Canada, as one of the leading trading nations of the world, the unimpeded flow of international commerce is of vital importance. Canada has contributed its full share, commensurate with its economic importance, in negotiating the agreements which seek to establish conditions necessary to a prosperous world-trade unhampered by unjust and artificial restrictions.

The Havana Conference, officially known as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, was convened on November 21, 1947, and concluded its work on March 24, 1948. It took as its basic document a draft charter prepared by a Preparatory Committee of seventeen countries appointed by the United Nations. The U.S.S.R., although appointed to the Committee, did not attend any of the meetings leading to the Havana Charter and the General Agreement. It was attended by fifty-six countries (nine of which were not members of the United Nations) representing ninety per cent of the total trade of the world. Fifty-four countries signed the Final Act of the Conference thus establishing the text of the Havana Charter.

The Charter now awaits ratification by the legislatures of the various signatory countries and it will come into force sixty days after the twentieth government has deposited its instrument of ratification. It is now expected that the International Trade Organization will be set up towards the end of 1949. A number of governments have already placed before their national legislatures the measures necessary for the ratification of both the Havana Charter and the General Agreement².

The text of the Havana Charter has been available for some time, and some publicity has already been given to the purpose and scope of the Charter, the nature of the Organization for which it provides, and its significance to Canada. The Charter is a highly complex technical document of some 30,000 words. It contains 106 articles and 16 annexes divided into nine chapters.

The Havana Charter, and the Organization which it is hoped will be established for its administration, will be a new experiment in international

¹ Tabled in the House of Commons, December 8, 1947.

² See minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce of the House of Commons and of the Standing Committee on Canadian Trade Relations of the Senate, Session 1947-48.

economic relations. For the first time in history an organization on a world-wide scale will be set up especially to solve the problems of international rivalry in trade and to promote general prosperity and welfare for all nations through co-operation.

The ITO Charter is not a perfect document. Many of its provisions are the result of compromise between countries of varying economic policy, size, degree of development, interests, and aspirations. Being a compromise, it does not give full satisfaction to all the governments concerned with its provisions. At Havana, however, it was believed that the compromise reached was the best possible, in view of the difficulties of the task and of the fact that the Charter deals with international economic relations hitherto not covered by international agreement.

Further the Charter reflects the difficult times in which it was formulated. The economic dislocation which resulted from the war; the widespread economic mistrust; the reluctance to permit encroachment on economic sovereignty: all these factors have affected the provisions of the Charter and the nature of the organization which it establishes.

The success of the International Trade Organization will depend on the goodwill and on the co-operation of its members, the efficient functioning of its Conference and of its Executive Board, rather than on the actual legal provisions of the Charter. However, if unfair advantage is taken of its escape clauses and the exceptions which had to be included in the Charter to obtain wide acceptance of its provisions, the Organization cannot be expected to succeed.

When the Canadian Parliament ratifies the Charter and when the ITO is set up, Canada, as a result of its membership on the Executive Board, can play a leading role in the application of the provisions of the Charter and in the functioning of the Organization.

Although it was not expected at Havana that the Charter would enter into force for eighteen months, it was evident that a good deal of preparatory work would have to be done so that the Organization would be set up as expeditiously as possible, and once established would be prepared immediately to assume its functions and obligations, many of which would be urgent.

The preparatory work and the interim functions of the ITO were assigned to the Executive Committee of the Interim Commission which will make recommendations to the first session of the Conference of the Organization when established. This Committee of eighteen countries was elected at Havana in accordance with the Charter provisions for the election of the Executive Board of the ITO. Canada as a "country of chief economic importance" has a seat on the Committee, of which Mr. L. D. Wilgress is Chairman.

The first session of the Executive Committee was held immediately following the Havana Conference. Work at the first session was limited to establishing a small Secretariat to prepare reports for consideration at the second session.

The second meeting of the Executive Committee took place in Geneva from August 25 to September 15, 1948, and many proposals dealing with organizational matters, submitted by the Secretariat were considered and approved. For example, draft agreements on the relationship of ITO

with the United Nations and with other specialized agencies (such as the International Monetary Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the International Labour Organization) were prepared in consultation with those Organizations. Thought was also given to the incorporation of the International Customs Tariff Bureau which has been in operation since 1890, with headquarters in Brussels.

Other questions such as finances and the choice of a permanent site were considered to facilitate the efficient and prompt establishment of what will be a complex Organization. The third, and probably the last meeting of the Executive Committee, will be held shortly after the twentieth instrument of acceptance of the Charter has been deposited.

The ITO Charter now awaits the necessary ratification to come into effect. The General Agreement, on the other hand, is an operative Agreement which is now being applied. The governments represented on the ITO Preparatory Committee adopted a resolution at the first session in London to promote the major objectives of the future ITO by taking action to reduce tariffs and other trade barriers to their mutual advantage. Negotiations were therefore conducted at Geneva, beginning in May, 1947, with the result that over one hundred bilateral negotiations were incorporated into twenty Tariff Schedules (one for each negotiating country or group of countries) which were annexed to the General Agreement.

The Tariff and other concessions appearing in these twenty Schedules number over 45,000. They are extended to all the Contracting Parties, that is, to the countries applying the Agreement provisionally. Thus Canada enjoys the benefit of all concessions appearing in the Schedules whether or not the concessions were negotiated with Canada.

Clauses were incorporated into the text of the General Agreement to ensure that the tariff concessions contained in the Schedules would not be nullified or impaired by the use of other protective measures. Most of these general clauses were taken from the Geneva draft Charter, and provision was made whereby, subject to certain conditions, those clauses would be replaced by the corresponding provisions of the Havana Charter when the latter enters into force.

The administrative clauses of the General Agreement provide that the representatives of the contracting parties should meet from time to time to give effect to those provisions of the Agreement which involve joint action and, generally, to further the objectives of the Agreement.

During 1948, the first year of operation of the General Agreement, two meetings of the contracting parties were held under the chairmanship of Mr. L. D. Wilgress. There were no tariff negotiations at either session.

The first session was held at Havana toward the end of the Havana Conference; at that time there were only nine contracting parties. The main task of this session was to consider the relation between the General Agreement and the Havana Charter in the light of the provisions of the latter which had by that time been established. This relation was considered in order to implement certain important elements of the compromise which had made final agreement possible on the text of the Havana Charter.

The second session of the contracting parties was held during August and September, 1948. There were by this time twenty-two contracting parties to the Agreement. The most important decision of the contracting parties at this session was to invite other countries to enter into tariff

negotiations with a view to their accession to the Agreement. The following thirteen countries have accepted the invitation and will enter into tariff negotiations among themselves and with the existing contracting parties on April 11, 1949: Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Haiti, Italy, Liberia, Nicaragua, Peru, Sweden, Uruguay.

Other decisions were taken at the second session, of which the principal can be summarized as follows:

(1) Provision was made for the replacement of three articles of the Agreement (Geneva draft Charter text) by the corresponding provisions of the Havana Charter.

(2) Modifications were made in the text of the Agreement to eliminate temporary provisions and to clarify certain points, the interpretation of which may give rise to difficulties.

(3) The request of the Government of Chile for an extension of time to February 17, 1949, to decide upon adherence to the Agreement was granted.

(4) The request of the Governments of Brazil, Ceylon, Cuba and Pakistan to renegotiate, subject to certain conditions and rules, on specified tariff items was agreed to.

(5) Agreement was reached by a substantial number of countries to extend most-favoured-nation treatment to goods produced or manufactured in Western Germany. This undertaking is incorporated in a separate document not part of the General Agreement. Nine countries including the United Kingdom, the United States, France and Canada, had signed the agreement by the end of September, 1948.

(6) Procedures were established to ensure the application of the provisions of the Agreement, and to provide for consultation between the Contracting Parties during periods between sessions.

The next session is scheduled for April 8, 1949. It is probable that before the end of that session there will be a total of thirty-six Contracting Parties to the General Agreement. The Polish delegation placed on the agenda of the third session of the General Assembly an item concerning discrimination practiced by certain states in international trade. This resolution was considered in the Second Committee, where it precipitated long propaganda debate between the Soviet bloc and the countries involved in the European Recovery Programme. Resolutions were also submitted by Poland and China and various amendments to these were proposed. The Second Committee finally adopted a resolution to the effect that no action should be taken on the various proposals, but that a general account of the debate which took place in the Second Committee, should be transmitted to the third session of the General Assembly. This report of the Second Committee was noted by the General Assembly in plenary session.

10. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

The principle objective of UNESCO is to contribute to international peace and security by promoting international collaboration in education, science and culture. The Organization was established at a meeting of forty-one member states of the United Nations held for this purpose in London in November, 1945. The first session of the General Conference was held in Paris in November and December, 1946. Since its secretariat and headquarters were not organized until the early summer of 1947, UNESCO only then began work on the programme formulated by the Paris Conference.

The Canadian view has been that UNESCO should place emphasis in its programme on the educational, scientific and cultural reconstruction of war-devastated countries and on the development of education, science and culture in under-developed areas. In its report to UNESCO for 1948, submitted in accordance with the UNESCO Constitution, the Canadian Government stated that it considered that the present programme contained enough projects of a continuing nature to keep the Organization fully occupied for the next few years. At the third session of the General Conference, held in Beirut from November 17 to December 11, 1948, only a limited number of new projects was studied. At this session Dr. Jaime Torres-Bodet (Mexico) was elected Director-General of the Organization to succeed Dr. Julian Huxley.

During 1948, UNESCO has, in the Canadian view, dissipated its energies and resources on too many projects. Many of these were initiated at the Paris Conference of 1946, and new projects were added at the Mexico Conference of 1947. However, UNESCO during 1948 did achieve certain successes which are mentioned here.

In reconstruction, the Organization has cooperated with the Temporary International Committee for Educational Reconstruction (TICER) and National Committees of non-governmental organizations in the distribution of \$50,000,000 for educational relief to war-devastated areas. The Canadian Council for Reconstruction through UNESCO (CCRU) was one of the co-operating national organizations. UNESCO also devoted \$395,000 to the purchase of materials such as microfilm projectors, text books, etc. for countries of Europe and Asia.

In education, the Organization concerned itself also with the administration of some 200 fellowships including the 64 "Canadian-UNESCO" fellowships offered to fifteen countries by the CCRU. In September a school for public librarians was held in the United Kingdom attended by five librarians from Canada. The Organization held three teachers' seminars in the United Kingdom, United States and Czechoslovakia during July-August 1948. Educators from Canada attended all three seminars. The Organization was also responsible for the creation of the International Theatre Institute.

In natural sciences, UNESCO made grants-in-aid of \$232,254 to the International Council of Scientific Unions (ISU) and its ten federated unions.

The UNESCO Constitution states that "each member state shall make such arrangements as suit its particular condition for the purpose of associating its principle bodies interested in educational, scientific and cultural matters with the work of the Organization, preferably by the formation of a National Commission broadly representative of the Government and such bodies." The Canadian Government has not yet established a National Commission. However, various Canadian non-governmental educational, scientific and cultural bodies are co-operating with the Canadian Government in carrying out the programme of UNESCO in this country.

The Canadian financial contribution to UNESCO in 1948 was \$285,372 (U.S.) to the general budget, and \$35,400 (U.S.) to the reserve fund.

11. Universal Postal Union

The twelfth Congress of the Universal Postal Union convened in Paris on May 6, 1947. This was the first Congress to be held since the outbreak of World War II, the eleventh Congress being held in Buenos Aires in 1939. The Congress ordinarily is required to meet every five years to review the International Postal Convention.

The Universal Postal Union was established in 1874 and Canada has been a member since 1878. Canada's yearly contribution to this agency is approximately \$5,000.

The main business of the twelfth Congress was technical in character, relating to postage rates, financial and accounting arrangements, and amendments to existing regulations in connection with the handling and transportation of international correspondence, whether by land, sea or air.

The twelfth Congress concurred in an Agreement between the United Nations and the Universal Postal Union, which was later approved by the United Nations General Assembly at its second regular session in 1947. By virtue of this Agreement the Universal Postal Union became a specialized agency of the United Nations.

At its seventh session held in July and August, 1948, the Economic and Social Council considered in detail the reports of the specialized agencies, including that of the Universal Postal Union. The main questions which arose in the discussions in the Economic and Social Council concerned the relations of the Universal Postal Union with Spain, and its exclusion of the Baltic Soviet Republics from membership. The representative of the U.S.S.R. recommended that the Universal Postal Union be asked to review the whole question of membership, but the Economic and Social Council rejected this proposal, and decided to request the Secretary General to transmit to the Universal Postal Union the records of the discussions which took place in the Economic and Social Council on this report.

12. World Health Organization

As a result of the International Health Conference which met in June and July, 1946, a Constitution establishing a World Health Organization (WHO) was signed by fifty-one United Nations members, and by ten states not members of the United Nations. An interim arrangement establishing an Interim Commission of the World Health Organization was also signed by the sixty-one states. The WHO constitution was unanimously adopted by the General Assembly. It came into effect on April 7, 1948.

Plans which had been made earlier by the Interim Commission for convening the first World Health Assembly were confirmed, and the WHO met for the first time as a fully constituted specialized agency of the United Nations on June 24, 1948. The Government of the United States ratified the WHO Constitution just in time to permit a United States delegation to attend. Accordingly, it was possible to arrange a budget for the remainder of 1948 and for the year 1949 on the basis of the maximum contribution of the United States Government permitted by Congress.

Already in the autumn of 1947, the WHO had made an effective contribution to world public health through its efficient and prompt action in helping to check the outbreak of cholera in Egypt. For this purpose the scientific resources of the world were rapidly mobilized and what might have been a wide-spread epidemic was confined within narrow limits and brought under control.

At the first World Health Assembly, which was held June 24 to July 24, 1948, it was decided that priority should be given to six programmes in the field of public health — malaria, tuberculosis, venereal diseases, maternal and child health, nutrition and environmental hygiene. A special division within the WHO secretariat has been created for each of these fields and expert committees have been appointed. Special research studies will be undertaken and advisory assistance will be given to national health administrations. Arrangements are in hand to provide individual experts and teams of medical workers for such countries as may request them.

During 1949, WHO is to establish an influenza center, and will conduct an international survey to consider ways in which the production of insulin and penicillin may be stimulated. The existing fellowship programme which provides scholarships for medical students in backward or in war-devastated areas to study at the world's great medical centers is to be increased.

The Assembly agreed that WHO headquarters will remain in Geneva. It was agreed, too, that regional offices of the WHO should be established in the Eastern Mediterranean, Western Pacific, Southeast Asia, Africa and Europe. A sixth area, including North, Central and South America, will be served by the Pan American Sanitary Bureau which is to be integrated into WHO as rapidly as possible.

The work of the WHO in the standardization of diagnostic and other medical terms will be continued. The WHO is presently to publish a revised list of diseases and of causes of death. Studies and recommendations which are now going on for the standardization of drugs and of medical and biological products generally are to be continued.

The WHO is probably the least contentious of all specialized agencies. Co-operation from the Eastern countries of Europe and an almost complete absence of debates revealing political bias have marked all the sessions of the Interim Commission as well as the discussions which took place at the first World Health Assembly. There are certain matters of policy, however, which are yet to be determined, although it may be anticipated that these matters are likely to be decided on objective rather than on political grounds. The main points to be determined are as follows:

(a) There is not yet full agreement on the extent to which WHO should be an operative rather than a purely consultative body. The Canadian delegations to WHO meetings have adopted the view that WHO should provide consultants and experts capable of initiating programmes of public health in backward countries, but that WHO itself should not undertake the establishment or the maintenance of public health programmes in individual States. At the first General Assembly of WHO, the Canadian delegation was successful in securing the adoption of the general principle that states receiving help from WHO should pay for it if they have the means. It is in general the Canadian view that WHO should undertake operational activities only in the event of emergencies such as the cholera outbreak in Egypt.

(b) The Canadian delegation was able to give only reluctant support to the establishment of regional agencies of WHO. It has been the Canadian view that if regional agencies must be established, their organization should be modest and their responsibilities clearly defined. The Canadian delegation has argued constantly that the WHO should not dissipate its very meagre resources by creating an elaborate fractional structure. Only a modest provision has been made in the 1949 budget for the regional agencies. It may be expected, however, that the activities of the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau, presently to be integrated with WHO and to become the nucleus of the Western Region of WHO, will be maintained and extended.

For the year 1948, the WHO operated on a budget of \$5,000,000, to which the Canadian contribution was approximately \$150,000. Dr. Brock Chisholm of Canada, who for two years served as Executive Secretary of the Interim Commission of WHO, was elected Director-General of the permanent body in June of 1948.

V. TRUSTEESHIP

1. Non-Self-Governing Territories

In 1947, prior to the second session of the General Assembly, the question of how the United Nations should deal with information received in accordance with Article 75 of the Charter from Members administering non-self-governing territories other than trust territories. As a result of the committee's recommendations the Assembly adopted a resolution for the guidance of administering powers in drawing up their reports and observing certain procedures that is effect.

Information transmitted to the Secretary-General is also authorized by the reporting governments in the relevant form to facilitate comparative comparison and analysis of data on economic, social and educational matters. Political information is not included unless the administering power so desires. The information received by the Secretary-General is summarized and analyzed in the Trusteeship section of the Yearbook. Two sets of studies are prepared. The first summarizes information concerning all the trusteeship administrations by a single country or several countries. Information on specific items of interest covers all the results.

On September 2, 1948, a special committee appointed by the Fourth Trusteeship Council set of the Assembly and to examine the Secretary-General's routine studies of the territories under non-self-governing

V. Trusteeship.

of the world. The committee's report was published in the Yearbook of the Charter's Trusteeship Commission. The committee's report on New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States and their respective reports filed by the Trusteeship Commission in November 1947 (China, Cambodia, Laos, New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa and the U.S.A.P.). The special committee was asked to report on their information and to recommend measures and procedures to be adopted to assist administering powers in their reports. The committee also was asked to report on their information and to recommend measures and procedures to be adopted to assist administering powers in their reports. The committee also was asked to report on their information and to recommend measures and procedures to be adopted to assist administering powers in their reports.

The special committee's report was published in the Trusteeship Commission's report of which the latter approved. The committee's

1. Reports on economic and social conditions should be included in the reports of the administering powers. The reports should include information on the economic, social and educational conditions of the territories and the observance of human rights. The reports should also include information on the political and social conditions of the territories and the observance of human rights. The reports should also include information on the political and social conditions of the territories and the observance of human rights.

The committee's report was published in the Trusteeship Commission's report of which the latter approved. The committee's

V. TRUSTEESHIP

1. Non-Self-Governing Territories¹

In 1947, prior to the second session, a committee of the General Assembly examined the question of how the United Nations should deal with information received in accordance with Article 73(e) of the Charter from Members administering non-self-governing territories other than trust territories. As a result of the committee's recommendations the Assembly adopted a standard form for the guidance of administering powers in drawing up their reports and initiated certain procedures now in effect.

Information transmitted to the Secretary General is now arranged by the reporting governments in the standard form, to facilitate summary, comparison and analysis of data on economic, social and educational matters. Political information is not included unless the administering power so desires. The information received by the Secretary General is summarized and analysed in the Trusteeship Section of the Secretariat. Two sets of studies are prepared. The first summarizes information concerning all the territories administered by a single power; the second analyses information in specific fields of interest drawn from all the reports.

On September 2, 1948, a special committee appointed by the Fourth (Trusteeship) Committee of the Assembly met to examine the Secretary-General's routine analyses of information on fifty-nine non-self-governing territories received in 1947 and 1948. The special committee was composed of the eight members which transmit information under Article 73(e) of the Charter (Australia, Belgium, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States) and eight non-colonial powers elected by the Trusteeship Committee on November 6, 1947 (China, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, India, Nicaragua, Sweden and the U.S.S.R.). The special committee was asked to submit reports on the information it had examined, making any procedural recommendations considered appropriate. Substantive recommendations were not to be made about individual territories but should relate to functional fields generally—that is to say: recommendations on health, education, agriculture, industry and social policy for wide geographical areas having common problems.

The special committee made four recommendations to the Trusteeship Committee, all of which the latter approved. These concerned:

- (a) Reports, summaries and analyses—Administering powers should be invited to include information in the optional category on geography, history, peoples and the observance of human rights, even though they might not wish to include information on purely political questions. The Secretariat should issue full summaries and analyses once every three years, with supplemental reports in intervening

¹For a summary of the work of the United Nations concerning non-self-governing territories other than trust territories see *Report on the United Nations Conference on International Organization*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1945, No. 2, pp. 53-54; *The United Nations, 1946*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1946, No. 3, pp. 114-117; and *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, pp. 124-127.

years. In compiling its analyses it might use all relevant and comparable official statistical information communicated to the United Nations and specialized agencies. The summaries and analyses should be distributed to Members by July 15 or 31, and in any event not later than August 15.

- (b) Special committee—A special committee should be appointed again for 1949, without deciding the issue of whether the practice was to continue. It would meet at least three weeks before the next regular session of the Assembly and fill the same functions as the 1948 committee.
- (c) Specialized agencies—Aid already given by three organizations was mentioned. All appropriate specialized agencies were invited to comment on analyses of information prepared by the Secretary-General.
- (d) Cooperation with the Economic and Social Council—Fuller use might be made of the technical assistance which this body was in a position to provide.

Poland failed in an attempt to have the special committee transformed into a permanent body, and a Brazilian suggestion that the committee should be appointed for three years was also rejected. Members of the special committee elected for 1949 were the same as for 1948, except that Brazil, the Dominican Republic and Venezuela replaced Colombia, Cuba and Nicaragua.

The Trusteeship Committee rejected the following proposals of the U.S.S.R.: (a) that Members should be required to submit information on the development of organs of self-government in non-self-governing territories, (b) that United Nations representatives should visit non-self-governing territories at regular intervals, (c) that the special committee should be allowed to consider communications from local populations, and (d) that the Secretariat should be allowed to use data received from private groups or individuals as well as from official sources in preparing its summaries.

Canada voted in favour of the four recommendations of the special committee and against the amendments proposed by the U.S.S.R., Poland and Brazil.

The Trusteeship Committee of the General Assembly also adopted a draft resolution proposed by the Indian delegation providing that members who ceased to supply information under Article 73(e) of the Charter should apprise the Secretary General of the changes in the constitutional position or status of the territory in question which had led the administering power to stop submitting annual reports. The United Kingdom, though agreeing that the United Nations should be informed in general terms of such changes, thought it unnecessary to insist on having details of acts, orders or constitutions ushering in a new regime, or on receiving information on the structure and powers of the territorial government and its relation to the metropolitan power, for all of which the Indian resolution provided. The resolution was adopted without change by the Trusteeship Committee. Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom and twelve others abstained from voting. The General Assembly confirmed all these decisions taken by its Trusteeship Committee.

2. South West Africa¹

During the first World War the German colony of South West Africa was occupied by forces of the neighbouring Union of South Africa. At the close of the war the Union Government was authorized by the Allied and Associated Powers to continue to administer the territory under a League of Nations mandate of the Class C category which, like those established in the Pacific, permitted the mandatory power to administer the former German colony as an integral portion of its own territory, subject to certain safeguards designed to protect the interests of the indigenous population.

At the San Francisco conference in 1945 the South African delegation indicated that its Government did not intend to transfer South West Africa to the United Nations trusteeship system but hoped instead to incorporate the territory into the Union. In the following year a series of consultations was held by the South African Government with tribal groups, the majority of whose leaders said they were contented with the South African administration of the preceding quarter-century and desired its continuation in preference to undefined changes which might be imposed on them by alien states of whom the tribesmen knew nothing. On the basis of this inquiry the South African delegation reported to the General Assembly in the autumn of 1946 that roughly 70% of the non-European population of South West Africa favoured incorporation, 11% opposed it, while 19% could not be consulted. The Europeans, who form 10.8% of the population, are solidly in favour of incorporation and have repeatedly demanded it.

The General Assembly, expressing doubt as to whether the native population understood the issues on which the chiefs had offered their opinions, decided that it was unable to accede to the incorporation of South West Africa in the Union. It recommended instead that the mandated territory should be placed under the trusteeship system, and invited the Government of South Africa to propose a trusteeship agreement for the approval of the General Assembly.

In April, 1947, the South African parliament decided that instead of incorporating South West Africa into the Union as a new province, it would arrange to have representatives of the territory sit in the Union parliament "as an integral portion of that body". Meanwhile, although not under obligation to do so, it would send annual reports on the administration of South West Africa to the Secretary General of the United Nations, because of a previous declaration that the Union would continue to administer the territory "in the spirit of the mandate". The position was taken that South West Africa was neither legally nor morally bound to submit a trusteeship agreement for South West Africa.

In the autumn of 1947 the General Assembly took note of South Africa's decision not to proceed with the incorporation of South West Africa, but firmly maintained its recommendation that South West Africa should be placed under trusteeship and expressed the hope that South Africa would submit a trusteeship agreement for the territory in time for its consideration by the General Assembly at the third session in 1948.

¹ See also *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series, 1947, No. 1, pp. 121-123.

The question of the future status of South West Africa came before the third session of the General Assembly as part of the report of the Trusteeship Council. A resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on November 26 which noted with regret that South Africa had not carried out the Assembly's two previous recommendations that it place South West Africa under the trusteeship system. The resolution called on the Union Government to continue to submit annual reports on its administration of the territory for examination by the Trusteeship Council. It noted South Africa's assurance that it would continue to administer the territory in the spirit of the League of Nations mandate. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 43 in favour and one against (South Africa) with five abstentions (Canada, Australia, New Zealand, United Kingdom and India). The Indian delegation abstained because it felt the resolution was weak and ineffective.

The Canadian delegation took no part in the debate on this question either in the Fourth Committee or in the General Assembly. Canada has been unable to agree with those who argue that either the terms of the Charter itself or the repeated invitations of the General Assembly place the South African Government under a legal obligation to submit a trusteeship agreement for South West Africa for the approval of the United Nations. On the other hand, Canada believes that in cases where questions of annexation are involved it would be dangerous for the General Assembly to accept soundings of opinion taken by interested parties. Canada associated itself with the first invitation extended to the Union Government in 1946 to place South West Africa under trusteeship, but it voted against the second invitation in 1947 because the inclusion in it of a time limit for compliance seemed to the Canadian delegation to be likely to have the effect of provoking increased opposition in South Africa to the policy advocated by the General Assembly.

The Canadian delegation abstained from voting on the resolution of the third session of the General Assembly as it did not appear logical to support a resolution maintaining the recommendation of November 1, 1947, which the Canadian delegation had voted against at that time.

3. Strategic Areas

In February, 1947, the United States Government submitted to the Security Council the draft of a "strategic area" trusteeship agreement for the former Japanese mandated islands in the Pacific—the Marshalls, the Marianas and the Carolines—and requested that the matter be placed on the agenda of the Security Council. This agreement was submitted in accordance with Article 83(1) of the Charter which provides that "all functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the Security Council." Since these Islands were, in the opinion of the United States Government, of permanent strategic importance, the United States proposed in accordance with Article 82 of the Charter that this trust territory should be designated as a strategic area.

When discussion of the United States proposal began in the Security Council in February, 1947, the Council invited members of the Far Eastern Commission desiring to participate in the discussion to do so. Canada, a member of the Far Eastern Commission, accepted this invitation. The Canadian representative, in expressing the views of the Canadian Government on this matter, stated that the Canadian Government in general approved of the proposed United States trusteeship agreement. Canadian security in the Pacific would be protected by United States control of these islands scattered across the midwest Pacific. At some later date Canada might wish to secure equal privileges with other nations for a trans-Pacific airline that might pass through the islands.

The draft trusteeship agreement submitted by the United States Government was approved unanimously by the Security Council in April, 1947; and in July, 1947, the President of the United States announced that the agreement was approved by the United States Government.

In November, 1947, the Secretary-General, in a letter addressed to the President of the Security Council, observed that the Security Council was required by Article 83(1) of the Charter to exercise all functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas; and, by Article 83(3) of the Charter, to avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council to perform those functions of the United Nations under the trusteeship system relating to political, economic, social and educational matters in the strategic areas. It was further pointed out in this letter that Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter were made applicable to the area by Article 13 of the trusteeship agreement. The letter concluded by suggesting that the Security Council formulate and approve procedures to govern the detailed application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter to the strategic areas. In November, 1947, the Security Council referred all questions arising out of this letter to its Committee of Experts for study and report.

In the discussions by the Committee of Experts on the question of the respective functions of the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council concerning strategic areas placed under trusteeship, a clear division of opinion developed between the U.S.S.R. (supported by Poland, and later by the Ukraine) and the other members of the Committee. The majority of the Committee of Experts recommended that the Security Council

adopt a draft resolution by which the Trusteeship Council would be requested to perform on behalf of the Security Council functions relating to the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of strategic areas, subject to the terms of the relevant trusteeship agreements. The Trusteeship Council would give to the Security Council a copy of any questionnaire formulated in respect of a strategic area, and would submit to the Security Council its reports and recommendations on matters affecting strategic areas. The majority of the members of the Committee contended that this type of consultation was mandatory on the Security Council, in view of Article 83(3). They argued that in view of the technical nature of the administrative problem, the Security Council should act with the assistance of the Trusteeship Council. It was their opinion that the Trusteeship Council was better qualified to deal with those functions of the United Nations relating to political, economic, social and educational matters in strategic areas than was the Security Council. The Trusteeship Council would have the experience and personnel to deal with these technical matters through working with the other territories for which it exercised responsibility.

The United States Pacific Trust Territory was the first strategic area trusteeship established, and it did not seem to the majority that there was any point in requiring the Security Council to duplicate, for this one strategic area, services already being rendered by the Trusteeship Council for other trust territories.

The U.S.S.R., however, claimed that Articles 83(1) and 85(1) of the Charter provided that all questions relating to strategic areas should be dealt with exclusively by the Security Council. Article 83(3), in their opinion, carried no mandatory obligation on the Security Council to consult with the Trusteeship Council.

In June 1948, the Security Council considered the preliminary report of the Committee of Experts concerning those matters arising out of the Secretary-General's letter of November, 1947. The report of the Committee indicated that the differences between the representative of the U.S.S.R. (and the Ukrainian S.S.R.) and the other members of the Committee on the question of the degree of control which the Security Council should exercise over the strategic areas had not been resolved. These differences were carried over into the discussions which took place in the Security Council. The Security Council took no decision on the report, but it was decided that there should be consultation between the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council to determine the responsibilities of each in this matter.

4. The Trusteeship System¹

Canada is not a member of the Trusteeship Council. The Council consists of members of the United Nations administering trust territories, permanent members of the Security Council which do not administer trust territories, and as many other members, selected for a three year term by the General Assembly, as will ensure that the membership of the Council is equally divided between members which administer trust territories and members which do not.²

The second and third sessions of the Trusteeship Council were held between November, 1947, and August, 1948. In these sessions the Trusteeship Council examined reports for South West Africa, and the trust territories of Western Samoa and New Guinea in the Pacific, and Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika in Africa. It prepared observations on each for submission to the General Assembly. It dealt with petitions; it established an important precedent in giving an oral hearing to a representative of the inhabitants of Eweland, who petitioned the United Nations to reunite the two Togolands now under French and United Kingdom trusteeship; and it made arrangements for the first regular visiting mission of the Trusteeship Council to go to Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika in 1948. It took up with the Security Council the question of co-operation in supervising the administration of strategic areas. It also drafted a statute for the international administration of the City of Jerusalem and gave emergency consideration to the protection of Jerusalem, reporting to the General Assembly on these two subjects during the special session in April and May, 1948.

Until April, 1948, the Soviet Union refused to participate in the work of the Trusteeship Council, on the ground that when the General Assembly approved the trusteeship agreements, whose operation the Trusteeship Council was to supervise, it had disregarded or violated certain important provisions of Chapter XII of the Charter. In April, 1948, however, when the Trusteeship Council began to consider emergency measures to protect the City of Jerusalem, a representative of the Soviet Union took his seat. Since then a somewhat larger proportion of the time of the Trusteeship Council appears to have been occupied by discussions of ideological problems at the expense of the study of actual conditions in the trust territories.

The main body of the Trusteeship Council's report to the third session of the General Assembly was taken up with observations and recommendations concerning the administration of Ruanda-Urundi, New Guinea and Tanganyika. These might be regarded not only as an appraisal of the results of a quarter-century of mandatory administration in the three territories, but also as the first indication of the spirit in which the Trusteeship Council is likely to fulfil its supervisory functions. It is therefore significant that consistent attention was given to the need for improvements

¹ For a full summary of the establishment of the trusteeship system of the United Nations see *Report on the United Nations Conference on International Organization*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series, 1945, No. 2, pp. 49-53; *The United Nations, 1946*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series, 1946, No. 3, pp. 105-110; and *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, pp. 117-120.

² For present membership of the Trusteeship Council see Appendix VI, p. 270.

in the fields of education, health, economic and social policy, and in measures designed to prepare the inhabitants for self-government.

When the report of the Trusteeship Council was considered in the Fourth (Trusteeship) Committee of the third session of the General Assembly, education was singled out for special attention, although a general resolution was also adopted emphasizing the duty of administering authorities to promote the development of trust territories in the political, economic and social fields as well as in the realm of education. Without minimizing the importance of health measures, economic improvement and a sound social policy, the majority of the members of the Trusteeship Committee were of the opinion that no consistent advancement could be expected in these fields without a rapid extension of educational facilities.

The resolution calling on administering authorities to intensify their efforts to increase educational facilities in trust territories was introduced by four Latin American states and amended by the United Kingdom, Belgium, Mexico and the U.S.S.R. The resolution proposed to the administering authorities (a) that primary education should be free, and access to higher education possible even for those without means, (b) that they should improve and expand facilities for training indigenous teachers, and (c) that they should study, in consultation with UNESCO, if the Trusteeship Council agreed, the financial and technical implications of an expansion of existing facilities for higher education, including the possible establishment of an African university in 1952. Canada voted for the resolution in Committee, and in the General Assembly the resolution was adopted unanimously.

Protracted discussions took place on sections of the Trusteeship Council's report which dealt with administrative unions. Of these there were three. The trust territory of Ruanda-Urundi was united administratively with the Belgian Congo in 1925. The trust territory of Tanganyika was united administratively with the colonies of Kenya and Uganda at the end of 1947; and in 1948 a bill was introduced in the Australian Parliament for the administration of the trust territory of New Guinea and the colony of Papua by a single Administrator, a single Executive Council and Advisory Council for Native Affairs, and a single judiciary. The trusteeship agreements for each of the three trust territories concerned had made provision for customs, fiscal or administrative unions with adjacent colonies, provided these unions were not inconsistent with the purposes of the trusteeship system and with the provisions of the trusteeship agreements themselves. The question which arose, therefore, both in the Trusteeship Council and in the Fourth Committee, was whether the three administrative unions now established or planned were compatible with the purposes of the trusteeship system.

The Trusteeship Council expressed the hope that the political identity of Ruanda-Urundi would be preserved. It reserved judgment on the ability of Tanganyika to retain its separate identity. Its first regular visiting mission was sent to Tanganyika in 1948 and the Trusteeship Council decided to await the report of this mission on the practical effects of the administrative union before making a recommendation. In the case of New Guinea, where a closer fusion is planned, the Trusteeship Council suggested that the International Court of Justice should be asked for a ruling on the compatibility of the Australian bill with the terms of the trusteeship agreement. The Trusteeship Council also recommended that

Australia should review its own policy to make sure that conditions which might obstruct the separate development of New Guinea should not be created.

The U.S.S.R., leading the opposition to administrative unions of any sort, proposed in the Fourth Committee of the Assembly that the administrative unions already constituted or proposed should be dissolved. This resolution was rejected, Canada being among those who voted against it.

There was more support for an attempt (a) to prevent the establishment of administrative unions until the inhabitants of the trust territories concerned were ready to form their own governments and to decide for themselves the political associations into which they wished to enter, (b) to require that administering authorities should consult the Trusteeship Council before extending the period or scope of an existing administrative union or before establishing a new one, and (c) to subject the entire area of an administrative union to the Trusteeship Council's supervision if it became impossible to supply separate data on the portion to which the trusteeship agreement applied. This supervision would be without prejudice to the status of the non-trust territory in the union. Because these proposals seemed to restrict unduly a right given to the administering authorities under specific provisions of the individual trusteeship agreements concerned, Canada voted against them. Although adopted by the Fourth Committee, they were defeated in the General Assembly.

The position now taken by the United Nations on the contentious issue of administrative unions is as follows:

- (a) The General Assembly has endorsed the observation of the Trusteeship Council that administrative unions must remain strictly administrative, and that they must not create conditions which would obstruct the separate development of any trust territory as a distinct entity in the fields of political, economic, social and educational advancement.
- (b) The Trusteeship Council has been asked to do three things:
 - (i) to investigate the effects of the administrative unions already constituted or proposed, and to recommend safeguards needed both to preserve the distinct political status of the trust territories and to facilitate its own supervisory functions;
 - (ii) to ask the International Court of Justice, where necessary, for an opinion on the compatibility of any union with the terms of the Charter and the relevant trusteeship agreement;
 - (iii) to report the results of its investigations to the fourth session of the General Assembly.

Finally the General Assembly adopted a resolution asking the Trusteeship Council to consider the comments and suggestions made during the third session of the General Assembly on the whole range of the Trusteeship Council's interests.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS

1. Report of the Board of Auditors¹

In the "Financial Report and Accounts for the year ended December 31, 1947 and Report of the Board of Auditors", the United Nations Board of Auditors of which the Auditor General of Canada is Chairman, drew attention to several ways in which the administrative and financial practices of the United Nations could be improved.

In June, 1948, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions examined the report of the Board of Auditors and stated that the observations and conclusions of the Auditors reflected the fact that the United Nations by the end of 1947 was emerging from the period of administrative difficulties which had characterized 1946. The Advisory Committee considered that the deficiencies in the financial system to which the Auditors had drawn attention appeared to be well in hand by June, 1948. There had been numerous consultations between the Chairman of the Board of Auditors, the Advisory Committee and the Secretariat to obtain efficiency and economy in the United Nations administration.

The Fifth Committee of the General Assembly considered the "Financial Report and Accounts and the Report of the Board of Auditors" on September 28, 1948, as well as the observations on it of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. The discussion in the Fifth Committee on the report generally was very brief. In a general statement given during the opening debate in the Committee, the Canadian representative indicated Canada's approval both of the report of the Auditors and of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

After a few delegations had reserved their position on specific points which might arise in connection with other items on the agenda to be dealt with later, the Fifth Committee agreed without objection to recommend to the General Assembly that it accept the report of the Board of Auditors and concur in the observations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on it. A resolution giving effect to these recommendations was subsequently adopted without objection by the General Assembly.

¹ See also *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, p. 140.

2. The Budget of the United Nations

(a) 1949 Budget

The third session of the General Assembly approved budgetary expenditures for the year 1949 totalling \$43,487,128 (US) and estimated that miscellaneous income for the same period would amount to \$4,794,550 (US). Accordingly, the net amount to be contributed by Member Governments for 1949 will be \$38,692,578 (US). Under the United Nations scale of contributions the Canadian share of this assessment is 3.2% so that the Canadian contribution for 1949 will be \$1,238,162.50 (US). The following is the Budget for 1949 as approved:

FOR FINANCIAL YEAR 1949

A. THE UNITED NATIONS

PART I—SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, THE COUNCILS, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

Section	Amount (In United States dollars)
1. The General Assembly and Commissions and Committees thereof.....	\$ 1,706,200
2. The Security Council and Commissions and Committees thereof.....	472,300
3. The Economic and Social Council and Commissions and Committees thereof.....	\$ 438,780
(a) Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body.....	45,000
(b) Regional Economic Commissions.....	48,110
4. The Trusteeship Council and Commissions and Committees thereof.....	150,000
	<hr/>
	\$ 2,860,390

PART II—SPECIAL CONFERENCES, INVESTIGATIONS AND ENQUIRIES

Section	Amount (In United States dollars)
5. Special Conferences.....	\$ 86,330
6. Investigations and Enquiries.....	5,248,303
	<hr/>
	\$ 5,334,633

PART III—HEADQUARTERS, NEW YORK

Section	Amount (In United States dollars)
7. Executive Office of the Secretary-General.	\$ 332,360
8. Department of Security Council Affairs....	645,400
9. Military Staff Committee Secretariat.....	162,200
10. Department of Economic Affairs.....	2,181,000
11. Department of Social Affairs.....	1,256,125
12. Department of Trusteeship and Informa- tion from Non-Self Governing Territories.	812,490
13. Department of Public Information.....	\$2,860,050
A. Library Services.....	378,110
	<hr/>
	3,238,160
14. Department of Legal Affairs.....	480,380
15. Conference and General Services.....	6,825,000
16. Administrative and Financial Services....	1,387,120
17. Common Staff Costs.....	4,379,200
18. Common Services.....	2,083,700
19. Permanent Equipment.....	370,090
	<hr/>
	\$24,153,225

PART IV—EUROPEAN OFFICE

Section	Amount (In United States dollars)
20. The European Office (excluding direct costs, Chapter III, Secretariat of the Per- manent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body).....	\$3,667,880
Chapter III, The Secretariat (direct costs) of the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body.....	41,200
	<hr/>
	\$ 3,709,080
	<hr/>
	\$ 3,709,080

PART V—INFORMATION CENTRES

Section	Amount (In United States dollars)
21. Information Centres (other than Informa- tion Services, European Office).....	\$ 719,990

PART VI—REGIONAL ECONOMIC COMMISSIONS
(Other than the Economic Commission for Europe)

Section	Amount (In United States dollars)
22. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.....	\$ 587,380
23. Economic Commission for Latin America.....	385,430
	\$ 972,810

PART VII—HOSPITALITY

Section	Amount (In United States dollars)
24. Hospitality.....	\$ 20,000

PART VIII—ADVISORY SOCIAL WELFARE FUNCTIONS

Section	Amount (In United States dollars)
25. Advisory Social Welfare Functions.....	\$ 631,000

PART IX—UNDISTRIBUTED EXPENSES

Section	Amount
26. Cost of the adoption of Spanish as a Working Language.....	\$ 300,000

B. INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

PART X—THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Section	Amount (In United States dollars)
27. Salaries and Expenses of Members of the Court.....	\$ 375,000
28. Salaries, Wages and Expenses of the Registry.....	205,000
29. Common Services.....	60,000
30. Permanent Equipment.....	10,000
	\$ 650,000

PART XI—COST OF CONVERTING SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES FROM NET TO GROSS AND INCREASE IN HEADQUARTERS COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCES

Section	Amount
31. Cost of converting salaries and allowances from net to gross and increase in Headquarters cost of living allowances.....	\$ 4,286,000
	<hr/>
32. Global reduction on provisions for Contractual Printing.....	\$43,637,128
	<hr/>
	- 150,000
	<hr/>
	\$43,487,128
Less estimated miscellaneous income.....	-4,794,550
	<hr/>
	\$38,692,578

These appropriations were approved after critical and exhaustive examination by the Fifth Committee both of the budget estimates submitted at the beginning of the session by the Secretary-General, which proposed expenditures amounting to \$33,469,587 (US), and of supplementary amounts required for 1949 to implement the decisions made by the General Assembly during the session. Among Assembly decisions leading to large increases in the original estimates were the following:

- (a) decisions to continue the activities of a number of special commissions of enquiry such as the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans, the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, the Committee of Good Offices on the Indonesian Question, the United Nations Conciliation Commission on Palestine, the Commission on Korea, at an estimated cost of \$5,248,303;
- (b) the provision of \$336,000 for a second part of the third session of the General Assembly;
- (c) \$288,000 for technical assistance for economic development; and
- (d) adoption of Spanish as a working language for the General Assembly at a cost of \$300,000.

Supplementary amounts may also be required later for any projects which are approved at the second part of the third session, and to cover commitments made during 1949 by the Secretary-General under the special authorization granted to him by the General Assembly to meet unforeseen and extraordinary expenses arising during the period the Assembly is not in session.

In his opening statement before the Committee the Secretary-General indicated his willingness to co-operate in achieving maximum economies during 1949 by agreeing to accept the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for proposed reductions in the budget of over \$1¼ million. He was not, however, willing to accept a further proposal for a reduction of \$300,000 in expatriation allowances for staff members serving away from their home countries¹.

¹ See Section VI, Chapter 8, p. 181.

He also stressed his recognition of the need for further improvement in the conduct of the administrative and budgetary affairs of the Organization and drew particular attention to the necessity of "controlling the financial implications of the activities of Government representatives in the many agencies of the United Nations if any effective control over expenditures was to be attained".

During the general debate that followed the Canadian delegate agreed that although there had been considerable improvement in the financial affairs of the United Nations over the past year the need for increasing efficiency and economy in all United Nations activities could not be over-emphasized. While approving generally of the budget estimates as modified by the reductions proposed by the Advisory Committee and in the light of the observations of the Board of Auditors, he indicated his intention of pressing for further economies and other improvements during the course of examination of the individual sections of the budget. He also commented generally on certain of the financial activities of the Organization to which the Canadian Government attaches importance¹.

In accordance with the intention expressed in these opening remarks the Canadian delegate participated actively in examination of all proposed expenditures. His attitude in budgetary discussions was that funds adequate for the effective and economical carrying out of priority projects should be approved but that less urgent projects should be deferred until a more propitious time. He drew attention to the adverse effect on world public opinion that would arise if the feeling became widespread that the Organization was financially irresponsible. However, he opposed arbitrary cuts in the budget which in the opinion of the Canadian delegation would have seriously curtailed the ability of the organization to perform its functions properly and to carry out its responsibilities fully.

During the course of the discussion of the estimates the Secretary-General gave specific assurances that he would endeavour to achieve, wherever possible, further economies in those phases of the activities of the Organization such as expenditures of the Department of Public Information on printing and on overseas missions which had been the subject of critical remarks by a number of delegations during the session.

As in preceding years, the delegations of the U.S.S.R. and other Eastern European countries took exception to the approval of appropriations for the Interim Committee and for the political Commissions of Enquiry. It was their contention that these bodies were either unnecessary or had been illegally constituted. When the budget resolution was voted in the General Assembly, the U.S.S.R. and the other five Eastern European states therefore abstained, on the grounds that a number of unconstitutional items had been included and also because, in their opinion, the budget had reached too high a figure.

(b) Supplementary Expenditures for 1948

The General Assembly also approved an amount of \$4,460,541 (US) as a supplement to the 1948 Budget (of \$34,825,195) which had been adopted by the second session of the General Assembly. Of these supplementary requirements only \$2,958,235.40 (US) will have to be contributed by Member Governments as the balance is available out of savings in the 1946 and 1947 appropriations and from a revision in the amounts of miscellaneous

¹ For text of this statement see Appendix IV-A, pp. 256-258.

income actually collected during 1947 and 1948. On the basis of a share of 3.2%, the Canadian portion of this additional assessment is \$94,663.53 (US). Taken in conjunction with Canada's assessed share of \$1,238,162.50 for the 1949 Budget this means that Canada's total contribution to the United Nations during 1949 will be \$1,332,826.03 (US).

The supplementary appropriations referred to above were necessary to cover the following commitments for unforeseen or extraordinary expenses entered into by the Secretary-General during 1948 under special authority granted by the General Assembly:

	Amount (In United States dollars)
Investigations and Enquiries (mainly Palestine Mission)	\$4,129,305
General Assembly (mainly Special Session for Palestine)	222,519
Economic Commissions for Europe and for Asia.....	268,620
Transfer of League of Nations Assets.....	533,767
Repayment to the Working Capital Fund of Advances made to finance expenses of the International Con- ference on Trade and Employment and its preparatory bodies.....	779,642
	5,933,853
LESS other adjustments in 1948 appropriations (net figure).....	1,473,312
	\$4,460,541

In considering these items the expenses incurred for Palestine, which constituted such a substantial portion of the total, were subjected to very thorough and detailed examination¹. During this discussion the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Administrative and Financial Services gave assurances that the Secretariat would make every endeavour to give full effect to a number of recommendations made by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions regarding the administration and financing of future missions of this kind.

While the difficulties confronting the Secretary-General in the administration and control of overseas missions were generally recognized, it was the view of the Committee that these difficulties, and the fact that strict adherence to regular administrative and budgetary procedures was not always possible, made it all the more important that the financial implications of decisions taken and the need for the most effective possible control over expenditures should be borne constantly in mind. The Canadian delegation suggested that the Advisory Committee and the Board of Auditors should, in co-operation with the Secretary-General, pay particular attention during 1949 to the administrative, budgetary and financial activities of overseas missions with a view to submitting to the next session of the General Assembly recommendations regarding appropriate measures which might be taken to render existing methods of control over expenditures more effective.

¹ For discussion of "Repayment of Advances to International Conference on Trade and Employment", and of "Transfer of League of Nations Assets", see Section VI, Chapter 3, p. 168 and Chapter 5 p. 172.

3. The Working Capital Fund

a) Advances from the Working Capital Fund

In a resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its second session, the Secretary-General was authorized to make advances from the Working Capital Fund to meet unforeseen and extraordinary expenses during 1948, to establish various revolving funds, to make loans to specialized agencies and to make advances for certain other purposes.

The Secretary-General presented to the third session of the General Assembly a report which described in considerable detail the main types of advances made under this authorization. The report was considered by the Fifth Committee and proved non-contentious with the exception of the section dealing with the financing of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment. For this purpose \$1,336,756 (U.S.) had been expended up to the time the Interim Committee of the International Trade Organization came into being (\$557,114 (U.S.) by appropriations from the United Nations Budget, and \$779,642 (U.S.) by advances from the Working Capital Fund). The question to be resolved was the portion of these expenditures to be borne by the United Nations (which initiated the discussions leading to the establishment of the Interim Committee of the ITO) and the portion to be borne directly by the Trade Organization, (when finally established), or by the Member States participating in the trade discussions.

Before coming to a decision on the specific question raised by the advances to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, the Committee discussed and finally agreed upon the following general principles for financing new specialized agencies:

- (i) That expenses in connection with technical preparatory committees established by the Economic and Social Council for the creation of any new specialized agency in accordance with the terms of Article 59 of the Charter and held prior to the first full conference, should be borne, as a general rule, by the United Nations budget;
- (ii) That the expenses of a first general conference called to frame the constitution of an organization and to open it for signature may in appropriate circumstances be borne by the United Nations budget;
- (iii) That the expenses of preparatory or interim commissions created by the constituent conferences should be borne by the Governments ratifying the constitution of a proposed new specialized agency;
- (iv) That any loans made by the United Nations to an established specialized agency should be on a fully reimbursable basis.

The result of the voting in the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly was (i) to require the United Nations to defray the whole of the advances to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, and, (ii) to authorize the Secretary-General to make additional advances, up to a specified limit, to the Interim Committee of the International Trade Organization, on the understanding that these were to be clearly recognized as loans rather than advances.

b) Size of the Fund

During the third session of the General Assembly, the Soviet delegation proposed a reduction of the Working Capital Fund to \$15,000,000, contending that the present Fund was unnecessarily large. In advancing this proposal, the Soviet delegate agreed that if the General Assembly later approved an advance of \$5,000,000 from the fund for financing relief for Palestinian refugees (then under consideration in the Third Committee) the whole question might be reconsidered. The Soviet proposal was defeated after a number of delegations had pointed out that the financial position of the organization would be seriously jeopardized by any reduction in the Working Capital Fund at the present time. The Fund, therefore, remains at \$20,000,000. The decision to maintain the Fund at this figure, and to authorize the Secretary-General to make advances from it during 1949 for certain stated purposes, was contained in a resolution which was adopted by the General Assembly without objection.

4. Scale of Contributions to the Budget¹

In its deliberations to date the Committee on Contributions has been handicapped by a shortage of reliable statistics, and as a result the scales of assessments for the apportioning of the expenses of the United Nations which the Committee has recommended, though generally reflecting "capacity to pay", have necessarily been somewhat arbitrary in nature. This situation did not change during 1948, and the Committee on Contributions recommended a continuation of the temporary scale of contributions for another year.

The Fifth Committee of the third session of the General Assembly considered the report of the Committee on Contributions, as well as a proposal from the United States representative for an amendment to rule 149 of the Rules of Procedure, which would provide for the establishment of a ceiling of one-third on the contributions of Member Nations. The United States representative stated that in an organization of sovereign equals it was not desirable that one nation pay too high a share of the budget. The Fifth Committee also had before it a further amendment to rule 149 of the Rules and Procedure, submitted by the Canadian delegation, to the effect that the per capita contribution of any Member should not exceed the per capita contribution of the Member bearing the highest assessment. The Canadian delegate pointed out that member states would find it difficult to justify a higher per capita payment than that of the country with the highest per capita income².

After lengthy discussion both in the Committee and in a special working group set up to deal with these proposals, a resolution, was approved by the Fifth Committee. The resolution noted that "in normal times", no Member State should contribute more than one-third of the ordinary expenses of the United Nations for any one year, and that "in normal times" the per capita contribution of any Member should not exceed the per capita contribution of the Member which bears the highest assessment. It noted also that the Committee on Contributions needs more adequate statistical data for its work.

The operative part of this resolution :

- (a) re-affirmed the terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions, as well as the principle of a percentage ceiling;
- (b) called upon Member States to assist the Committee on Contributions by providing essential statistics and information;
- (c) instructed the Committee on Contributions to recommend how additional contributions resulting from the admission of new Members, and from increases in the relative capacity of Members to pay, can be used to remove existing maladjustments in the present scale of contributions; and
- (d) stated that the General Assembly will decide on a proper ceiling rate when a more permanent scale is proposed.

¹ See also *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, p. 137.

² The text of the Canadian statement is given in Appendix IV-B, pp. 258-260.

The Canadian representative speaking in the discussion of the Fifth Committee on this resolution, supported it as an acceptable compromise, and urged all Governments to furnish all information on their capacity to pay.

The recommendations of the Fifth Committee were approved by the General Assembly in plenary session, on November 18, 1948.

Under the scale adopted the contributions of the largest contributors for 1949 are;

United States of America.....	39.89
United Kingdom.....	11.37
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	6.34
China.....	6.00
France.....	6.00
India and Pakistan.....	3.95
Canada.....	3.20

5. Transfer of the Assets of the League of Nations¹

The General Assembly of the United Nations at the first part of its first session in February, 1946, approved the common plan recommended by the Assembly of the League of Nations for the sharing of the assets of the League among the thirty-two countries who were members of the League at the time of its dissolution. These assets are divided as follows:

Permanent Capital Assets.....	\$9,741,994.00 (US)
Other than Permanent Capital Assets.....	\$1,067,535.21 (US)
Total Credits.....	\$10,809,529.21 (US)

The U.S.S.R., Chile, Venezuela, Peru, Haiti, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua had also submitted claims since they were at one time members of the League of Nations.

This matter was considered by the Fifth Committee of the third session of the General Assembly which had before it a joint resolution of the United Kingdom and France, recommending that the thirty-two former member states of the League should make available shares in the credits of the League of Nations to the nine other states submitting claims, and that each of the thirty-two beneficiary countries should for this purpose surrender a pro rata share of their credits. This resolution was approved by the Fifth Committee which also decided that the credits should be repaid in the following way:

- (1) The sum relating to other than Permanent Capital Assets to be liquidated in two equal installments in 1949 and 1950.
- (2) The amount relating to permanent capital assets, in fifteen equal annual installments beginning with the United Nations annual budget for 1951.

The credits will be applied against contributions to the budget of the Organization.

¹For previous discussion of this question see *Report on the First Part of the First Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1946, No. 1, pp. 36-38.

6. Other Administrative and Budgetary Questions

(a) Payment of Travelling and Subsistence Expenses to Representatives to the General Assembly and Members of Committees and other Bodies.

The question of the payment of travelling expenses and subsistence allowances to representatives to the General Assembly and members of Commissions has arisen at each session of the General Assembly. At the second session of the General Assembly it was decided to refer the question to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for examination and report to the third session of the General Assembly. In its report for 1948 the Board of Auditors noted that the travel and subsistence allowances paid to representatives to the General Assembly and to members of Commissions were excessive. In view of the fact that clear principles had not been established for payment of these expenses, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, in its first report for 1948, recommended specific methods for dealing with them.

The Fifth Committee of the third session of the General Assembly considered these suggestions of the Advisory Committee, and adopted them with certain modifications. The Canadian representative on the Fifth Committee supported the report of the Advisory Committee on this matter.

The Fifth Committee also approved a proposal of the Philippine delegation designed to improve the administration of rules governing payment of travelling and subsistence allowances. This proposal is intended to ensure a more effective control over these expenditures for missions away from headquarters.

(b) Transfer to the United Nations of the Residual Assets of UNRRA.

The Secretary-General informed the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations that he had concluded an Agreement with the Director-General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, whereby the United Nations would take over the residual accounting functions of UNRRA and the following other functions:

- (a) Supervision of the completion of the UNRRA History Project.
- (b) Maintenance of UNRRA's archives.
- (c) Assignment of certain UNRRA claims for the account of the International Children's Emergency Fund.

This Agreement was ratified by the third session of the General Assembly in plenary session, on the unanimous recommendation of its Fifth Committee.

(c) Use of Spanish as a Working Language.

The Secretary-General, as requested by the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, presented to the third session a report on the proposal for the adoption of Spanish as one of the working languages of the General Assembly. In it, the Secretary-General stated that the use of Spanish as a working language of the General Assembly alone would

involve additional costs amounting to \$347,666 and if the other organs of the United Nations also adopted it, the additional cost for staff and facilities would be increased by a further \$888,565. The Secretary-General also stated that the efficient organization and functioning of the Secretariat would be adversely affected if this proposal were adopted. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions informed the third session of the General Assembly that it concurred in the Secretary-General's report.

The Fifth Committee of the General Assembly considered the political, legal, administrative and budgetary aspects of this problem in the light of the reports of the Secretary-General and of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. After a lengthy discussion the Fifth Committee approved the report of the Advisory Committee by 21 votes in favour, 20 against, with 5 abstentions. However, this decision was reversed by the General Assembly in plenary session, so that Spanish is now an official working language of the General Assembly. Upon adoption of Spanish as a working language, the Chinese and Soviet delegations unsuccessfully pressed for similar status for the Chinese and Russian languages.

The Canadian delegation opposed the introduction of Spanish as a working language, since the delegation considered that its adoption would hamper administrative efficiency and require a further increase in an already large budget at a time when there was obvious need for economy.

(d) Training in Public Administration.

A proposal for international training in public administration, which the Economic and Social Council had considered at its sixth session in February, 1948, was discussed at the third session of the General Assembly. The plan proposed included suggestions for an International Administrative Staff College for senior civil servants, an International School of Public Administration for younger or potential civil servants, the provision of experts to give technical assistance upon request by governments, and facilities for exchange of civil servants. This matter was considered by the Fifth Committee, which had before it a number of resolutions, and finally adopted a proposal of the Secretary-General which, although it accepted the principle of the establishment of an International Centre, confined the activities in 1949 to the selection of the Directing Staff, the conduct of detailed studies and preparation for operating the Centre in 1950. The estimated expenditure for this purpose during 1949 would be approximately \$16,700 (US). Canada did not regard the proposed International Centre as essential at the present time, and considered that in any case the Governments and the individuals concerned should, if the proposal were acted upon, assume the large part, if not the whole, of the expenses. The resolution accepted by the Fifth Committee was adopted by the General Assembly in plenary session on December 4, 1948.

(e) United Nations Postal Services.¹

By a resolution of the General Assembly adopted on November 20, 1947, the Secretary-General was requested "to make inquiries into the administrative, technical and financial implications of the organization of a

¹ See also *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series, 1947, No. 1, p. 154.

United Nations Postal Service and to make recommendations to the next regular session of the General Assembly”.

The report of the Secretary-General on this proposal was considered at the third session of the General Assembly. The Secretary-General's report concluded with the following comment:

“In view of the limited financial prospects, complicated technical and administrative operations involved, and limited usefulness to overseas offices and specialized agencies, it would appear that there would be no financial advantage in pursuing this project further at the present time.”

The Fifth Committee, however, in a resolution of October 1, 1948, made the following decisions:

- 1) to approve only in principle the establishment of a United Nations postal administration;
- 2) to request the Secretary-General to negotiate arrangements for special or over-printed United Nations stamps provided that there will be no financial loss to the United Nations as a consequence of these special stamp issues.

When this resolution was considered in plenary session of the General Assembly, the representative of the U.S.S.R. moved the deletion of the paragraph “The General Assembly approves in principle the idea of establishing a United Nations postal administration”. The Soviet proposal was defeated by a vote of 12 in favour, 30 against and 11 abstentions. The resolution was then adopted by the General Assembly without opposition.

The establishment of a United Nations Postal Service, although approved in principle by the Fifth Committee, will not, it is expected, be made effective for two or three years at least, and may indeed be indefinitely postponed.

The question will come up again at the fourth session of the General Assembly when the Secretary General reports on his endeavours to negotiate with the Universal Postal Union and also with national postal administrations.

(f) United Nations Telecommunications System.¹

The Secretary-General was authorized by the second session of the General Assembly to negotiate for the obtaining of wave lengths, call signs and other facilities necessary for the operation of a United Nations telecommunications system and to report on this subject to the third session of the General Assembly. In his report the Secretary-General did not recommend any appropriation of funds at the present time but urged the General Assembly to reaffirm the United Nations position as an operating agency in international telecommunication, and to call upon Member Nations to support the United Nations requirements for frequencies and services at all international telecommunications conferences. The present operations of United Nations radio services have been possible only because transmission time of United States and Canadian transmitters has been placed at the disposal of the United Nations.

¹ See *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, p. 155.

The General Assembly at its third session examined and approved with slight changes the report of the Secretary-General. The Assembly considered that the United Nations should have its own radio facilities, but should not at present commit itself to any specific plan either to own or to rent facilities, or to any financial undertaking. The Secretary-General is to present to the General Assembly, at its session in 1950, recommendations for the establishment of the telecommunications system.

7. Appointments to Standing Committees of the General Assembly¹

Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions

The following were appointed to serve on the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Question for a period of three years beginning January 1, 1949:

Mr. Thanassis Aghnides (Greece)

Mr. C. L. Hsia (China)

Mr. V. I. Kabushko (U.S.S.R.)

The General Assembly also approved a report of the Fifth Committee appointing to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions Mr. William O. Hall of the United States for the remainder of the term of Mr. Donald C. Stone who had resigned. Mr. Hall's term of office expires on December 31, 1949.

Committee on Contributions

The following were appointed to the Committee on Contributions to serve for a period of three years beginning January 1, 1949:

Mr. René Charron (France)

Mr. P. M. Chernyshev (U.S.S.R.)

Mr. Seymour Jacklin (Union of South Africa)

Mr. G. Martinez-Cabanas (Mexico)

Czechoslovakia proposed that at the third session of the General Assembly Dr. Jan Papanek, the former permanent representative of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations, who is a member of both these committees, should be replaced, on the grounds that he no longer retained the confidence of the countries in the geographic area which he was appointed to represent. In considering this item the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly heard statements by the representative of Czechoslovakia, by Dr. Jan Papanek, and by the Legal Department of the Secretariat. The Fifth Committee by a roll-call vote defeated the Czechoslovak motion by 25 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions. In the plenary session the representative of Poland introduced a resolution similar to the earlier Czechoslovak resolution. The Polish resolution was rejected by a vote of 6 in favour, 30 against and 13 abstentions. Canada concurred in the opinion of the majority that Dr. Papanek had been appointed to these two committees in his capacity as an expert, and should not therefore be removed from office.

¹ The full membership of these standing committees is given in Appendix VI, pp. 268-272.

Board of Auditors

The Auditor-General (or corresponding official) of Denmark was appointed to fill the vacancy in the membership of the Board of Auditors. He will serve for a three-year term commencing on July 1, 1949.

Investments Committee

The General Assembly approved the appointment by the Secretary-General, concurred in by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, of Mr. Leslie R. Rounds, First Vice-President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, as a member of the Investments Committee for a three-year term commencing January 1, 1949.

Committee on Contributions

The following were appointed to the Committee on Contributions to serve for a period of three years beginning January 1, 1949:

Mr. René Clavier (France)

Mr. P. M. Chagnyber (U.S.A.)

Mr. Seymour Jackson (Union of South Africa)

Mr. G. Mariner-Cabanis (Mexico)

Czechoslovakia proposed that at the third session of the General Assembly Dr. Jan Pánek, the former permanent representative of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations, who is a member of both these committees, should be replaced, on the grounds that he no longer retained the confidence or the respect in the geographic area which he was appointed to represent. In considering this item the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly heard statements by the representative of Czechoslovakia, by Dr. Jan Pánek, and by the local Department of the Secretary-General. The Committee by a roll-call vote decided the Czechoslovak motion by 12 votes to 0 with 12 abstentions. In the plenary session the representative of Poland introduced a resolution similar to the earlier Czechoslovak motion. The Polish resolution was referred by a vote of 6 to 10 to the Second and 13 abstentions. Canada concurred in the opinion of the majority that Dr. Pánek had been acquitted to these two committees in his capacity as an expert and should not therefore be removed from

The full membership of these standing committees is given in Appendix II.

8. Questions Relating to the Secretariat

(a) United Nations Staff Pension Scheme.

During the third session of the General Assembly the Fifth Committee considered two reports relating to the United Nations Staff Pension Scheme. The first, the annual report of the Staff Benefit Committee on the operation of the Pension Scheme and on the financial position of the Pension Fund, was approved without objection after a brief discussion. The second, a report by the Staff Benefit Committee containing proposals for a permanent pension scheme and the observations and recommendations on these proposals submitted by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions at the request of the second session of the General Assembly, required more detailed consideration.

In this report the Advisory Committee recommended acceptance of the proposals of the Staff Benefit Committee subject to certain revisions. These revisions mainly entailed integration of orphans' benefits into the scheme, a change in withdrawal benefits and in conditions for payment of widows' benefits, and certain reductions mainly in the scale of disability benefits in order to ensure that the financial cost of the scheme would remain within the limit of 21% of the salaries (of which the staff member would contribute 7% and the organization 14%). The Advisory Committee also drew attention to the necessity of safeguarding the right of the General Assembly to make changes in the scheme in future if these were necessary or desirable. Furthermore it recommended that the scheme as evolved should be suitable to cover both the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

After detailed discussion of these recommendations by the Fifth Committee of the third session of the General Assembly in which the Chairmen of the Advisory Committee and the Staff Benefit Committee participated, agreement was reached on amendments which should be made in the regulations for a permanent pension scheme. The report with these amendments was approved by the Fifth Committee and by the General Assembly in plenary session. In this discussion the Canadian delegation expressed itself in favour of the proposals of the Advisory Committee.

(b) Tax Equalization.

At its second session the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare a staff contributions plan designed to overcome some of the difficulties arising out of the current situation under which certain staff members pay taxes and others do not. The Secretary-General was also to report on the action taken by Member States to exempt their nationals employed by the United Nations from national income taxation.

In the Fifth Committee of the third session of the General Assembly the preliminary discussion of the tax plan proposed by the Secretary-General was exceedingly acrimonious. Differences arose not only in relation to the technical aspects of the scheme, but also due to the fact that certain delegations, especially Poland and other Eastern European States vigorously attacked the United States on political as well as technical grounds for failure to grant tax exemption. The Canadian delegation intervened in

this discussion to point out that the objections of the United States to a tax-free class were understandable in the light of her history and traditions, and that these objections were shared by the Canadian people. However, the Canadian delegation contended that the plan represented a practicable and equitable method of achieving the desired results. After this discussion the Fifth Committee adopted four resolutions under which the General Assembly

- (a) Resolves to adopt a staff assessment plan and establishes the basis for its operation.
- (b) Authorizes revisions in the salary rates essential to give effect to this decision.
- (c) Calls upon Member States to grant tax immunity or alternatively to grant relief from double taxation to their nationals employed by the United Nations.
- (d) Authorizes the Secretary-General to continue during 1949 to reimburse staff members for taxes paid to their national governments.

These resolutions were adopted by the General Assembly at its plenary session on November 18. In voting on the resolutions, the Canadian delegation supported resolutions (a), (b) and (d), but abstained on resolution (c), as Canada has not yet granted full tax immunity to Canadian nationals employed by the United Nations.

(c) Composition of the Secretariat and the Principle of Geographical Distribution.

One of the problems which caused much discussion at the second session of the Assembly was the unbalanced geographical distribution of the Secretariat.¹

As a result of these discussions the Secretary-General, in accordance with a resolution approved by the second session of the General Assembly, submitted a report to the third session of the Assembly examining the recruitment policy, the qualifications and experience of the members of the staff and the methods by which the geographical distribution of the staff could be improved.

This report was discussed by the Fifth Committee of the third session of the General Assembly which commended the Secretary-General on the progress he had made during 1948 in improving the geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat. The Committee noted that the figures presented by the Secretary-General revealed more progress in the numerical distribution of the various nationalities than in the nationality distribution in the higher posts. The Fifth Committee adopted a resolution asking the Secretary-General, "with due regard to the other principles embodied in Article 101, paragraph 3 of the Charter",² to continue his efforts toward the objective of staffing on as wide a geographical basis as possible all posts and grades internationally recruited.

¹ See *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, p. 146.

² Paragraph 3 of Article 101 reads as follows:

"The paramount consideration in the employment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. Due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible."

(d) Salaries and Allowances

One of the most important of the decisions of the Fifth Committee relating to the Secretariat concerned the whole system of remuneration of the United Nations staff. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions suggested that a comprehensive review of the salary and allowance system should be undertaken by the Secretary-General for consideration at the fourth regular session of the General Assembly. It recommended that a working party of three independent experts appointed by the Secretary-General in agreement with the Advisory Committee assist in this review. The Fifth Committee unanimously agreed that this review should be undertaken.

(e) Expatriation Allowances.

The Fifth Committee of the third session of the General Assembly also considered a recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions that "after two years residence, persons who intend to remain with the United Nations as a career should be expected to adapt themselves to the general conditions of service and be assimilated to the regular United Nations salary scales without expatriation allowance". This recommendation of the Advisory Committee was opposed by the Secretary-General who contended that the elimination of expatriation allowances would make it more difficult to recruit staff of high calibre from abroad. This might lead to a reduction in the overall ability and efficiency of the staff. After a lengthy discussion, the Fifth Committee agreed to permit the payment for one more year of expatriation allowances; the whole question to be reviewed again in the light of the recommendations of the expert committee in its review of the salary and allowance system.

(f) Cost-of-living Bonus and Administrative Tribunal.

The Fifth Committee also approved recommendations for cost-of-living adjustments and received an assurance from the Secretary-General that he would take steps to establish suitable machinery to deal with staff problems and report to the fourth session of the General Assembly on the action taken in this respect.

9. Budgetary and Financial Co-ordination of the Specialized Agencies

The United Nations Charter assigns important responsibilities to the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council for co-ordinating the policies and activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. To discharge these responsibilities, many important measures have already been taken and new techniques for co-operation are being established.¹

These measures have included both formal agreements defining spheres of responsibility in order to facilitate co-operation between the United Nations and the agencies, and informal arrangements for consultation and co-operation in the solution of common problems. Various forms of liaison and reciprocal representation have been developed, and a standing committee of the chief administrative officers of the United Nations and of each of the specialized agencies (called the "Administrative Committee on Co-ordination") meets regularly to discuss problems of common concern.

The problem of administrative and budgetary co-ordination has demanded considerable attention at each session of the General Assembly. At the second session in 1947 detailed consideration was given to the possibility of co-ordinating the budgetary and administrative arrangements of the United Nations and the several agencies. In addition to a request to member states to ensure co-ordinated policies in their own administrative arrangements the Assembly approved two resolutions: the first referred to the specialized agencies a report and recommendation on the budgets and budgetary practices of the agencies prepared by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions; the second dealt primarily with the problem of co-ordinating activities and programmes but also raised important budgetary questions.

Among the more important recommendations in this second resolution was a request to the Secretary-General that, in consultation with the specialized agencies and the Advisory Committee, he should

- (a) prepare a report (i) recommending measures to achieve greater uniformity in the budgets of the specialized agencies, in order to provide a sound basis for comparison, and (ii) commenting on the advisability of improved budgetary co-ordination, including the possibility of eventually establishing a consolidated or common budget for the United Nations and the specialized agencies;
- (b) promote the development of similar budgetary, administrative and financial practices in the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

Reports were submitted to the third session of the General Assembly on these matters by the Economic and Social Council, by the Secretary-General, and by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, indicating that substantial progress had been achieved in carrying out these recommendations. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions also submitted for consideration its Fifth Report (for 1948) relating to the 1949 budgets of the specialized agencies.

¹ See also *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, pp. 143-144.

Since the subjects dealt with by these reports were closely related, it was decided that they should be examined concurrently at a joint meeting of the Second, Third and Fifth Committees of the Assembly.

The progress made in the development of priorities within the various organizations, in the elimination of overlapping, and in administrative and budgetary co-ordination was generally commended, though it was recognized that the Economic and Social Council still had an important part to play in furthering co-ordination of policy and programme planning.

The Joint Committee, after some debate, adopted unanimously a resolution submitted by the New Zealand delegation, as amended by the Canadian, U.S.S.R. and Norwegian delegations, which, *inter alia*:

- (1) requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, to continue efforts to improve administrative and budgetary co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies, giving particular attention to the possibility of developing a joint system for external audit and for a common collection of contributions;
- (2) drew the attention of member states and the specialized agencies to the recommendations of the fifth report made in 1948 by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;
- (3) called upon the Economic and Social Council to continue its examination of the organs having responsibility in the field of co-ordination with a view to suggesting further improvements and bringing to a minimum consistent with efficiency the number of such organs;
- (4) drew attention to the fact that the delegations of each Member State to the various United Nations sessions and meetings should follow consistent policies if co-ordination is to be achieved.

The final text of the New Zealand resolution was most acceptable to the Canadian delegation, since Canadian policy has consistently emphasized the need for continuous improvement of existing machinery and methods for co-ordination, and the avoidance of costly new machinery; and has also opposed the introduction of measures or techniques for co-ordination which might lead to interference with the functional autonomy of the specialized agencies.

The recommendations of the Joint Committee were adopted by the General Assembly in plenary session on November 18.

10. Permanent Headquarters of the United Nations¹

In a resolution on December 14, 1946, the General Assembly accepted an offer made by Mr. John D. Rockefeller in December, 1946, "to give to the United Nations the sum of \$8,500,000 (U.S.), on certain terms and conditions, to make possible the acquisition by the United Nations of a tract of land in New York City in the area bounded by First Avenue, East 48th Street, the East River and East 42nd Street." Under the terms of acquisition of this site, the United Nations also obtained exclusive rights on the waterfront in order to permit building out to the United States Pierhead Line if this is desired. Excavation work on the site has begun. Plans call for buildings for a conference area, office space for the Secretariat, a library, exhibition halls, facilities for recreation of the staff and delegates, restaurants and parking facilities. The present plans also provide for buildings which will accommodate members of permanent national delegations and personnel of the specialized agencies which have their international headquarters in New York. Construction of buildings for these two groups has not the same urgency as space for the Secretariat and General Assembly delegations, and consequently has been given a lower priority in the Secretary-General's plans.

At the second session of the General Assembly a resolution was adopted authorizing the Secretary-General to negotiate and conclude an agreement with the Government of the United States for an interest free loan not to exceed \$65,000,000, for a term of not less than 30 years, repayable in annual instalments from the ordinary budget of the United Nations, the first payment to be made from the budget of 1951. This resolution also authorized the Secretary-General to proceed with the construction and furnishing of the headquarters as soon as the loan agreement was completed. In order that the Secretary-General might continue detailed architectural and engineering planning work, pending the coming into force of the loan agreement, the Secretary-General was further authorized to utilize during 1948 a sum not exceeding \$1,000,000 from the Working Capital Fund. The Canadian delegation to the second session of the General Assembly supported these financial arrangements for the construction of the headquarters of the United Nations.

In planning the construction of the permanent headquarters the Secretary-General has been assisted by a Headquarters Advisory Committee. This Committee is composed of sixteen member states, including Canada. On February 25, 1948, the Headquarters Advisory Committee approved a loan agreement which had been negotiated by the Secretary-General and representatives of the Government of the United States. This agreement was signed on March 23, 1948, by the Secretary-General and by the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations. The loan agreement was approved by the United States Senate during the session of the 80th Congress, but did not receive approval by the House of Representatives prior to adjournment. However, on August 5, 1948, the House of Representatives, during a Special Session of Congress, approved it.

¹ For previous discussions see *The United Nations, 1946*, Department of External Affairs Conference Series, 1946, No. 3 pp. 155-156 and *Canada at the United Nations 1947*, Department of External Affairs Conference Series, 1947, No. 1, p. 142.

The report of the Secretary-General on the permanent headquarters of the United Nations was examined by the Fifth Committee of the third session of the General Assembly. It was considered that the plans for financing, planning and construction were proceeding satisfactorily. The discussion in the Fifth Committee turned particularly to the clarification of the relationship between and individual responsibility of the Secretary-General, the Headquarters Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. There was general agreement that the Secretary-General alone was responsible to the Assembly in connection with arrangements for the headquarters; that the Headquarters Advisory Committee's function was to advise the Secretary-General; and that the authority and responsibility to the General Assembly of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, in accordance with its terms of reference, were in no way affected or diminished in regard to questions pertaining to the headquarters.

At a plenary meeting on November 18 the General Assembly adopted the resolution submitted by the Fifth Committee on the United Nations headquarters. This resolution approved the report of the Secretary-General and expressed appreciation of the co-operation extended by the Government of the United States, the State of New York and the City of New York. The resolution also provided that the Headquarters Advisory Committee should be continued with the existing membership, and requested the Secretary-General to submit a further report on the headquarters to the fourth regular session of the General Assembly.

VII. Legal Questions

VII. LEGAL QUESTIONS

I. Chilean Complaint against the U.S.S.R.

In October, 1947, the Government of Chile broke all diplomatic and consular relations with the U.S.S.R. on the ground that the Soviet Government had intervened in Chilean internal affairs by supporting strikes and disorders. Subsequently arrangements were made for the return of the majority diplomatic mission to their respective countries. However, the Chilean Government refused to accept the Soviet presence in the U.S.S.R. or to act as the daughter-in-law of the Chilean ambassador, Mrs. Leticia Larraín de Irujo, a U.S.S.R. citizen.

The Chilean Government refused to take any further action by delaying the departure of the second group of Soviet Union representatives. The Soviet Government continued by refusing to allow the departure of the Chilean Ambassador in Moscow.

The matter arose first in the Chilean Government's decision to bring it to the attention of the United Nations. On May 27, 1948, the Chilean Government asked the Secretary-General of the United Nations to place this matter on the provisional agenda of the third regular session of the General Assembly.

Since that time, the Chilean and Soviet Governments continued agreement to the resolution was signed August 29, 1948, and the Secretary-General's report was submitted to the General Assembly on September 15, 1948.

VII. Legal Questions.

The Government of Chile has requested the General Assembly to declare the U.S.S.R. to be in violation of Article 2 of the Charter, in accordance with Article 11 of the Charter.

The U.S.S.R. objects to the inclusion in the agenda of the United Nations of the United States of America. The Secretary-General of the United Nations has advised that the United States Government has agreed to the inclusion of this matter on the agenda of the United Nations.

At the first session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General suggested that the Chilean matter be assigned to the Sixth Committee. An informal arrangement was made to have it transferred to the Third Committee of the General Assembly. The subject was handled under rather than legal or political considerations. The subject was handled under rather than legal or political considerations. The subject was handled under rather than legal or political considerations. The subject was handled under rather than legal or political considerations.

The Secretary-General stated that the United Nations has not completed its deal with the matter as it was originally intended for the purpose of settling the U.S.S.R. The Secretary-General stated that the United Nations has not completed its deal with the matter as it was originally intended for the purpose of settling the U.S.S.R. The Secretary-General stated that the United Nations has not completed its deal with the matter as it was originally intended for the purpose of settling the U.S.S.R.

¹ The text of the Secretary-General's report is given in paragraph 10 of the report.

VII. Legal Questions.

VII. LEGAL QUESTIONS

1. Chilean Complaint against the U.S.S.R.

In October, 1947, the Government of Chile broke off diplomatic and consular relations with the U.S.S.R. on the ground that the Soviet Government had intervened in Chilean internal affairs by encouraging and supporting strikes and disorders. Accordingly, arrangements were made for the return of the respective diplomatic missions to their countries. However the Soviet Government refused to grant the Chilean mission in the U.S.S.R. an exit visa for the daughter-in-law of the Chilean Ambassador, Mrs. Lidia Lesina de Cruz, a U.S.S.R. citizen.

The Chilean Government decided to take retaliatory action by delaying the departure of the second group of Soviet Union representatives. The Soviet Government countered by refusing to allow the departure of the Chilean Ambassador in Moscow.

The matter rested there until the Chilean Government decided to bring it to the attention of the United Nations. On May 27, 1948, the Chilean Government asked the Secretary-General of the United Nations to place this matter on the provisional agenda of the third regular session of the General Assembly.

Since that time, the Chilean and Soviet Governments reached agreement on the simultaneous return (August 29, 1948), of their respective diplomatic missions. The son of the Chilean Ambassador has remained in Moscow under temporary visa.

The Government of Chile requested the inclusion of its complaint against the U.S.S.R. on the provisional agenda of the General Assembly in accordance with Article 14 of the Charter.

The U.S.S.R. objected to the inclusion in the agenda of the Chilean item, on the ground that its consideration would be illegal. The Government of the U.S.S.R. further denied that the action of which the Chilean Government complained was an infringement of basic human rights or the principles of the United Nations.

At the third session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General suggested that the Chilean resolution be assigned to the Sixth Committee. An unsuccessful attempt was made to have it considered by the Third Committee on the ground that the subject was humanitarian rather than legal in character. Subsequently amendments by Uruguay and France were made to the Chilean resolution with the result that the case against the Soviet Union was defined as a violation of fundamental rights and human freedoms, and as being also "contrary to courtesy, to diplomatic practices and to the principle of reciprocity" and "calculated to endanger friendly relations between nations".

The Soviet delegate argued that the United Nations was not competent to deal with the matter as it was solely within the sovereign jurisdiction of the U.S.S.R. The Canadian delegate announced his intention to support the resolution and referred to the experience which Canada had had in obtaining exit visas for Soviet citizens married to Canadians.¹

¹ The text of the Canadian statement is given in Appendix V-A, pp. 261-263.

The resolution as amended was adopted by the Sixth Committee. Twenty-six delegates voted in favour, 6 against and 6 abstained. Nineteen members of the Committee were absent when the vote was taken. The resolution will come before the second part of the third session of the General Assembly in New York, in April, 1949.

In October, 1947, the Government of Chile from an... relations with the U.S.S.R. on the ground that the Soviet Govern- ment had interfered in Chilean internal affairs by encouraging and supporting strikes and disorders. Arrangements were made for the return of the respective diplomatic missions to their countries. However, the Soviet Government refused to grant the Chilean mission in the U.S.S.R. an exit visa for the daughter-in-law of the Chilean Ambassador, Mrs. Lidia Leizaola de Cruz, a U.S.S.R. citizen.

The Chilean Government decided to take retaliatory action by delaying the departure of the second group of Soviet Union representatives. The Soviet Government countered by refusing to allow the departure of the Chilean Ambassador in Moscow.

The matter rested there until the Chilean Government decided to bring it to the attention of the United Nations. On May 27, 1948, the Chilean Government asked the Secretary-General of the United Nations to place this matter on the provisional agenda of the third regular session of the General Assembly.

Since that time the Chilean and Soviet Governments reached agree- ment on the simultaneous return (August 29, 1948) of their respective diplomatic missions. The son of the Chilean Ambassador has remained in Moscow under temporary visa.

The Government of Chile requested the inclusion of its complaint against the U.S.S.R. on the provisional agenda of the General Assembly in accordance with Article 14 of the Charter.

The U.S.S.R. objected to the inclusion in the agenda of the Chilean item on the ground that its consideration would be illegal. The Govern- ment of the U.S.S.R. further denied that the action of which the Chilean Government complained was an infringement of basic human rights or the principles of the United Nations.

At the third session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General suggested that the Chilean resolution be assigned to the Sixth Committee. An unsuccessful attempt was made to have it considered by the Third Committee on the ground that the subject was humanitarian rather than legal in character. Subsequently, amendments by Hungary and France were made to the Chilean resolution with the result that the case against the Soviet Union was defined as a violation of fundamental rights and human freedom, and as being also "contrary to courtesy, to diplomatic practices and to the principle of reciprocity," and "calculated to subvert friendly relations between nations."

The Soviet delegate argued that the United Nations was not competent to deal with the matter as it was solely within the soviet jurisdiction of the U.S.S.R. The Canadian delegate understood the intention to support the resolution and referred to the experience which Canada had had in dealing with Soviet citizens arrested in Canada.

The text of the Chilean resolution is given in Appendix V, A, pp. 261-262.

2. Genocide¹

On December 9, 1948, at its third session, the General Assembly approved a Convention on the Crime of Genocide, defined as the "denial of the right of existence of entire human groups". This Convention is accordingly now open for signature and ratification.

This development has had a relatively long history in the United Nations. The subject was first introduced in the form of a draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Cuba, India and Panama at the second part of the first session of the General Assembly, in September, 1946. A resolution was at that session adopted by the General Assembly affirming that "genocide is an international crime condemned by the civilized world, for which principals and accomplices . . . are punishable". The resolution also requested the Economic and Social Council to undertake studies to prepare a draft convention for consideration at the next regular session of the Assembly. A draft was accordingly produced by the Council for consideration by the Assembly at its second session.

At this stage, the Assembly merely noted that many Governments had not submitted observations on the draft convention and asked the Economic and Social Council to continue its work taking into account that the International Law Commission had, at the same session, been charged with the formulation of the principles of the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal as well as the preparation of a draft code of offences against peace and security. The General Assembly also informed the Economic and Social Council that it need not await observations from all members but that it should submit a report and draft convention to the third session of the General Assembly.

Pursuant to this resolution, a draft Convention on Genocide prepared by the Secretariat was passed to the General Assembly by the seventh session of the Economic and Social Council. During the general debate at the Economic and Social Council the Canadian delegation expressed general approval of the draft Convention, but reserved Canada's right to move the deletion of Article III (on cultural genocide) at the third session of the General Assembly. Canadian opposition to the inclusion of "cultural" genocide in the convention was prompted by the consideration that it was neither within the Council's terms of reference nor properly included in a convention designed for the protection of human life.

The Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly, to which the matter was referred at the third session, examined the draft convention article by article during forty-four meetings held from October 5 to November 9. Of particular interest to Canada was the deletion by the Committee of Article III.

On December 9, 1948, the General Assembly, as has been said, adopted the resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee to which was annexed the Convention on Genocide.²

¹ See also *The United Nations, 1946*, Dept. of External Affairs, Conference Series 1946, No. 3, p. 141, and *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Dept. of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, p. 164.

² For the text of this resolution and of the convention see Appendix V-B, pp. 263-267.

An interesting feature of the Convention is the provision in Article VI, which states that persons charged with genocide shall be tried either by an international tribunal "or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those Contracting Parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction". Moreover, the newly organized International Law Commission has been asked by the General Assembly to consider the possibility of establishing a Criminal Chamber of the International Court of Justice.

The International Law Commission was established in 1946 by the General Assembly of the United Nations. It is a body of experts in international law, which is to assist the International Court of Justice in the discharge of its functions. The Commission is composed of fifteen members, five of whom are elected by the General Assembly and ten by the International Court of Justice. The Commission's work is to identify and codify the principles and norms of international law, and to advise the United Nations on legal questions. It has issued several reports on the subject of genocide, and has been instrumental in the development of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. The Commission's work is carried out in a systematic and methodical manner, and its reports are published in the Yearbook of International Law. The Commission's work is of great importance, as it helps to ensure that international law is applied consistently and fairly. It also helps to identify areas where the law needs to be developed or clarified. The Commission's work is a vital part of the international legal system, and it is essential for the maintenance of peace and stability in the world.

3. Privileges and Immunities¹

(a) General Convention, Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations

The Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations was drawn up in 1946 in accordance with Article 105 of the Charter of the United Nations. The General Assembly recommended that all Member Governments accede to the Convention. As of November 30, 1948, twenty-five countries, including Canada, had acceded.

The Privileges and Immunities (United Nations) Act (II George VI) of the Canadian Parliament passed in 1947, was the means by which Canada fulfilled its obligations which would arise when the Canadian Government acceded to the Convention. The Instrument of Accession of the Government of Canada was deposited on January 22, 1948, under Order in Council PC 3946 of October 1. However, the Act included a reservation "that exemption from taxation imposed by any law in Canada on salaries and emoluments shall not extend to a Canadian citizen residing or ordinarily resident in Canada." This reservation was, of course, included in the Canadian Instrument of Accession.

(b) Approval of Supplementary Agreements with Specialized Agencies concerning the use of the United Nations laissez-passer

On February 25, 1948, the Economic and Social Council approved a resolution requesting the Secretary-General:

"(a) To conclude with any specialized agency which may so desire a supplementary agreement to extend to the officials of that agency the provisions of article VII of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, and to submit such supplementary agreement to the General Assembly for approval; and

"(b) Pending the entry into force of such agreement, to make arrangements for the use of the United Nations laissez-passer by officials of the specialized agency concerned, such laissez-passer to be issued on a provisional basis for use only in those countries which have previously undertaken to recognize the validity of laissez-passer so issued."

The third session of the General Assembly approved in plenary session supplementary agreements concerning the use of the United Nations laissez-passer concluded by the Secretary-General with the International Civil Aviation Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization.

At present, Australia, Guatemala, Luxembourg, Iceland, India, Dominican Republic, Canada (insofar as the officials of the ICAO are concerned) and Lebanon (insofar as the third conference of UNESCO was concerned) have undertaken to recognize the validity of the laissez-passer issued under such conditions.

¹ For a full summary of the discussions in 1947 on Privileges and Immunities see *Canada at the United Nations 1947*, Department of External Affairs Conference Series 1947, No. 1, pp. 162-163.

In accordance with a clause which has been included in the agreements between the United Nations and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund and the International Telecommunications Union, special arrangements are to be made for the use of the United Nations laissez-passer by the officials of these agencies.

The following is a summary of the arrangements made for the use of the United Nations laissez-passer by the officials of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund and the International Telecommunications Union. The arrangements were made at the meeting of the Special Committee on the Laissez-Passer, held in Geneva on 11 October 1948. The Committee was set up by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolution of 11 October 1948. The Committee's report is contained in the Annex to the report of the Secretary-General, dated 15 November 1948.

1. Approval of Supplementary Agreement with Specialized Agencies concerning the use of the United Nations laissez-passer

On February 22, 1948, the Economic and Social Council adopted a resolution regarding the laissez-passer.

(a) To conclude with any specialized agency which may so desire a supplementary agreement to extend to the officials of that agency the provisions of article VII of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, and to submit such supplementary agreement to the General Assembly for approval; and

(b) Finding the entry into force of such agreement to make arrangements for the use of the United Nations laissez-passer by officials of the specialized agency concerned, and to make every effort to issue a laissez-passer to the officials of such agencies who are necessary to enable them to exercise the functions of their offices.

The third session of the General Assembly approved in plenary session a resolution concerning the use of the United Nations laissez-passer, which was contained in the Supplementary Agreement with the International Labour Office and the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry.

The Secretary-General, Canada, Australia, Luxembourg, India, France, the Netherlands, Canada, and the United Kingdom were members of the Special Committee on the Laissez-Passer. The Committee was established by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolution of 11 October 1948.

The following is a summary of the arrangements made for the use of the United Nations laissez-passer by the officials of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund and the International Telecommunications Union.

4. Registration and Publication of Treaties and International Agreements¹

Under Article 102 of the Charter, member states are required to register with the Secretariat "every treaty and international agreement" to which they become party, and the Secretary-General of the United Nations is required to publish such treaties or agreements. The Secretary-General presents each year to the General Assembly a report on registration of treaties by member states.

It is a matter of some difficulty to define precisely the term "international agreement". This difficulty has existed since registration of agreements began under the League of Nations in 1920; no general agreement has yet been reached on the precise meaning of the term.

The problem of defining international agreements received only incidental mention in the Secretary-General's report of August 17, 1948, on registration of treaties. The report of the Secretary-General was considered by the Sixth Committee of the third session of the General Assembly. A supplementary statement was made by the Secretariat to the effect that in spite of problems of translation, staff, and budgetary appropriations, between December 4, 1946, and October 1, 1948, 420 registrations or recordings of treaties had been made.

The Sixth Committee adopted a draft resolution proposed by the Belgian delegation to ensure that registered treaties are published as soon as possible and that the highest standard of translation is maintained. The Sixth Committee also adopted a United States resolution which referred to the failure of members of the United Nations to register treaties and called upon each member to fulfil this obligation.

On November 3, 1948, the plenary session of the General Assembly adopted, without objection, these two resolutions recommended by the Sixth Committee.

¹ See also *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Department of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947, No. 1, p. 168.

5. The International Court of Justice

During the latter part of 1947 two cases, one for judgment and one for advisory opinion, were referred to the International Court of Justice. These are the only cases which have been referred to the Court since its inception, and hearings on both were held in 1948.

The first of these, the Corfu Channel case, arose from a dispute between the United Kingdom and the Albanian Government over damage sustained by two British warships in the Corfu Channel in May, 1946. As yet only a preliminary objection by Albania, that the Court did not have jurisdiction, has been dealt with. All fifteen regular judges (the judge nominated by Albania to hear the case dissenting)¹ rejected the objection and decided that proceedings should continue.

The second case arose from a request by the General Assembly that the Court give an advisory opinion on Article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with the admission of states to membership. The Court held (with six judges dissenting) that no member may qualify its affirmative vote for the admission of a certain state by a condition that another state be also admitted, or otherwise attach conditions not laid down in Article 4.

During 1948, the following seven states accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court: Honduras, Pakistan, Belgium, Switzerland, Hyderabad, Brazil and Bolivia, the last two without reservations.

Switzerland accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court on July 28, 1948, and became the first state not a member of the United Nations to become a party to the Statute of the Court. The Security Council recommended on September 28 that, in accordance with Article 4(3) of the Statute of the Court, the General Assembly should allow Switzerland to nominate and elect members of the Court. The Assembly approved this recommendation on October 8 and thus Switzerland participated in the election of judges on October 22.²

¹ Article 31(2) of the Statute of the International Court of Justice provides "If the Court includes upon the Bench a judge of the nationality of one of the parties, any other party may choose a person to sit as judge. Such person shall be chosen preferably from among those persons who have been nominated as candidates as provided in Articles 4 and 5."

² See above Section I, Chapter 5, p. 32.

Appendix I

1. Statement by the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the
Operating Results of the Company, September 30, 1922

The Board of Directors of the Company has the honor to acknowledge the interest and cooperation of the stockholders in the annual meeting held on September 27, 1922. The Board is pleased to report that the operations of the Company during the year have been successful and that the financial position is strong. The Board has also taken into consideration the suggestions and criticisms of the stockholders and has endeavored to make such changes as may be necessary to improve the management of the Company. The Board is confident that the future of the Company is bright and that the stockholders will be satisfied with the results of the year.

The Board of Directors of the Company has the honor to acknowledge the interest and cooperation of the stockholders in the annual meeting held on September 27, 1922. The Board is pleased to report that the operations of the Company during the year have been successful and that the financial position is strong. The Board has also taken into consideration the suggestions and criticisms of the stockholders and has endeavored to make such changes as may be necessary to improve the management of the Company. The Board is confident that the future of the Company is bright and that the stockholders will be satisfied with the results of the year.

VIII. Appendices.

The following are the appendices to the report of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1922:

- Appendix A: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1922.
- Appendix B: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1921.
- Appendix C: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1920.
- Appendix D: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1919.
- Appendix E: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1918.
- Appendix F: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1917.
- Appendix G: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1916.
- Appendix H: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1915.
- Appendix I: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1914.
- Appendix J: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1913.
- Appendix K: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1912.
- Appendix L: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1911.
- Appendix M: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1910.
- Appendix N: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1909.
- Appendix O: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1908.
- Appendix P: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1907.
- Appendix Q: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1906.
- Appendix R: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1905.
- Appendix S: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1904.
- Appendix T: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1903.
- Appendix U: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1902.
- Appendix V: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1901.
- Appendix W: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1900.
- Appendix X: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1899.
- Appendix Y: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1898.
- Appendix Z: Statement of the Board of Directors for the year ending September 30, 1897.

5. The International Court of Justice

During the latter part of 1945, cases came for judgment and were by advice of special committees to the International Court of Justice. There were the only cases which have been referred to the Court since its inception, and hearings on each were held in 1948.

The first of these, the *Case Concerning the Arrest Warrant* between the United Kingdom and the Albanian Government over a demand contained by two British warships in the Corfu Channel in May, 1946. After only a preliminary objection by Albania that the Court did not have jurisdiction, but has been dealt with, and Albania's appeal judges have been appointed in Albania to hear the case, the Court rejected the objection and decided that proceedings should continue.

The second case arose from a request by the General Assembly that the Court give an advisory opinion on Article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with the admission of states to membership. The Court held with its judges divided that no member may refuse to admit a state to the organization if a request is made by a resolution of the General Assembly. The Court also stated that the admission of states to membership is not subject to Article 4.

During 1947, the following seven states accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court: Honduras, Pakistan, Belgium, Switzerland, Luxembourg, Spain and France. The latter two have not yet made any use of it.

VIII - Appendix III
The Court on July 28, 1948, was notified that the United States of America had become a party to the Statute of the Court. The Security Council recommended on September 18 that a resolution with Article 43 of the Charter of the Court, the General Assembly should have authorized the United States to become a member of the Court. The Assembly approved this recommendation on October 3 and that Switzerland participated in the election of judges on October 22.

Article 43 of the Charter of the International Court of Justice provides that the Court shall have the power to elect the members of the Court. The Court has the power to elect the members of the Court. The Court has the power to elect the members of the Court. The Court has the power to elect the members of the Court.

¹ See also Article 43 of the Charter.

Appendix I

A. Statement by the Chairman of the Canadian Delegation in the Opening Debate in the General Assembly, September 28, 1948.

It affords me particular pleasure to say to the Government and people of France how deeply the Canadian delegation appreciates the choice of Paris as the place of meeting of the Third Assembly of the United Nations. This city, over many centuries, has been a radiant centre of political and cultural achievements. No country represented here is so remote from Paris, nor so distinct in tradition from France, that it has not been greatly influenced by movements of enlightenment and progress which have had their origin in this city and in this country. Of no country and of no people is this truer than of my own. One third of the people of Canada have ancestors who came from the shores of France. They still speak its language and share the traditions of French civilization.

As I listened to the eloquent and moving speech of the President of the French Republic at the opening of this Assembly, and as I recalled the great services which M. Vincent Auriol has rendered, and is rendering, to his country, I could not but reflect upon the continuing significance of the role of France among the nations. After all she has suffered and endured in two wars, France has again taken her place in the front rank of the world community. Canadians never doubted that France would rise again to the full stature of her glorious past.

What France records of man's ability to develop political freedom within the framework of organized society should remind us that, in the work of the Assembly, we are carrying forward a great tradition. It should strengthen our conviction that, through the instrument of the United Nations, we also, in our day, have an opportunity to develop political ideas, and forms of political organization of service not to one nation only or to a few nations, but to mankind.

This Assembly of the United Nations affords an opportunity for judging to what extent the United Nations has thus far found it possible to further the great purposes to which it is dedicated. We have now an opportunity to measure the work done, and to survey work that remains to be done. This Assembly should be made the occasion for a real audit of achievement. It should equally be made the occasion for a searching analysis of failure, where such has occurred.

If we are true to ourselves, we will admit that there is not one among us who has not been discouraged by the difficulties which have beset the path of our new organization, and who today is not disturbed by doubts and uncertainties. Too many of us have assumed that the high aims and purposes of an organization which seeks the betterment of mankind throughout the world could not fail to have a universal appeal. We have not been sufficiently conscious of the realities of the world situation.

I for one believe the United Nations has attempted to accomplish far too much, in far too short a time. We have overlooked the fact that any world institution, especially one which aims at effective co-operation among all nations, is certain to be of slow growth. It is true that nature never

rests. It is equally true that nature never hastens. One reason why the international institutions the United Nations have created since the close of war are not working in the way we hoped they might, is that the sense of a world community of interest on which these institutions must rest, and which, in themselves, they tend to create, has not yet been developed. It may take a long time to develop.

The United Nations, I feel, must seek to close the gap, already far too wide, between the purposes which are within its reach, and those which exceed its grasp. We must not dissipate the moral and other resources of a world which desperately needs peace on too many secondary objectives, however desirable they may be in themselves.

We do well to recognize that the advance of science demands, in an increasingly urgent and imperative way, the existence of a community sense which is world wide. In seeking to create this sense of a world community, the United Nations is certain to be confronted by many difficulties. In thinking of these difficulties, I have sometimes wondered whether the experience in co-operation and association of the countries of the Commonwealth of Nations, to which Canada is proud to belong, has not some lessons, both positive and negative, which might be of help in meeting like difficulties in the development of a world community sense.

It is true the countries of the Commonwealth have never had a charter, have never appointed a Secretary-General, and have never taken a decision by a simple or two-thirds majority. They have nevertheless, over many years, worked together with an increasing appreciation of interests they have in common. It is true they have by no means solved all their difficulties; some of these difficult situations have found their way on to the agenda of the United Nations. Nevertheless, by and large, it is true that the countries of the Commonwealth do try to understand each other's problems, institutions and points of view. Between themselves they have sought agreements by accommodation and mutual forbearance. Without positive formulation, they have contrived to share in large measure a common point of view. This community sense they have developed despite the differences in language, race, tradition, and religion which characterize the member states. In this more limited experiment in international political association there are some things which may be of value in shaping the development of the United Nations.

By our presence here in Paris, we are reminded not only of what may be accomplished through the combined efforts of nations, but also of the peril which again threatens civilization.

The conflicts of the last eighty years have flowed back and forth across this land of France and have exacted an appalling penalty of its people. Since the latest and greatest of these conflicts, the nations have set themselves the double task of reconstructing the shattered political and economic life of Europe, and of preventing a recurrence of such conflicts. These are aims towards the realization of which every nation might have been expected to co-operate wholeheartedly. It must frankly be admitted, however, that we have cause for misgiving about the progress of both these undertakings.

The reconstruction of Europe, stimulated by aid from countries which suffered less directly from the war, and carried forward by the co-operative effort of the peoples of Western Europe, has, fortunately, made some

progress. On the other hand, rather than participate in this work of reconstruction, from which they themselves would benefit, certain nations have chosen not merely to stand aside, but, wilfully or otherwise, to misrepresent and obstruct the efforts of others. This obstruction in the task of reconstruction is unfortunately but one example of what would appear to be a policy of deliberate hindrance of the political and economic reorganization of the postwar world. In so far as this may be so, we cannot be otherwise than profoundly concerned for the well-being of the entire work of reconstruction and peacemaking which has been undertaken since the war.

It will come as a painful surprise, if not as a shock, to my fellow countrymen in Canada to learn that anyone addressing this Assembly could have left the impression that members of the United Nations had ignored the interests of the peoples of those countries which suffered most from the war, and from the severe hardships which were imposed by the Hitlerites. Such, certainly, was the impression left on my mind in listening to the address of the delegate of the U.S.S.R. on Saturday morning last. I find the impression left on others was similar to my own.

The specific references, it is true, were to the Economic and Social Council's Economic Commission for Europe, but the impression conveyed was that the United Nations had been indifferent to the important interests of the people of those countries which had suffered most. This certainly is not true of the United Nations as expressed in the contributions of its member nations.

I am sure the Assembly would be glad to hear from the representatives of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia what quantity of farm implements, how many motor trucks, how many locomotives, to say nothing of food supplies and medical aid, their countries have received, since the end of the war, by gift and credit, from countries, members of the United Nations, that have sought to help in the common task of reconstruction.

I speak with some knowledge and feeling on this question because the people of Canada have taken their full share of the load of providing relief and assistance for the war-shattered countries of Europe — through mutual aid, through military relief, through UNRRA, as well as through direct governmental credits of over 500 million dollars for the continent of Europe. I can speak for the Government of which during these years I have been the head, and which recommended to Parliament the necessary appropriations. I can speak for the Parliament of Canada which made the appropriations possible, and for the people of Canada who supported these policies for the rehabilitation of the economy of war-devastated countries, and supplemented them by sending millions of dollars more, through private and voluntary channels, for the relief of the needy and destitute. Their single purpose was to assist the peoples who had suffered most from the war to rebuild their homes, restore their agriculture, restart their industries—so that their countries could take their places again in the world economy and world community to which we all belong.

What I have said about the Canadian effort, and the spirit that inspired it, holds good, I believe, in every particular, for the many times greater contribution in each of these fields that the United States has made, and continues to make, towards the recovery of Europe's economic independence and well-being.

The second major undertaking of the postwar world has been the establishment of machinery for the settlement of international disputes and for the maintenance of peace. Great hopes have been entertained that the establishment at San Francisco of the United Nations would mark the beginning of a world organization which would provide real security. Today, this task stands in equal peril.

The settlement of international disputes, through machinery provided by the United Nations, has made some progress, though it is still far from having achieved success. Its success or failure would appear to have been dependent upon the extent to which the application of the veto has been in accordance with the general consensus of view of the member nations. In areas where it is clear that the veto has not been applied to further the special interest of one or more member nations rather than the general interest, procedures of negotiation and compromise, mediation and adjustment have been undertaken, and have proved helpful and constructive. However, in every area, and on every subject where it is obvious that the veto has been applied to further some particular interest, rather than the general interest, the process of compromise and adjustment has been ignored, and little or no progress as a consequence has been made.

The stalemate which has resulted from this state of affairs affects many situations which are of direct and imperative concern in the life of all free nations. Its continuance cannot fail to lead to threats to freedom arising not only from aggressive aims at territorial expansion, but, as well, from sinister plans to undermine the structure of free government within the borders of individual nations.

There is no nation, however great, which, in a world such as the one in which we live today, can defend its freedom solely with its own resources. All nations are, therefore, interested in security. Where existing machinery for the prevention or settlement of international disputes has proven or is proving inadequate to effect security, additional means must be sought.

Security for individual nations, under such circumstances, can be assured only by the effective co-operation, and the united power of those nations whose determination to maintain their freedom constitutes a strong bond of community between them. It is not surprising therefore that certain nations, knowing that their security depends on collective action in some form, and which are not yet able to achieve that security on the universal basis which the United Nations contemplates, should, pending this large accomplishment, seek to achieve their security on a less than universal basis.

As nations, we are all members one of another. The good of each is bound up in the good of all. This sense of community of interest cannot be too highly, too rapidly, or too widely developed. It is vital to the defence of freedom to maintain a preponderance of moral, economic and military strength on the side of freedom — all else is wholly secondary. To direct its energies to this imperative end seems to me to be the supreme task of the United Nations today.

There is a further all-compelling reason why a world community sense cannot be too completely developed. I mean, of course, the urgent necessity for the effective control of atomic energy. Scientific achievements have in recent years placed this terrible weapon of destruction at the disposal of mankind. The processes by which atomic energy is released are now well

known to the scientists of all nations. The ability to make and release the atomic bomb will, in the course of time, be available to any nation which possesses and devotes sufficient skill to that purpose. The international control of atomic energy might change it from a force of terrible destruction into a power which could greatly benefit the whole of mankind.

In the presence of the menace which atomic energy constitutes, every nation, in the interest of its own people as well as those of other lands, cannot strive too earnestly to ensure this mighty transformation. The hope of the world is, I believe, centred today in the United Nations as the one world organization capable of establishing this international control.

In his address to this Assembly last Saturday, the representative of the U.S.S.R. said that after thirty months of work by the Atomic Energy Commission there had been no positive results, that the work of the Atomic Energy Commission had remained fruitless. He sought to place the blame on the United States for the failure, thus far, to bring about the international control of atomic energy. I do not think this is borne out by the facts. The Government of Canada has taken part in the important discussions and negotiations on this subject since their inception. I am therefore able to speak with some knowledge of the facts.

The facts show conclusively that not only has the United States striven earnestly and hopefully for a solution, but that, subject to proper safeguards, they have unhesitatingly offered to give to the world the far-reaching advantages which came to them in consequence of their vast efforts in this field during the late war.

Two years ago, when the meetings of the Atomic Energy Commission were commenced, no one was certain that it would be possible to produce a workable plan in the international control and development of this great source of energy. A plan for this purpose has, however, been developed. The nations of the world, which now possess the resources and the skill for the production of atomic energy, have stated their willingness to take part in the operation of the plan.

The representative of the U.S.S.R., in denying that substantial progress has been made toward the working out of arrangements for the international control of atomic energy, stands almost alone in this view. Every other country which has participated in the work of the Atomic Energy Commission established by this Assembly at its first session in London, which has been free to express its conclusions, has joined in full acceptance of the majority report of the Commission.

The report of the Commission will come before the Assembly later for detailed study and approval. At that time, members of the Canadian delegation will develop the reasons for Canada's acceptance of its proposals. In our opinion they are based on the inescapable facts of atomic energy, and constitute the only method by which these new dread forces may properly be brought under effective control in the interest of peace and well-being of all the peoples of the world.

In international relations, as, indeed, in all human relations, attitude and will are of first importance. A solution of most problems is not difficult to find where men or nations are really anxious to discover common ground, and bring their wills to that task. Where, however, there is no will to peace, and an attitude of antagonism rather than of co-operation is deliberately fostered, the appeal soon becomes one to force, rather than to

reason. Wherever the appeal is to force, security, which is essential to the preservation of freedom, demands a preponderance of strength on the side of freedom. This is necessary, not from any thought of aggression, but to save from destruction the very nations and peoples who have at heart the aim of creating better conditions for others as well as for themselves.

The problems of today are not going to be solved by any formula. They will be solved only to the degree that each individual does his part, and each nation does its part to further the common good, by an attitude of good-will towards all. In this particular, example is all powerful. Patience and forbearance are not signs of weakness. They are the hall-marks of strength.

If this world of ours is to escape destruction, international relationships, characterized by antagonism and coercion must make way for a world community which recognizes that "over all nations is humanity". The habit of mind which resolves problems in terms of class, or race or of national prestige must be abandoned, and its place taken by a world outlook.

Let us not be deceived. The terrible truth is that the nations have yet to decide which is to prevail: the law of blood and of death, ever imagining new means of destruction, and forcing nations to be constantly ready for the battlefield; or the law of peace, work and health, ever evolving new means of delivering man from the scourges which beset him. Mankind has still to discover whether violent conquest or the relief of humanity is to triumph in the end.

Whatever may be said by or of individuals, the peoples of the world — in every community — ardently desire world peace. Today they are looking anxiously to all the representatives of all the nations at this Assembly, to work together towards the fulfilment of this great purpose. The proceedings of this Assembly may help to determine whether the world is to be plunged into the darkness of anarchy, or whether mankind is to continue to move towards the light of ordered freedom and universal peace.

B. Extract from Statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in the House of Commons, April 29, 1948 (Review of World Affairs).

On repeated occasions the government has indicated that collective security through the operations of an effective international organization was a primary objective in the foreign policy of this country. This continues to be our policy. We are fully aware, however, of the inadequacy of the United Nations at the present moment to provide the nations of the world with the security which they require. The realities of this situation must be faced, and the policy of the government in respect of it may be summarized very briefly.

In the first place we shall not encourage or foster any activity which at this moment might provide any state with a legitimate—I emphasize the word "legitimate"—excuse to withdraw from the United Nations. On the other hand, we shall not refrain from action which we know to be right merely because it displeases certain other members of the United Nations. We shall continue to give every assistance to constructive efforts to make the United Nations into the instrument for security and co-operation which it was originally designed to be, and in the meantime utilize its present possibilities to the fullest extent.

We will also oppose demands on the United Nations which at the moment are too heavy for its resources. It should not, for instance, attempt to undertake administrative responsibilities and police activities in various parts of the world before it has been given the means which may be required for carrying out those responsibilities.

We must realize also that the effectiveness of the United Nations is at the moment greatly reduced by the divisions which have grown up between the countries of Eastern Europe and the countries of the rest of the world. Until there has been some measure of settlement of the issues that appear to divide the world, we should not expect too much from the United Nations in its present form and organization. No one should expect, for instance, the machinery of the United Nations to produce a solution for problems on which the two most powerful nations of the world may have diametrically opposed views that cannot be reconciled.

During the last two years our faith in the United Nations as an effective organization for peace and security has been pretty severely shaken. What is unshaken is our determination to make of it, or within it, an effective organization for these purposes. Unshaken also is our faith that this can be achieved. It is therefore important that the United Nations be kept in existence, and that we make every possible use of the very high degree of vitality which, in spite of these divergent opinions, it has shown. There are, for example, subjects such as the dispute in Kashmir, to which I have referred, and the difficulties which have arisen in Indonesia, which are not directly within the area of conflict between the Eastern European states and the rest of the world, and where the machinery of the United Nations has been used very effectively.

Our willingness to stand for, and our ability to secure, election to the Security Council last September was an earnest of our desire to play our full part in the United Nations. That part involves us in discussions and decisions on matters which once may have seemed to be remote from our interests. Although we know, as I have already said, that this remoteness is illusory, nevertheless, this does not alter the fact that during the next year and a half Canada, as a member of the Security Council, will at times have to declare its position publicly on certain matters which previously might not have come to the attention of the government at all, or might have been dealt with confidentially through diplomatic channels.

The position of a power of the middle rank on the Security Council is under any circumstances a difficult one. A small power is in a sense by its very smallness relieved from much of the responsibility which participation in decisions involves, and which the implementations of such decisions requires. At the other extreme the great powers can protect their positions with the veto. A "middle country" such as Canada, however, is in a different position. Its economic strength and political influence are of importance, and its prestige is high. The material and moral contribution which Canada can make to collective action, as the last two wars have shown, is significant. The judgments which the Canadian Government express on United Nations matters must therefore be made with care and a sense of responsibility, especially since Canada is a country the views of which are taken seriously and which has the reputation of conscientiously carrying out the commitments into which it has entered.

Canada's position on the Security Council, as a middle power, would be an important one in any circumstances. The special nature of our rela-

tionship to the United Kingdom and the United States complicates our responsibilities, though it also enlarges our opportunities for influencing developments. Canada will be expected by some to follow the lead of the United Kingdom; by others to follow the lead of the United States. The fact that these two states are now in general agreement on fundamental questions eases but does not remove our particular difficulties. Unfriendly observers will write us off as a satellite of both, hoping in this way to minimize the effect of our independent action. More objective observers will tend to assume that it will be hard for Canada to follow a policy of its own. The fact that Canadian interests will often naturally be identical with those of the United Kingdom and the United States, without any suggestion or influence from these states, in a sense makes Canada's position more ambiguous. It will not be easy to secure credit for independence and honesty of argument and decision. Nevertheless we will continue to make our decisions objectively, in the light of our obligations to our own people and their interest in the welfare of the international community.

Appendix II

A. Canadian Statement, Ad Hoc Political Committee, November 22, 1948: Admission of New Members.

The Canadian delegation, both in the Security Council and at previous sessions of the General Assembly, has consistently maintained that the only qualifications which are necessary for a state to be admitted to membership in the United Nations are those which are set forth clearly in Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Charter. Thus, an applicant must be a state, must be peace-loving, must accept the obligations of the Charter, must be able to carry out these obligations, and must be willing to do so.

In our opinion, Mr. Chairman, these qualifications are exhaustive. No other qualifications are relevant to the question of admission of a state to membership in the United Nations. Any attempt to impose other conditions constitutes, in the opinion of my delegation, a violation of Article 4 of the Charter which is quite specific and definite. In the past, certain members of this organization have attempted to qualify their support of certain applicants for membership on considerations which, to say the least, were irrelevant and therefore contrary to the Charter. I refer for example to the question of whether or not an applicant was a belligerent in the war, or has diplomatic relations with certain other members of the United Nations. Both these considerations have, of course, nothing whatsoever to do with the question as to whether or not a state is qualified for membership in the United Nations at the present time. Nevertheless, these two conditions have, in the past, been cited as reasons for non-support of certain membership applications.

Then again, in the past, certain States have attempted to trade in this matter of membership. They have said: "If you support States A, B, C, and D, then I will support State E". "If you do not support States A, B, C, and D, then I will not support State E". I need hardly say with what concern the Canadian delegation looks upon this type of dealing in the all-important matter of membership applications. It is not only deplorable, it should not be associated with the name of any present member of the United Nations in good standing.

The International Court of Justice, on May 28 of this year, handed down an Advisory Opinion on the Conditions of Admission of a State to Membership in the United Nations. This was given as a result of the General Assembly Resolution of November 17, 1947, which requested the Court to give its opinion on this question. As all members are aware, the majority opinion of this distinguished body of international jurists was that the conditions for membership as set forth in Article 4 (1) of the Charter "constitute an exhaustive enumeration and are not merely stated by way of guidance or example. The provision would lose its significance and weight, if other conditions, unconnected with those laid down, could be demanded. The conditions stated in paragraph (1) of Article 4 must therefore be regarded not merely as the necessary conditions, but also as the conditions which suffice." Surely we cannot ignore this majority opinion which was handed down only after the most careful consideration of all aspects of the question.

Let it not be thought for one moment that we consider the conditions as set forth in Article 4 (1) to be easy to fulfil. These are conditions which were carefully thought out at San Francisco before they were decided upon. It is not an easy matter to decide whether a state is "able and willing to carry out" the obligations of the Charter. Yet surely if, after a careful objective examination of the applications of States by the General Assembly, more than two-thirds of the present Members of the United Nations, that is more than 39 fully-qualified States, come to the conclusion that an applicant is so qualified, then that state has the right to be admitted to our organization without further delay. This surely constitutes the considered judgment of world opinion. If this does not suffice to judge whether an applicant is or is not qualified according to Article 4 (1) of the Charter, then what does suffice?

You will recall that during last year's session of the General Assembly, the Canadian representative proposed that the five permanent members of the Security Council should waive their right of the veto in the case of applications for membership. I believe that I am right in saying that the representatives of the U.K., U.S.A., France and China indicated their willingness to accept this suggestion, but the representative of the Soviet Union refused to do so. Thus peace-loving States, entirely qualified to become members of the United Nations, are prevented from doing so because of the attitude of the U.S.S.R. The peoples of the world will not forget this. Certainly, the peoples of such states as Italy, Ireland, Portugal, Austria, Transjordan and now Ceylon, the latest victim of the Soviet veto, will not forget this in a hurry.

I might mention a word about Ceylon. Here is a new independent Asiatic state, ready, willing and capable of becoming a member of the United Nations. That Ceylon is a State constitutionally capable of carrying out its obligations is evident from an examination of Working Paper No. 13 and other information which was submitted by the Secretariat to the Security Council on June 24, 1948. Additional information was submitted by Ceylon to the Security Council on August 5 (Document S/951). Ceylon is now a fully independent and self-governing member of the British Commonwealth of Nations under the terms of the Ceylon Independence Act, 1947, and other parallel documents. Yet one country alone, the Soviet Union, blocks Ceylon's admission to the United Nations. The Charter never envisaged such a misuse of its principles and the Canadian delegation deplores and regrets this attitude.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we would like to reserve our right to express our views later on the specific proposals which are submitted to this Committee.

B. (1) Extracts from Canadian Statement, First Committee, September 30, 1948: Atomic Energy.

...When the Commission first met in New York in June, 1946, it was presented with two different plans for the control of atomic energy. One was proposed by the United States and the other by the U.S.S.R.

The plan which was the result of the work of the Commission has been submitted to the General Assembly and carries the endorsement of nine out of eleven present members of the Commission. It is based on the proposals originally put forward by the United States. In brief, this plan is a great project for international collaboration on a scale far exceeding anything previously attempted.

It calls for the formation of an international atomic energy authority which would own all uranium and thorium in trust for the nations of the world from the time these substances are taken from the ground, and which would control the mining of all such ores. Production would be strictly related to consumption, and there would be no accumulation of stocks to cause anxiety. The authority would own, operate and manage all facilities handling dangerous amounts of these fissionable materials, and thus would control directly all the atomic energy activities in all nations which might become a potential menace to world security.

A licensing and inspection system is contemplated for activities of a less serious character, and it is provided that the authority would foster beneficial uses and research in nationally owned establishments which would be limited, of course, to non-dangerous quantities. It is proposed that this system of control should be set up by stages, and after it is fully in operation the manufacture of bombs would cease and existing stocks would be disposed of and the explosive material reclaimed for peaceful use. The authority would then be given all available information from all sources regarding the production of atomic energy and similar related matters.

In contrast with these proposals which carry the majority support, the U.S.S.R. representatives have proposed a plan which differs fundamentally. They envisage the immediate outlawing of the atomic bomb and the destruction of all existing stocks of weapons within a three months period, and to this end the representative of the U.S.S.R. has tabled a draft convention which he has said should be negotiated forthwith as the first step towards the establishment of international control. The representative of the U.S.S.R. has refused to even pledge his country to any second step in the development of control, and to us it seems that the idea that the menace to world peace which is presented by the atomic bomb could be dispelled by the mere signing of an agreement to prohibit its use is very unreal indeed. Certainly, the experience of the last twenty-five years has shown that international agreements alone are not sufficient to safeguard the peace. The prohibition by itself of the use and manufacture of the atomic bomb at the present time would not contribute to security—it would merely most seriously reduce the military strength of the United States of America, which is the only nation now in possession of atomic bombs, at least on any scale which would suffice to make atomic war. It would be a measure of unilateral disarmament which would give no assurance that any country engaged in the production of atomic energy would or could not use the bomb in the future, because the fissionable material which is the essential substance for such peaceful applications as the development of atomic power is also the explosive element of the bomb, and in the absence of an effective system of control could readily be developed from a peaceful to a military use by a nation secretly preparing to wage atomic war.

For these reasons, most members of the Commission are in agreement that the prohibition of the use and manufacture of atomic bombs should form part of an over-all control plan so that when such prohibitions are put into effect they would be accompanied by the application of safeguards such as international inspection of all countries on a scale and with a thoroughness sufficient to ensure that no secret activities are in progress. The prohibition of atomic weapons standing by itself is little more than a pious hope; but prohibition as part of a comprehensive, thorough and

effective system of control, starting with the international ownership of all fissionable materials in trust for the nations of the world, is something else again.

This seems so elementary that it has been very difficult to realize that U.S.S.R. is really serious in its simple prohibition convention. It was felt in the Commission that no doubt whatever must be left on this point, and so during this last year more than half the time and the attention of the members of the Commission has been devoted to a meticulous re-examination of the U.S.S.R. proposals in detail, in order to make abundantly certain that no possible misconception of their purpose should stand in the way of agreement. However, it is now evident there is no misconception and there thus remains a wide gap between the views of the U.S.S.R. now supported in this Commission by the Ukrainian S.S.R., and those of the remaining members of the Commission who have rejected the U.S.S.R. proposals as "completely ignoring the existing technical knowledge or providing an adequate basis for effective control and the elimination of atomic weapons from national armaments".

In contrast to the U.S.S.R. proposals, the plans which have been evolved by the majority are based on a strict acceptance of the scientific facts as to the very nature of atomic energy, and on the conclusions which follow logically from these facts. After more than 240 meetings, the Commission has decided that "No other solution will meet the facts, prevent national rivalries in this most dangerous field, and fulfil the Commission's terms of reference".

Such is the impasse which has developed in the Atomic Energy Commission, and such is the state of affairs which made it evident that the issue raised in the Commission should be taken to the General Assembly of the United Nations. In this Committee and in the meetings of the General Assembly at this session, it will be the hope that the majority proposals may be fully explained to the nations which previously have not had an opportunity to study these grave questions in detail. It will be the hope also that these proposals may be dealt with objectively, as their importance requires, and that the conclusions which are reached in the General Assembly will be based strictly on the merits of the case. The issues in question are far too grave and far too serious for the future of the world to permit them safely to be confused in discussion with other matters which have not had the benefit of the detailed, careful and meticulous preparation which the Atomic Energy Commission has given to the question of atomic energy. . .

(2) Extract from Canadian Statement, General Assembly, November 4, 1948: Atomic Energy.

In the course of the long debate on atomic energy which has taken place in this Assembly, the issues have been made quite clear. I wish now to re-state in the form of a series of brief propositions the position which the Canadian Government holds in regard to atomic energy, and because of which the Canadian delegation will give its full support to this resolution.

In the first place, the Canadian Government believes that it is possible to establish a practicable system for the control of atomic energy which will protect the nations of the world from the dangers of atomic war and which will give freedom to use atomic energy for peaceful purposes. This

belief is demonstrated by the time and attention which the Canadian delegation has devoted to the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and it is demonstrated also by the anxiety of the Canadian Government that the work of the Commission should continue and that the difficulties standing in the way of agreement between nations should be removed. Canada possesses, as is well known, extensive resources of the raw materials from which atomic energy may be derived, and Canadian scientists and engineers have acquired special skills and knowledge in the field. These conditions made possible for Canada a considerable national development of atomic energy. We believe nevertheless that full benefits can come only through the organization of this development on an international rather than on a national basis.

My second proposition is the following: atomic warfare cannot be prohibited nor the international development of atomic energy ensured except on a basis which provides proper security for all nations. The principles through which these two objectives may be realized have been set forth in the majority reports of the Atomic Energy Commission. These principles have been arrived at by a long and arduous process of study and discussion in which representatives of seventeen nations have been engaged. Fourteen nations have agreed in the majority reports and only three have dissented. The Canadian Government, which was represented in the discussions in which these principles were evolved, adheres to them firmly, and confidently recommends their acceptance to other members of the United Nations as the "necessary basis" from which progress can be made towards the solution of the complicated problems of the prevention of atomic warfare and the freeing of the world's resources of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

In the third place, the Canadian Government believes that the stage has been reached in the work of the Atomic Energy Commission where, before further significant progress can be made, clear direction must be given to the Commission by the Assembly. It was from this General Assembly in its first session that it derived its original mandate. The resolution which is now before the General Assembly gives confirmation to the conclusions which have already been accepted by a majority of the members of the Commission. On the strength of this resolution it will be possible for the members of the Commission to return to their task and to proceed to such further studies as are practicable in the confidence that they will have the support which comes from the acceptance, by a majority of the nations of the world, of the basic conclusions which they have already reached.

Before the Atomic Energy Commission can go far in this work, however, it will be necessary to clear the ground of present difficulties and misunderstandings which make agreement on principles impossible amongst the powers most directly concerned. It is therefore proposed in this resolution that the nations which, by reason of their special concern, first brought the question of the control of atomic energy to the attention of the United Nations and who are referred to as the "sponsors", shall consult together to determine if there exists a basis on which the work of the Atomic Energy Commission may be pressed forward to completion by the preparation of a draft treaty or convention. The sponsors will, of course, be required to consider this problem in all its aspects. Speaking for the Canadian delegation, it is our intention to press for a meeting of the sponsors at the earliest

possible moment, and to press also that representation of the six nations at this meeting shall be on the high level appropriate to the consideration and resolution of the political difficulties which exist. If, as a result of these consultations, the sponsors are able to report back to the Assembly, either in a regular session or, if necessary, in a special session, that some clarification or adjustment of the existing position will enable the world to proceed towards a solution of the problem of the control of atomic energy, the Canadian delegation will be the first to welcome that development and give its support in the Assembly to a directive which might then be issued by the Assembly to the Atomic Energy Commission. In the meantime the Canadian delegation will use its best endeavours to contribute to such work as the Atomic Energy Commission may find it useful and practicable to undertake. I would like to make it quite clear that we believe the sponsors should have the responsibility of removing the political difficulties so that the Commission may proceed with the solution of the technical difficulties which are outstanding.

My final proposition is this. The problem of atomic energy is so complicated and the issues are so fateful that the world must not be led into the belief that any simple solution is adequate. This is our serious and honest objection to the Soviet proposal, which we consider to represent an oversimplification of the grave problems at issue. The processes for the preparation of the materials which release atomic energy are long and complicated and costly. The process by which these materials are assembled in an atomic bomb is quick and relatively simple; it is the same material that serves for peaceful uses in the arts and sciences or for destruction, and as a consequence every step of the process from the time the ores are first separated from the ground must be controlled. The world will be free from the danger of atomic warfare only if the whole process from beginning to end is placed within the framework of an adequate system of control and development. It is because of the absence of this effective control that we are convinced that the proposal which the Soviet delegation has made is quite inadequate to give the assurance of security which the nations of the world require.

Our position, which has been stated in detail by the Canadian delegation in the Political Committee of this Assembly and elsewhere, is held in the serious belief that it gives not only the best but the only hope of relieving humanity from fear of atomic warfare, and of giving freedom for the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. We shall vote for this resolution not with any sense that we have reached an end in the process of negotiation on the subject of the control of atomic energy, but for the purpose of marking a first stage which we hope will constitute the necessary basis for further progress

(3) General Assembly Resolution, November 4, 1948: Atomic Energy.

The General Assembly

Having examined the first, second and third reports of the Atomic Energy Commission which have been transmitted to it by the Security Council in accordance with the terms of the General Assembly resolution 1(I) of 24 January, 1946;

1. Approves the general findings (Part IIc) and recommendations (Part III) of the First Report and the specific proposals of Part II of the Second Report of the Commission as constituting the necessary basis for

establishing an effective system of international control of atomic energy to ensure its use only for peaceful purposes and for the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons in accordance with the terms of reference of the Atomic Energy Commission;

2. Expresses its deep concern at the impasse which has been reached in the work of the Atomic Energy Commission as shown in its Third Report and regrets that unanimous agreement has not yet been reached;

3. Requests the six sponsors of the General Assembly Resolution of January 24, 1946, which are the permanent members of the Atomic Energy Commission, to meet together and consult in order to determine when there exists a basis for agreement on the international control of atomic energy to ensure its use only for peaceful purposes and for the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons, and report to the General Assembly the results of their consultation not later than its next regular session.

Meanwhile, the General Assembly,

4. Calls upon the Atomic Energy Commission to resume its sessions, to survey its programme of work and to proceed to the further study of such of the subjects remaining in the programme of work as it considers to be practicable and useful.

C. Canadian Statement, Security Council, October 15, 1948: Berlin.

I should like to take this opportunity to express the most sincere appreciation of the manner in which the President of the Council has carried forward the great responsibilities which came to him to discharge, when he accepted the Presidency of this Council for the consideration of the grave issues which are before us today. I know that I can speak not only for myself, but for our colleagues who have also been associated with him in the talks which he has had, in expressing our confidence in the wisdom and initiative which he has shown.

I have no doubt the President of the Council in the course of our discussions will give an account of the talks. These informal talks in which the representatives on the Security Council of the Argentine, Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia and Syria have been engaged since the last meeting of the Council on the subject of Berlin have had as their purpose the gathering of fuller information as to the points of view of the parties concerned with the problem. In these conversations we have sought also for clarification of the issues involved. In view of the gravity and complexity of these issues it has seemed to us that we have a serious responsibility to examine these matters in all their varied aspects, and with the help of all the information which we can secure. As members of the United Nations, and particularly because we hold the privileges of membership in this Council, the duty is incumbent upon each of us in our task of maintaining international peace and security, to seek methods and procedures which are best suited to that purpose. In order that there may be no misconception of what we have sought to do, I should like to emphasize that we have not been concerned with producing any offer of mediation or with drafting of resolutions, of whatever character, to be placed before this Council. Our work to date has been strictly exploratory and preliminary, because we recognize that it is here in this Council that decisions must be taken.

Mr. President, may I say again that I believe it to be the duty of this Council to reach conclusions and take appropriate decisions promptly for the situation is that we are carrying on this debate under the shadow of violence.

The specific questions which I understand the President has put to the representatives of France, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom and the United States have developed from our discussions as points upon which we desire further enlightenment. I hope that all concerned will take advantage of this opportunity to make this further information available so that work in this Council may proceed promptly.

D. Extracts from Canadian Statement, Security Council, March 31, 1948: Czechoslovakia.

The representative of Chile, in the view of the Canadian delegation, has performed a valuable service in bringing this matter to the notice of the Security Council. It is proper that the very grave charges contained in his letters of March 12 and March 16 should be most carefully examined in the Council. If it were established that the coup in Czechoslovakia, by the Communist minority, was in fact as alleged in this letter "effectuated successfully only because of official participation of representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the threat of the use of military force of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which were held in readiness on the northeast boundaries of Czechoslovakia", then clearly a serious violation of the Charter would have occurred.

Such a violation is of direct and immediate concern to every member of the United Nations, and any member State, therefore, is abundantly justified in requesting the Security Council to examine the allegations which have been made and to endeavour to establish the facts in the case, what did happen in Czechoslovakia in the month of February? From the discussion which has taken place in the Council to date I must confess that we have not added substantially to the specific information already available to the members as a result of newspaper despatches which were sent out from Prague at the time. A number of pertinent questions have been asked in the Council but no satisfactory answers have so far been given. Instead, we have heard counter charges and reference to the motives of those who have been trying to establish the facts in the case . . .

. . . The events in Czechoslovakia parallel all too closely early developments in other States in Eastern Europe so that they cannot be dismissed as pure coincidence. As has been noted in the Council already, it is too much to expect us to believe that the creation of similar regimes in countries like Bulgaria, Hungary and Roumania could have taken place without the active and organized help of an outside power. The fact that the appearance of constitutional forms was used to cloak this overthrow of political liberty does not hide the fact that liberty has been overthrown and free political institutions subverted.

Having in mind the intimate associations between the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia, as in other countries and the Soviet Union, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Communist Party gained control of Czechoslovakia with the knowledge, approval and some help at least from the Soviet Union. As has been mentioned already in the Council those who were most active in the coup were known to have lived and received their

training in the Soviet Union itself. The Action Committees which were so effective in intimidating the opposition had apparently been established during the earliest days of the occupation of Czechoslovakia by troops of the Soviet Union.

Unquestionably, where a strong and highly organized political group is known to be linked with the support of an outside Power whose interests it advances, it is difficult to distinguish the relative weight of responsibility that must be borne by each, in the events to which I have referred. But this increases the importance of trying to ascertain the facts with regard to this process, whereby a minority-group linked with an outside Power is able to overthrow its political opponents and deprive the majority of the people of their political liberties, for this is not only dangerous to democracy but also creates a threat to international peace and security.

It is not to be expected that those who have been responsible for the overthrow of the democratic Government in Czechoslovakia would help the Council in assessing their responsibility for these events. But there are some whose testimony might be available to use and who should, therefore, give evidence. I refer not only to Dr. Papanek, but also those citizens of Czechoslovakia who were firsthand witnesses to the sad events which took place there in February and who have since had to leave their country to escape persecution. It is the duty of the Council, in the opinion of the Canadian delegation, to arrange that they be heard.

E. (1) Canadian Statement, First Committee, October 11, 1948: Disarmament.

The course of this debate has made it clear how earnestly the nations desire real and effective disarmament. Disarmament is a universal objective. I submit that there is no peaceful State, however great or small it may be, that is not willing to disarm to the fullest extent consistent with its security. Certainly the people of Canada are wholeheartedly in favour of any effective plan which would make it possible for them and for other peaceful peoples to reduce the amounts that they must now spend on armaments and armed forces as a measure of security. The same is true in every country that is peacefully inclined and has no aggressive intentions. I repeat that disarmament is a universal objective. It is impossible to emphasize that fact too frequently.

Unfortunately, the Soviet delegation is doing everything in its power to create the impression that the Soviet Union and those States that follow the Soviet line with such remarkable fidelity are the only champions of disarmament. How often have we heard it said that only the U.S.S.R. and those associated with them are upholders of peace and believers in disarmament. Nothing could be further from the truth. I am sure it is unnecessary for me to state that Canada is a wholehearted and sincere believer in peace and is completely without aggressive designs on anyone. In the whole of its history, since self-government was secured in Canada a century ago, not one square foot of territory has been acquired in my country through war or as a result of war. Other delegations have spoken convincingly of their desire for peace and I have no doubt that still others will follow. The point was well put by the delegate of the United Kingdom the other day when he asked us to imagine Luxembourg as a menace to the safety of the Soviet Union. It cannot be stated too often or remembered

too vividly that the Soviet Union, through every means at its disposal, is deliberately twisting facts in an effort to make the unthinking believe that only the Soviet Union favour peace and disarmament, while the rest of the world is in favour of war. As I said before, nothing could be further from the truth.

If we are to make progress in disarmament, as we all so earnestly desire, we can only do so upon a basis of confidence and goodwill. Does anyone think that mutual understanding, goodwill and co-operation are universal in the world today? To pose the question is to give the answer. But it is not enough to leave the matter there. Why has there been such a breakdown in international confidence and goodwill?

What must be remembered by every thinking citizen of this troubled planet is that the tension existing today has been created by the Soviet Union which continues to add fuel to the flame. Not only has the Soviet Union created tension through its policies in international affairs, about which I shall have a word to say later on, but it has added to it by the efforts which it is making to create confusion and dissension within the borders of every liberty-loving and democratic State. If the leaders of the Soviet Union are sincere in their desire for a peaceful and happy world, we have a right to look to them for a moderation of the tension which they have been and are creating. It is because we see no signs of such moderation that we are in doubt as to Soviet motives in presenting the resolution which is now before us.

Let us turn now to an examination of the Soviet resolution on disarmament. We shall have to make our own examination of this resolution because M. Vishinsky in a long statement on Thursday last made practically no reference to the resolution itself. We heard a great deal about Mr. Spaak, we heard a great deal about Mr. Bevin, we even heard some historical records about the Disarmament Conference 20 years ago but nothing about the resolution.

How would the resolution, if adopted, add to our security? Why should we regard it as offering a solution to the complex and difficult problem of disarmament?

Questions like these which are normally answered by the sponsor of a resolution were left untouched. Now let me turn again to the resolution. On the question of reducing by one-third the force of the permanent members of the Security Council we have already heard cogent reasons from some of its permanent members as to the utter unsuitability of a mere proportional cut in armaments. There must clearly be qualitative as well as quantitative disarmament. In order to realize the emptiness of the Soviet suggestion that unless we approve their particular resolution we are opposed to disarmament, it is only necessary to turn to the resolution itself and to see what teeth it contains. By teeth I mean what measures of enforcement it provides. No agreement to disarm can be effective unless it provides a clear and workable system for bringing about disarmament and making sure beyond any doubt that the parties to the agreement are living up to their obligations. It is certainly regrettable that Soviet policies have brought the world to a point where we cannot be expected, in view of the secrecy which shrouds the Soviet Union, to accept vague assurances that this or any other measure of disarmament would actually be put into effect inside the borders of that State. That is why we are forced to the conclusion that, at all times, we must concentrate our attention upon measures

of enforcement, inspection, verification and control. Canada, like most of the countries that fought together in the recent war, substantially reduced its own armaments and armed forces upon the conclusion of hostilities. We did this in the hope that we might be able to place reliance for our own security on the undertakings to which all members of the United Nations had pledged themselves under the Charter. We also hoped that we could rely on the machinery for the maintenance of international peace provided by the Charter.

No country, therefore, would welcome more sincerely than Canada any progress that can be made towards effective measures of general disarmament. Let there be no mistake about that. Canada warmly welcomes effective measures of general disarmament and that has been our consistent opinion. But we will not support measures of disarmament at the cost of insecurity for ourselves or at the cost of insecurity for other nations bent upon maintaining international peace and security on the basis of the principles and purposes of the Charter. As has already been said, why should we be asked to pool our security with a nation which will not, and is determined not to, reveal to the world what it is doing?

I suggest with deference that if the factors contributing to the present state of tension and insecurity were objectively examined, it would be found that the principal aggravating causes are:

1. The tremendous size of the armed forces maintained and deployed by the Soviet Union, particularly in Europe;
2. The failure of the Soviet Union to co-operate in the establishment of collective forces under the United Nations on the basis of Article 43 of the Charter;
3. The failure of the Soviet Union to co-operate in the development of proposals to establish international control of atomic energy; and
4. The failure of the Soviet Union to respond to the majority view expressed in the Commission for Conventional Armaments that measures must be taken to strengthen the sense of security of nations before national armaments may be regulated or reduced. A glance at the Soviet resolution reveals how essentially meaningless it is. The resolution seeks to persuade us that it favours disarmament, but what does it propose in the way of enforcement? I quote the final paragraph of the Soviet draft resolution:

"The General Assembly recommends to establish within the framework of the Security Council an international control body for the purpose of supervision of, and control over, the implementation of the measures for the reduction of armaments and armed forces and for the prohibition of atomic weapons." In appearance, this may sound reassuring, but in fact what does it mean? It means that an international body—whose activities are not even outlined—is to be established "within the framework of the Security Council." That can only mean that the veto is to apply at some stage and can be used to prevent the inspection and enforcement that is so essential to a disarmament agreement. As has already been asked in this debate, what opportunity is there for inspection, for verification and for control? The Soviet proposals about international control over the implementation of measures of disarmament are, to say the least, ambiguous. In the view of the Canadian delegation, a system of international inspection is essential to any disarmament agreement. It is one thing for the Soviet Union to say that they will reduce by one-third their present land, naval

and air forces, and even to say after a year has passed that the one-third reduction has been carried out, but it is quite another thing for the Soviet Union to tell us that they will welcome international observers before, during and after the reduction. There, I submit with deference, lies the weakness of the proposal. In the first case, the world has to accept the unsupported assurances of the Soviet Government. In the second case, the world can satisfy itself as to the manner in which disarmament is being carried out. This international inspection would, of course, apply to every country and there would be no invidious singling out of any one country for inspection. A constant scrutiny would be kept on the progress of disarmament measures.

In the view of our delegation, there is nothing more important in this whole problem of international disarmament than the question of inspection, verification and control. The Soviet delegate has already been asked to declare unequivocally whether his country is prepared to open its doors and its borders to international observers teams. Such observer teams might establish both quantitatively and qualitatively the armed forces and armaments, both existing and potential, at the disposal of the Soviet Union in its own territories and the territories under its control, as well as in the territories of all other principal States. It strikes our delegation that an inspection of this nature is clearly a necessary prerequisite if a sound basis for progressive general disarmament is to be established. Following such an inspection a formula of disarmament must be found which would be related to the needs of international peace and security. The Canadian delegation will await with interest the Soviet delegate's reply to this question, already put and now repeated.

Mr. Chairman, I have made it clear why this delegation considers that the Soviet resolution, in spite of its appearance of simplicity, would actually set us back in the complicated task of securing disarmament. A decision has already been taken to disarm, in the General Assembly resolution of 1946, and adequate machinery has been established to carry out that purpose. All that is needed now is the willingness on the part of *all* nations to accept the principles and procedures for disarmament which are acceptable to the majority. We have before us this morning a resolution that has been circulated by the United Kingdom delegation. It makes the circumstances clear by referring to the Military Staff Committee and the Commission on Conventional Armaments and the Atomic Energy Commission, bodies which are already charged with the technical tasks of disarmament. It makes clear also that a majority of nations in those bodies are willing to disarm on the basis of principles which will not endanger the lives and homes of their people. This resolution if adopted by the Assembly will demonstrate to the world that disarmament is possible, without threat or danger to any State, whether in the majority or minority in this debate, if the lines of approach, already laid down, are followed. The principles of this resolution are ones to which the Canadian delegation fully adheres, and we are prepared to continue our participation in efforts to put them into practice. The Canadian delegation hopes that the Committee will put before the Assembly a resolution in terms of the United Kingdom proposal.

(2) General Assembly Resolution, November 19, 1948: Disarmament.

The General Assembly,

Desiring to establish relations of confident collaboration between the States within the framework of the Charter and to make possible a general reduction of armaments in order that humanity may in future be spared the horrors of war and that the peoples may not be overwhelmed by the continually increasing burden of military expenditure,

Considering that no agreement is attainable on any proposal for the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces so long as each State lacks exact and authenticated information concerning conventional armaments and armed forces of other States, so long as no convention has been concluded regarding the types of military forces to which such reduction would apply, and so long as no organ of control has been established,

Considering that the aim of the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces can only be attained in an atmosphere of real and lasting improvement in international relations, which implies in particular the application of control of atomic energy involving the prohibition of the atomic weapon,

But noting on the other hand that this renewal of confidence would be greatly encouraged if States were placed in possession of precise and verified data as to the level of their respective conventional armaments and armed forces;

Recommends the Security Council to pursue the study of the regulation and reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces through the agency of the Commission for Conventional Armaments in order to obtain concrete results as soon as possible;

Trusts that the Commission for Conventional Armaments, in carrying out its plan of work, will devote its first attention to formulating proposals for the receipt, checking and publication, by an international organ of control within the framework of the Security Council, of full information to be supplied by member States with regard to their effectives and their conventional armaments;

Invites the Security Council to report to it no later than its next regular session on the effect given to the present recommendation with a view to enabling it to continue its activity with regard to the regulation of armaments in accordance with the purposes and principles defined by the Charter.

Invites all nations in the Commission for Conventional Armaments to co-operate to the utmost of their power in the attainment of the above-mentioned objectives.

F. (1) Security Council Resolution, April 21, 1948: India-Pakistan.

The Security Council,

Having considered the complaint of the Government of India concerning the dispute over the State of Jammu and Kashmir, having heard the representative of India in support of that complaint and the reply and counter complaints of the representative of Pakistan,

Being strongly of opinion that the early restoration of peace and order in Jammu and Kashmir is essential and that India and Pakistan should do their utmost to bring about a cessation of all fighting,

Noting with satisfaction that both India and Pakistan desire that the question of the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan should be decided through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite,

Considering that the continuation of the dispute is likely to endanger international peace and security;

Reaffirms the Council's Resolution of January 17th,

Resolves that the membership of the Commission established by the Resolution of the Council of January 20, 1948, shall be increased to five and shall include in addition to the membership mentioned in that Resolution, representatives of—and¹—and that if the membership of the Commission has not been completed within ten days from the date of the adoption of this Resolution the President of the Council may designate such other Member or Members of the United Nations as are required to complete the membership of five,

Instructs the Commission to proceed at once to the Indian sub-continent and there place its good offices and mediation at the disposal of the Governments of India and Pakistan with a view to facilitating the taking of the necessary measures, both with respect to the restoration of peace and order and to the holding of a plebiscite by the two Governments, acting in co-operation with one another and with the Commission and further instructs the Commission to keep the Council informed of the action taken under the Resolution, and to this end,

Recommends to the Governments of India and Pakistan the following measures as those which in the opinion of the Council are appropriate to bring about a cessation of the fighting and to create proper conditions for a free and impartial plebiscite to decide whether the State of Jammu and Kashmir is to accede to India or Pakistan.

A. *Restoration of Peace and Order*

1. The Government of Pakistan should undertake to use its best endeavours:
 - (a) To secure the withdrawal from the State of Jammu and Kashmir of tribesmen and Pakistani nationals not normally resident therein who have entered the state for the purpose of fighting and to prevent any intrusion into the State of such elements and any furnishing of material aid to those fighting in the State.
 - (b) To make known to all concerned that the measures indicated in this and the following paragraphs provide full freedom to all subjects of the State, regardless of creed, caste, or party, to express their views and to vote on the question of the accession of the State, and that therefore they should co-operate in the maintenance of peace and order.
2. The Government of India should:
 - (a) When it is established to the satisfaction of the Commission set up in accordance with the Council's Resolution of 20 January that the tribesmen are withdrawing and that arrangements for the cessation of the fighting have become effective, put into operation in consultation with the Commission a plan for withdrawing their own forces from Jammu and Kashmir and reducing them progressively to the minimum strength required for the support of the civil power in the maintenance of law and order,

¹ On April 23, Belgium and Colombia were added to the Commission

(b) Make known that the withdrawal is taking place in stages and announce the completion of each stage;

(c) When the Indian forces shall have been reduced to the minimum strength mentioned in (a) above, arrange in consultation with the Commission for the stationing of the remaining forces to be carried out in accordance with the following principles:

- (i) That the presence of troops should not afford any intimidation or appearance of intimidation to the inhabitants of the State,
- (ii) That as small a number as possible should be retained in forward areas,
- (iii) That any reserve of troops which may be included in the total strength should be located within their present Base area.

3. The Government of India should agree that until such time as the plebiscite administration referred to below finds it necessary to exercise the powers of direction and supervision over the State forces and police provided for in Paragraph 8 they will be held in areas to be agreed upon with the Plebiscite Administrator.

4. After the plan referred to in paragraph 2 (a) above has been put into operation, personnel recruited locally in each district should so far as possible be utilized for the re-establishment and maintenance of law and order with due regard to protection of minorities, subject to such additional requirements as may be specified by the Plebiscite Administration referred to in paragraph 7.

5. If these local forces should be found to be inadequate, the Commission, subject to the agreement of both the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan, should arrange for the use of such forces of either Dominion as it deems effective for the purpose of pacification.

B. *Plebiscite*

6. The Government of India should undertake to ensure that the Government of the State invite the major political groups to designate responsible representatives to share equitably and fully in the conduct of the administration at the Ministerial level, while the plebiscite is being prepared and carried out.

7. The Government of India should undertake that there will be established in Jammu and Kashmir a Plebiscite Administration to hold a Plebiscite as soon as possible on the question of the accession of the State to India or Pakistan.

8. The Government of India should undertake that there will be delegated by the State to the Plebiscite Administration such powers as the latter considers necessary for holding a fair and impartial plebiscite including, for that purpose only, the direction and supervision of the State forces and police.

9. The Government of India should at the request of the Plebiscite Administration make available from the Indian forces such assistance as the Plebiscite Administration may require for the performance of its functions.

10. (a) The Government of India should agree that a nominee of the Secretary-General of the United Nations will be appointed to be the Plebiscite Administrator.

(b) The Plebiscite Administrator, acting as an officer of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, should have authority to nominate his Assistants and other subordinates and to draft regulations governing the Plebiscite. Such nominees should be formally appointed and such draft regulations should be formally promulgated by the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

(c) The Government of India should undertake that the Government of Jammu and Kashmir will appoint fully qualified persons nominated by the Plebiscite Administrator to act as special magistrates within the State judicial system to hear cases which in the opinion of the Plebiscite Administrator have a serious bearing on the preparation for and the conduct of a free and impartial plebiscite.

(d) The terms of service of the Administrator should form the subject of a separate negotiation between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Government of India. The Administrator should fix the terms of service for his Assistants and subordinates.

(e) The Administrator should have the right to communicate direct with the Government of the State and with the Commission of the Security Council and, through the Commission with the Security Council, with the Governments of India and Pakistan and with their Representatives with the Commission. It would be his duty to bring to the notice of any or all of the foregoing (as he in his discretion may decide) any circumstances arising which may tend, in his opinion, to interfere with the freedom of the Plebiscite.

11. The Government of India should undertake to prevent and to give full support to the Administrator and his staff in preventing any threat, coercion or intimidation, bribery or other undue influence on the voters in the plebiscite, and the Government of India should publicly announce and should cause the Government of the State to announce this undertaking as an international obligation binding on all public authorities and officials in Jammu and Kashmir.

12. The Government of India should themselves and through the Government of the State declare and make known that all subjects of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, regardless of creed, caste or party, will be safe and free in expressing their views and in voting on the question of the accession of the State and that there will be freedom of the Press, speech and assembly and freedom of travel in the State, including freedom of lawful entry and exit.

13. The Government of India should use and should ensure that the Government of the State also use their best endeavours to effect the withdrawal from the State of all Indian nationals other than those who are normally resident therein or who on or since 15 August, 1947, have entered it for a lawful purpose.

14. The Government of India should ensure that the Government of the State release all political prisoners and take all possible steps so that:

(a) all citizens of the State who have left it on account of disturbances are invited, and are free, to return to their homes and to exercise their rights as such citizens;

(b) there is no victimization;

(c) minorities in all parts of the State are accorded adequate protection.

15. The Commission of the Security Council should at the end of the plebiscite certify to the Council whether the plebiscite has or has not been really free and impartial.

C. General Provisions

16. The Governments of India and Pakistan should each be invited to nominate a Representative to be attached to the Commission for such assistance as it may require in the performance of its task.

17. The Commission should establish in Jammu and Kashmir such observers as it may require of any of the proceedings in pursuance of the measures indicated in the foregoing paragraphs.

18. The Security Council Commission should carry out the tasks assigned to it herein.

(2) Canadian Statement, Security Council, April 17, 1948: India-Pakistan.

In accordance with the invitation of the President, I should like to offer a brief statement with regard to the draft resolution presented to the Security Council in the name of the six delegations whose names appear in the document.

It has always been the hope of the Canadian delegation that, with the aid of the Security Council, the delegations of India and Pakistan would find it possible to reach, through the means of direct negotiation, an agreed basis for the settlement of their differences in regard to the State of Jammu and Kashmir, as well as on the other outstanding matters before the Security Council.

If the Security Council now has to turn to the procedure of adopting a draft resolution whereby it offers to both parties the measures which, in our opinion, should constitute a basis for a fair and equitable settlement, it does so in full realization of the fact that this draft resolution will have failed to achieve its purpose if the two parties themselves do not continue to make every effort to come together and co-operate in regard to its implementation.

I should like the delegations of India and Pakistan to know that the draft resolution before the Security Council represents the best advice which completely objective and fair-minded thought could bring to the difficult problem which the two parties referred to us, and with which the Security Council has been anxiously concerned for so many weeks.

In drawing up these proposals we have sought not only to find what measures would, in our view, be the most effective to bring about a cessation of fighting in the State of Jammu and Kashmir and to provide conditions necessary for a free and fair plebiscite to determine the future of the State, but also to provide those measures which will make evident, both to the peoples of the sub-continent of India and to the world, the justice and fairness of the terms and procedures envisaged in our proposal.

All of those who have been associated with the drafting of this draft resolution have been impressed with the unity of thought and purpose which has brought our minds together in the working out of this text. We have all had but one aim in mind, namely, how to bring about by peaceful means an end to the dispute between the sister Dominions of India and Pakistan over Kashmir.

As the President of the Security Council has indicated, the text before us represents what we think is fair, just and necessary. It is in this spirit that we commend the results of our endeavours to the Governments of India and Pakistan.

G. Security Council Resolution, February 28, 1948: Report of the Committee of Good Offices on Indonesia.

The Security Council:

Having considered the report of the Committee of Good Offices, informing the Council of the steps taken by the Netherlands Government and the Republic of Indonesia to comply with the Council's resolution of August 1, 1947;

Notes with satisfaction the signing of the Truce Agreement by both parties and the acceptance by both parties of certain principles as an agreed basis for the conclusion of a political settlement in Indonesia;

Commends the members of the Committee of Good Offices for the assistance they have given the two parties in their endeavours to settle their dispute by peaceful means, and endorses their offer of continued good offices in the working out of a political settlement;

Maintains its offer of good offices contained in the Resolution of August 25, 1947, and, to this end,

Requests both parties and the Committee of Good Offices to keep the Council directly informed about the progress of the political settlement in Indonesia.

H. (1) Canadian Statement, Interim Committee, July 9, 1948: Voting Procedure in the Security Council.

The attitude of the Canadian Government towards the general problem of voting procedure in the Security Council is well known from statements which have been made by Canadian delegations in previous discussions of this problem. What I wish to do this morning is to make a few remarks about this particular report.

I think it would be unfortunate if the Canadian delegation seemed, because it associated itself with the preparation of this report and gave its support to this report, either to be modifying its desire for a more radical solution to the problem of voting procedure in the Security Council or to be modifying its discontent and disappointment over the way in which the use of the privileged voting procedure of the permanent members in the Security Council had inhibited the work of that body.

I think I should make it clear, therefore, that the Canadian delegation regards this report merely as a first step in what must necessarily be a long and arduous journey. This is by no means the last time that the problem of voting in the Security Council will be discussed. This is by no means the last expedient that will be resorted to as a method of solving that situation. The report represents the consequences of a decision, taken by the sub-committee when it first met, on tactics. It was necessary to decide then whether a frontal attack should be made on the problem, by considering the possibility of revising the Charter, or whether a more gradual approach should be taken by considering what should be done in existing circumstances to improve the voting procedure. The sub-committee chose the latter course.

I think it made this choice wisely in existing circumstances, not only because of the atmosphere of tension which has developed in the world in recent months, but also because the problem is not simply a problem of voting procedure. It is a much greater problem than that. It is a problem that arises whenever an attempt is made to associate a number of members of varying sizes and strengths in a composite organization. It is a problem that is as old as the history of federalism and those of us who live in federal countries know how difficult a problem it is, how it requires constant scrutiny and repeated adjustments in the arrangements that are made to meet it. I do not think for a moment that this problem can be solved merely by a constitutional reform. If, by constitutional reform, the veto were to be removed tomorrow, I do not think we would be free of the problem which is created either by the immediate difficulty arising out of lack of unanimity among permanent members of the Security Council or by the long range difficulty that arises out of disparity in size, in strength, in willingness and ability to accept responsibility amongst the members. That is not to say for a moment that the present method of solving the problem is satisfactory.

It is a very rough and ready method of meeting that problem that has never been acceptable to the member states that do not enjoy the privilege of that voting procedure. On the other hand, the ultimate satisfactory solution to the problem will not be easy to find. I think it would be misleading the public if we represented this report as going very far but we would be misleading them further if we lead them to believe that more substantial progress could be made now by more radical measures. With reference to this report itself, I think, Mr. Chairman, it is a mistake to assume, as was suggested yesterday by Sir Carl Berendsen, (New Zealand), that the report is without practical significance. It may very well be, as he suggested, that we have gone no further on our journey than the Hudson tunnel. I am not sure, however, that we have not got as close to our destination as if we had wrapped ourselves up in a rocket and set off on a more spectacular journey.

Let us consider what has actually taken place. The voting procedure in the Security Council is stated in the Charter in a very few lines. It is a relatively brief statement. It is obvious that that statement is an inadequate definition of this procedure and that further definition and further interpretation will be required.

In fact, before the Charter itself was eventually signed, there was an interpretation of that section of the Charter, an interpretation which was embodied in the five power statement covering the use to which the veto would be put. That is the only formal interpretation that has ever been given to the procedure since that time. I think it is a mistake to assume that the five powers who were associated with that statement are alone entitled to interpret this particular section, that they alone have the right to define and interpret the privilege which is set forth for them in a very few words in the Charter. I think that the process of definition and interpretations is one in which all members of the United Nations should participate in a variety of ways. They should participate in that process of interpretation and definition in the manner which has been adopted in this Committee and actual participation in the Security Council from time to time in discussions and decisions which in themselves modify this procedure. What has been done in this document is to elaborate a further definition and

interpretation of the voting procedure in the Security Council to put alongside the one already in existence.

It is a definition and interpretation in which, if present indications are correct, the vast majority of members will concur. This interpretation has also the concurrence of four of the members who participated in the previous interpretation. Even though the interpretation which is embodied in this document is never formally put into effect by any single or precise action, it is nevertheless bound to have results in the same way that any general interpretative process has a result on a constitutional structure. It seems to me, therefore, that the results of this process which was begun by the Committee are bound to be of very considerable significance. It is true that what we have done is to initiate a very gradual process but it seems to me that it is only by a gradual process, by trial and error, by interpretation such as the one which we have now completed that the voting procedure in the Security Council can be altered in present circumstances. It may be that before long we can as it were, shift gears, and consider the more direct approach of constitutional amendment. In the meantime, it seems to the Canadian delegation that this constitutes a very useful and practical step towards the gradual solution of this problem and the Canadian delegation is very happy to associate itself with this report.

(2) Canadian Statement, Ad Hoc Political Committee, November 17, 1948: Interim Committee.

As a member of a delegation which took a fairly active part in the debate last year on the establishment of the Interim Committee, I would like to say a very few words on the work of the Committee during the year and on the question as to whether or not it should be continued.

I have listened attentively to the representatives who have spoken both in favor of and against the continuation of the Interim Committee. On the one hand, we have had some very clear reasons advanced why the Interim Committee should be continued for at least another experimental year, and there is no need for me to repeat these arguments here. On the other hand we have had some arguments — as they appeared to me, confused and at times contradictory arguments — why the Interim Committee should not be continued.

Last year, the opponents of the Interim Committee argued that it would be a dangerous agency to create, that it would rush in and interfere all over the place and cause trouble. This year, some of them argue that it is not doing anything to justify its existence. They are hard to please, I suppose because they don't want to be pleased.

A careful examination of the Interim Committee's Report shows that the Committee has proceeded cautiously and has not yet exercised several of the functions, some rather important functions, assigned to it by the Assembly. But I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a bad thing. The Interim Committee has, in fact, proceeded slowly and has been very careful indeed not to impinge on the activities of the Security Council. It has therefore not justified the violent and exaggerated criticism of its opponents who last year kept on repeating *ad nauseum* — and they seem to be doing it again this year — in spite of the evidence, that the Interim Committee was designed to circumvent the Security Council. I confess that I detected a slight note of sadness in the statement of the representative

of Poland when he admitted that the Interim Committee had not yet interfered with the Security Council. In point of fact, the work of the Interim Committee so far has, I suggest, knocked the props from under the arguments of the boycotters of the Committee. The repetition, consequently, of those arguments this year is not likely to impress anyone any more than it impressed us last year.

Mr. Malik, in spite of the care and caution of the Interim Committee, sees it ruining the Security Council. That Council has been so busy during the past year that it has had to meet four or five days nearly every week. How can it possibly be maintained by Mr. Malik that the Security Council, like the state in Communist theory, is withering away?

Insofar as the legal aspect of the question is concerned, the argument that the Interim Committee is unconstitutional had no validity last year, has no validity this year, and will have no validity next year. As I see it, Article 22 is quite conclusive in this respect:

“The General Assembly may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions”.

The repetition of the old arguments on this matter remind me of that Russian parable that Mr. Vishinsky is so fond of repeating to us about the priest who took a piece of meat, called it fish and ate it on Friday. The Soviet delegation insists on reversing the process — it takes an innocent Committee of the Assembly, curses it, and thereby makes it criminally unconstitutional not to be consumed at any time on pain of excommunication.

The question of expenditure has been mentioned. I need only refer in this connection to the Korean consultation whereby the Interim Committee actually saved the United Nations a great deal of time and expense by obviating the necessity of summoning a special session of the General Assembly. I repeat, that the Interim Committee has saved and in all probability will continue to save the United Nations money rather than put an additional burden on its already overburdened finances.

Anyone who has taken the time to read carefully the reports of the Interim Committee on the very thorough and careful studies which it has carried out will I think, readily see that the Interim Committee has justified its existence. I refer to the studies on “voting in the Security Council” and “methods for the promotion of international co-operation in the political field”. These were studies carried out patiently, carefully, and seriously. In many respects, they were technical studies divorced from the heated atmosphere of the political propaganda debates which are so depressingly characteristic of the Assembly. Something has been done already by the Interim Committee, and much more remains to be done, and for that reason my delegation will support the continuance of the Interim Committee. We think it would be prudent and wise at this time to continue it for one further experimental year and then review the situation at the next regular meeting of the General Assembly.

I. (1) Canadian Statement, General Assembly, December 12, 1948: Korea.

The strong support given in Committee One to the resolution on Korea which is now before the Assembly, is a striking mark of confidence both in the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea and in the validity

of the process by which as the result of the elections observed by the Commission the Korean Government was constituted. The Canadian government fully shares this confidence. We believe that the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea has given valuable assistance to the emergence in South Korea of the government which has been represented at the Assembly. We regret that it has not been possible for the Commission to carry out its functions for the whole of Korea. That is not the fault, however, either of the Commission itself or of the people of Korea.

The Canadian delegation wishes to take this opportunity to congratulate the representatives of the Korean government who have come to Paris, on the able account which they have given of the reestablishment of democratic institutions in South Korea, and on the progress which is being made in the reconstruction of the political life of the community. We fully concur in the proposal made in this resolution that the United Nations should again send representatives to carry out the functions defined in the terms of reference stated in the resolution. We do not consider, however, that for these continuing functions, a Commission as large as that originally sent to Korea is necessary. Our preference would have been for a Commission of not more than five members. Consideration was not given in the Committee to the possibility of reducing the number of representatives. We do not wish now to start a debate on this subject. It is possible, however, for the size of the Commission to be reduced at least to seven by a simple procedure. One of the nine members named to the Commission a year ago has refused to participate in its activities, and has announced again this year that it will have nothing to do with the work of the Commission. We see no reason, therefore, why the Ukraine should continue to be a member of the Commission. The elimination of the Ukraine alone would leave a Commission of eight members. This is not a convenient number. We are prepared, therefore, ourselves to withdraw from the Commission, thus reducing the number to seven. To this end the Canadian delegation has circulated a document amending Paragraph (4) of the Korean resolution so that the Commission on Korea would consist of Australia, China, El Salvador, France, India, the Philippines, and Syria. In proposing this amendment we wish to reaffirm our full confidence in the work of the Commission, and in the competence of the members of the Commission who will continue to serve, if the amendment is adopted.

(2) General Assembly Resolution, December 12, 1948: Korea.

The General Assembly,

Having regard to its resolution No. 112 of 14 November, 1947, concerning the problem of the independence of Korea;

Having considered the report of the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea (hereinafter referred to as the "Temporary Commission") and the report of the Interim Committee regarding its consultations with the Temporary Commission;

Mindful of the fact that due to difficulties referred to in the report of the Temporary Commission, the objectives set forth in the resolution of 14 November, 1947, have not yet been fully accomplished; and in particular that unification of Korea has not yet been achieved;

(1) *Approves* the conclusions of the reports of the Temporary Commission;

(2) *Declares* that there has been established a lawful government (the Government of the Republic of Korea) having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the Temporary Commission was able to observe and consult and in which the great majority of the people of all Korea reside; that this Government is based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which were observed by the Temporary Commission; and that this is the only such government in Korea;

(3) *Recommends* that the occupying Powers should withdraw their occupation forces from Korea as early as practicable;

(4) *Resolves* that, as the means to the full accomplishment of the objectives set forth in the resolution of 14 November, 1947, a Commission on Korea, consisting of the following states: Australia, China, El Salvador, France, India, the Philippines, Syria, be established to continue the work of the Temporary Commission and carry out the provisions of the present resolution, having in mind the status of the Government of the Republic of Korea as herein defined and in particular to:

(a) Lend its good offices to bring about unification of Korea and integration of all Korean security forces in accordance with the principles laid down by the General Assembly in the resolution of 14 November, 1947;

(b) Seek to facilitate the removal of barriers to economic and social and other friendly intercourse caused by the division of Korea;

(c) Be available for observation and consultation in the further development of representative government based on the freely expressed will of the people;

(d) Observe the actual withdrawal of occupying forces and verify the fact of withdrawal when such has occurred; and for this purpose, if it so desires, request assistance of military experts of the two occupying powers;

(5) *Decides* that the Commission:

(a) Shall within thirty days of the adoption of the present resolution, proceed to Korea, where it shall maintain its seat;

(b) Shall be regarded as having superseded the Temporary Commission established by the resolution of 14 November, 1947;

(c) Is authorized to travel and consult throughout Korea;

(d) Shall determine its own procedures;

(e) May consult with the Interim Committee with respect to the discharge of its duties in the light of developments, and within the terms of this resolution;

(f) Shall render a report to the next regular session of the General Assembly, and to any prior session which might be called to consider the subject matter of the present resolution, and shall render such interim reports as it may deem appropriate to the Secretary-General for distribution to members;

(6) *Requests* that the Secretary-General provide the commission with an adequate staff and facilities, including technical advisers as required; and authorizes the Secretary-General to pay expenses and per diem of a representative and alternate from each of the States members of the commission;

(7) *Calls upon* the Member States concerned, the Government of the Republic of Korea, and all Koreans to afford every assistance and facility to the Commission in the fulfillment of its responsibilities;

(8) *Calls upon* the Member States to refrain from any acts derogatory to the results achieved by the United Nations in bringing about the complete independence and unity of Korea;

(9) *Recommends* that Member States and other nations, in establishing their relations with the Government of the Republic of Korea, take into consideration the facts set out in paragraph 2 of the present resolution.

**J. (1) Canadian Statement, Security Council, March 24, 1948:
Suspension of Partition Plan for Palestine.**

The plan of partition with economic union recommended by the Special Committee on Palestine and adopted by the General Assembly on November 29, 1947, was based on a number of important assumptions. Events which have taken place since that date, and in particular the information which the Council received last week concerning consultations which had taken place amongst the Permanent Members of the Security Council, have made it clear that the expectations held in November have not been realized.

In the first place, it was assumed that the two communities in Palestine would co-operate in putting into effect a solution to the Palestine problem which was recommended by the General Assembly. The manner in which it was proposed to distribute territory between the two communities was based on the expectation that common economic policies and common fiscal services would be adopted in a high degree of integration between Jewish and Arab States. Without this integration in economic union, neither state would be able to organize satisfactorily even such elementary matters as road and rail communications, telephone and telegraph lines, electric power and water supply. The responsibility for making the plan of partition with economic union work was to depend primarily on the people of Palestine themselves, and on their willingness to work together, particularly in economic matters. It has now become clear, however, that co-operation between the Jews and Arabs of Palestine to the extent assumed in the plan of partition is not realizable under present conditions.

The second basic assumption made during the Palestine discussions at the General Assembly was that the Mandatory Power would be able to give assistance in bringing the recommendations of the General Assembly into effect. When the plan of partition was first prepared by the United Nations Special Commission on Palestine, it was provided that the Mandatory Power should supervise, over a period of two years, the transitional arrangements necessary for its realization. After the Assembly had met, however, the Mandatory Power indicated that it would not play a major role in implementing a plan against the wishes of either the Arabs or the Jews of Palestine. After the Assembly rose, the Mandatory Power confirmed the indications it had given during discussions in sub-committee that it could not permit the delimitation of boundaries and the recruiting of local militia until after the mandate was terminated, since these activities would increase the problem of maintaining public order. For the same reason it could not allow the Commission to go to Palestine until May 1st. Preparations essential to the fulfilment of the plan have therefore been impossible to carry out and it is now clear that the co-operation of the United Kingdom in the execution of the plan cannot be expected beyond accepting the recommendation that the mandate be laid down, and permitting an advance party of the Secretariat of the United Nations Commission to undertake preparatory work in Jerusalem.

A third assumption made, in adopting the plan of partition, was that a resolution of the General Assembly on this subject would be accepted even by the Members of the United Nations which voted against it in plenary session. Thus, in spite of the opposition of the Arab States, the Assembly acted in the belief that a recommendation supported by at least two-thirds of the Members of the United Nations present and voting would have "a position close to law" and would not be opposed by any Member States. An active minority of the Members of the United Nations has refused to accept the recommendation of the Assembly. This minority includes all states adjacent to Palestine. The nations in question are now said to be assisting the organization of irregular forces to resist partition, and they have indicated that they are prepared even to use their own armed forces if outside forces come to the aid of the Jews.

It was also assumed, when the plan of partition was adopted by the General Assembly, that it would be possible to transfer authority for the Government of Palestine rapidly and progressively from the Mandatory Power to the Provisional Councils of Government of the new states. For this reason, it was not expected that the Palestine Commission would be required to do more than superintend the acceptance by the Provisional Councils of Government of the administrative and protective responsibility which the Mandatory Power was surrendering. In effect, it was expected that the role of the United Nations would be no greater than to assist in the transfer of authority from the Mandatory Power to independent Arab and Jewish States. In practice however, it has not proved possible to put this procedure into effect. The progressive transfer of authority to the Councils of Government was not possible because the Mandatory Power did not consider that the situation in Palestine was such that the Palestine Commission could be permitted to enter Palestine until a fortnight before the termination of the mandate, and it was itself unwilling to take steps towards the establishment of local authorities to take over its administrative responsibilities. The Palestine Commission, therefore, if it were to function at all, would now have to undertake much wider responsibilities for administration following the termination of the mandate than was ever intended.

Finally, it was assumed in November that the Security Council would be in a position to take the initiative in maintaining peace in Palestine if difficulties arose there during the period of transition following the surrender of the mandate. It was recognized, by some states at least, that disorder might break out in Palestine, and it was assumed that agreement could be reached in the Security Council as to the measures necessary to be taken in that event. The report which we have recently received of the discussions amongst the Permanent Members of the Security Council indicates quite clearly, however, that agreement cannot be reached under present arrangements to take effective military action to keep order in Palestine.

What then are we to do? It seems then that if nothing is done either by the organized community of nations or by the states directly concerned, Palestine will become a scene of ever increasing violence and disorder. Both Jews and Arabs are prepared to fight for control of the country, and a bitter civil war seems likely to break out when the United Kingdom surrenders the mandate unless some alternative authority is established. The peace not only of Palestine but of the whole Middle East would be endangered. The interests of all members of the United Nations, and

particularly of the peoples who reside in this area, would be seriously endangered by such a calamity.

A brief but vigorous effort has been made to give effect to the plan of partition. It is now proposed that this effort should be suspended, at least temporarily. In considering this proposal, we should not overlook the conscientious and intelligent manner in which the Palestine Commission has endeavoured to carry out the task given it by the General Assembly and I should like to take this opportunity to bear tribute to the Commissioners and their advisers. The experience of the Commission has demonstrated, I think, that major tasks in the United Nations involving heavy responsibility should not be entrusted to commissions consisting entirely of small powers, especially if the larger powers are not in agreement that these tasks should be carried out. It is to be hoped, therefore, that if new plans for Palestine are to be considered, the responsibility for them will be assumed more directly by the powers which have major interests in that area.

There can be no doubt that the United States proposal for establishing a temporary trusteeship in Palestine presents certain difficulties which would have to be overcome. It is possible that the proposal might be resisted by both elements of the population despite the fact that a temporary trusteeship would not prejudice in any way an eventual settlement. It was not expected by either community that the period of mandatory power would be replaced by that of some other external authority after the termination of the mandate. Neither may be expected to welcome a decision which would mean that independence cannot now be granted to their people or that they must undergo a further tutelage. On the other hand the cooling-off period which a temporary trusteeship would provide would, however, have the great merit of giving an opportunity for moderate Jewish and Arab leaders to work out in a less unfavourable atmosphere a settlement of their common problems within the framework of the United Nations Charter. This period could be of short duration if these leaders were to address themselves with vigour and a mature sense of responsibility toward the settlement of their own problems by direct negotiation.

Alternative plans should be considered, but there is an obvious danger in our opinion that if the United Nations and the Council in particular is to turn from one course of action to another, without some assurance that the greatest possible amount of agreement and co-operation will be forthcoming from the states most directly concerned, we shall again encounter serious difficulties of implementation. Therefore in the circumstances the Canadian delegation is not at the present stage prepared to declare itself in favour of one course of action rather than another, until we have some evidence that there is a meeting of minds on the part of the countries most directly concerned on what the best course of action should be.

(2) General Assembly Resolution, May 14, 1948: Appointment and Terms of Reference of a United Nations Mediator in Palestine.

The General Assembly,
Taking account of the present situation in regard to Palestine,

I

Strongly affirms its support of the efforts of the Security Council to secure a truce in Palestine and calls upon all Governments, organizations and persons to co-operate in making effective such a truce;

II

1. Empowers a United Nations Mediator in Palestine, to be chosen by a committee of the General Assembly composed of representatives of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, to exercise the following functions:

(a) To use his good offices with the local and community authorities in Palestine to:

- (i) Arrange for the operation of common services necessary to the safety and well-being of the population of Palestine;
 - (ii) Assure the protection of the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites in Palestine;
 - (iii) Promote a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine;
- (b) To co-operate with the Truce Commission for Palestine appointed by the Security Council in its resolution of 23 April, 1948;
- (c) To invite, as seems to him advisable, with a view to the promotion of the welfare of the inhabitants of Palestine, the assistance and co-operation of appropriate specialized agencies of the United Nations, such as the World Health Organization, of the International Red Cross, and of other governmental or non-governmental organizations of a humanitarian and non-political character;

2. Instructs the United Nations Mediator to render progress reports monthly, or more frequently as he deems necessary, to the Security Council and to the Secretary-General for transmission to the Members of the United Nations;

3. Directs the United Nations Mediator to conform in his activities with the provisions of this resolution, and with such instructions as the General Assembly or the Security Council may issue;

4. Authorizes the Secretary-General to pay the United Nations Mediator an emolument equal to that paid to the President of the International Court of Justice, and to provide the Mediator with the necessary staff to assist in carrying out the functions assigned to the Mediator by the General Assembly;

III

Relieves the Palestine Commission from the further exercise of responsibilities under resolution 181 (II) of 29 November, 1947.

(3) Security Council Resolution, May 29, 1948: Palestine.

The Security Council,

Desiring to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Palestine without prejudice to the rights, claims and position of either Arabs or Jews,

Calls upon all Governments and authorities concerned to order a cessation of all acts of armed force for a period of four weeks,

Calls upon all Governments and authorities concerned to undertake that they will not introduce fighting personnel into Palestine, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Transjordan and Yemen during the cease fire and

Calls upon all Governments and authorities concerned, should men of military age be introduced into countries or territories under their control, to undertake not to mobilize or submit them to military training during the cease fire,

Calls upon all Governments and authorities concerned to refrain from importing or exporting war material into or to Palestine, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Transjordan and Yemen during the cease fire,

Urges all Governments and authorities concerned to take every possible precaution for the protection of the Holy Places and of the City of Jerusalem, including access to all shrines and sanctuaries for the purpose of worship by those who have an established right to visit and worship at them,

Instructs the United Nations Mediator for Palestine in concert with the Truce Commission to supervise the observance of the above provisions, and decides that they shall be provided with a sufficient number of military observers,

Instructs the United Nations Mediator to make contact with all parties as soon as the cease fire is in force with a view to carrying out his functions as determined by the General Assembly,

Calls upon all concerned to give the greatest possible assistance to the United Nations Mediator,

Instructs the United Nations Mediator to make a weekly report to the Security Council during the cease fire,

Invites the States Members of the Arab League and the Jewish and Arab authorities in Palestine to communicate their acceptance of this resolution to the Security Council not later than 6.00 p.m. New York Standard Time on 1 June, 1948,

Decides that if the present resolution is rejected by either party or by both, or if, having been accepted, it is subsequently repudiated or violated, the situation in Palestine will be reconsidered with a view to action under Chapter VII of the Charter,

Calls upon all Governments to take all possible steps to assist in the implementation of this resolution.

(4) Security Council Resolution, July 15, 1948: Palestine.

The Security Council

Taking into consideration that the Provisional Government of Israel has indicated its acceptance in principle of a prolongation of the truce in Palestine; that the States Members of the Arab League have rejected successive appeals of the United Nations Mediator, and of the Security Council in its resolution of 7 July, 1948, for the prolongation of the truce in Palestine; and that there has consequently developed a renewal of hostilities in Palestine;

Determines that the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter;

Orders the Governments and authorities concerned, pursuant to Article 40 of the Charter of the United Nations, to desist from further military action and to this end to issue cease-fire orders to their military and paramilitary forces, to take effect at a time to be determined by the Mediator,

but in any event not later than three days from the date of the adoption of this resolution;

Declares that failure by any of the Governments or authorities concerned to comply with the preceding paragraph of this resolution would demonstrate the existence of a breach of the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter requiring immediate consideration by the Security Council with a view to such further action under Chapter VII of the Charter as may be decided upon by the Council;

Calls upon all Governments and authorities concerned to continue to co-operate with the Mediator with a view to the maintenance of peace in Palestine in conformity with the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 29 May, 1948;

Orders as a matter of special and urgent necessity an immediate and unconditional cease-fire in the City of Jerusalem to take effect 24 hours from the time of the adoption of this resolution, and instructs the Truce Commission to take any necessary steps to make this cease-fire effective;

Instructs the Mediator to continue his efforts to bring about the demilitarization of the City of Jerusalem, without prejudice to the future political status of Jerusalem, and to assure the protection of and access to the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites in Palestine;

Instructs the Mediator to supervise the observance of the truce and to establish procedures for examining alleged breaches of the truce since 11 June, 1948, authorizes him to deal with breaches so far as it is within his capacity to do so by appropriate local action, and requests him to keep the Security Council currently informed concerning the operation of the truce and when necessary to take appropriate action;

Decides that, subject to further decision by the Security Council or the General Assembly, the truce shall remain in force, in accordance with the present resolution and with that of 29 May, 1948, until a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine is reached;

Reiterates the appeal to the parties contained in the last paragraph of its resolution of 22 May and urges upon the parties that they continue conversations with the Mediator in a spirit of conciliation and mutual concession in order that all points under dispute may be settled peacefully;

Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Mediator with the necessary staff and facilities to assist in carrying out the functions assigned to him under the resolution of the General Assembly of 14 May, and under this resolution; and

Requests that the Secretary-General make appropriate arrangements to provide necessary funds to meet the obligations arising from this resolution.

(5) Security Council Resolution, November 16, 1948: Palestine.

The Security Council

Reaffirming its previous resolutions concerning the establishment and implementation of the Truce in Palestine and, recalling particularly its Resolution of 15 July, 1948 which determined that the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter;

Taking Note that the General Assembly is continuing its consideration of the future government of Palestine in response to the request of the Security Council of 1 April, 1948 (document S/714);

Without Prejudice to the actions of the Acting Mediator regarding the implementation of the Resolution of the Security Council of 4 November, 1948;

Decides that, in order to eliminate the threat to the peace in Palestine and to facilitate the transition from the present Truce to permanent peace in Palestine, an armistice shall be established in all sectors of Palestine;

Calls upon the parties directly involved in the conflict in Palestine, as a further provisional measure under Article 40 of the Charter, to seek agreement forthwith, by negotiations conducted either directly or through the Acting Mediator on Palestine, with a view to the immediate establishment of the Armistice including:

- (a) The delineation of permanent armistice demarcation lines beyond which the armed forces of the respective parties shall not move;
- (b) such withdrawal and reduction of their armed forces as will ensure the maintenance of the armistice during the transition to permanent peace in Palestine.

(6) Canadian Statement, First Committee, November 22, 1948: Palestine.

The present situation in regard to Palestine represents a logical development in the series of events which began when the Palestine question was referred to the United Nations by the Mandatory Power in the spring of 1947. It is deplorable that this process has been interrupted by unnecessary violence with unhappy and even tragic consequences for the inhabitants of Palestine. By and large, however, the pattern of development has been a coherent, if at times a discouraging one. I think that its existence and the way that matters have been working out up to the present, gives a clue to what we should expect in the future.

The basic recommendation, which was first made by UNSCOP, and then confirmed by the General Assembly on November 29 last, was that the two communities in Palestine should be given a separate political existence. Many of us regretted the necessity of making this recommendation. Our motives in supporting it have been challenged, and our judgment violently attacked. However, so far as the delegation and government for which alone I have the right to speak, are concerned, our decision last year was sincerely and objectively taken after considering all the other possible solutions which had been proposed for this complicated and terribly difficult problem. We were honestly of the opinion that there was no practicable alternative to partition, and with other delegations we felt that this was the advice we should give to those most concerned. Some form of unitary or federal state would, of course, have been preferable, but there was no possibility of forcing political unity on the Arab and Jewish peoples of Palestine in a form which would not have been bitterly resisted by one side or the other. In these circumstances, the only thing we could do was to reconcile ourselves to the necessity of separation as the solution which seemed best in the circumstances. It was not the recognition of this necessity but the necessity itself which has been the source

of the difficult situation in which Palestine now finds itself. Let those who charge that this decision was the cause of all the bloodshed and destruction that have degraded the Holy Land in the last 12 months ask themselves whether there would have been peace and order in that area if a unitary state had been forced on the Jewish population of Palestine, or if the Assembly had made no recommendation at all.

The degree of separation and the geographical terms of the separation of the two communities, Arab and Jewish, in Palestine, were both matters of uncertainty when the Assembly first decided in favour of partition. We hoped then (though not blind to the obstacles and difficulties in the way) that it would have been possible for the two communities, though in separate states, to work together through a very considerable measure of economic integration. The resolution of November 29 was based on this assumption, which in turn led to the further assumption that a complicated distribution of territory which in other circumstances would have been quite unworkable, could be made between the two communities. Whether or not it was wise to make these particular assumptions is now a matter for history, but it is clear that *some* assumptions had to be accepted or no recommendation could have been made and this would simply have meant that nature would have been allowed to take its course. In any event, it is clear that expectations held last November were too optimistic because the conditions which would have made their realization possible did not exist. In certain respects it is perhaps more accurate to say these conditions were not encouraged or indeed permitted. It followed, therefore, that adjustments in the November plan would be necessary. This process of adjustment has been confused and, all too frequently, violent.

Violence has not, however, been the only force at work in Palestine and that, I suggest, is due in large part to the fact that there *was* a decision of the United Nations which involved not only the Assembly but the Security Council. Through the truce and mediation procedures initiated by the United Nations it has been possible to bring some external judgment to bear on developments in Palestine.

The situation which we now face is, therefore, a result of both the clash of arms which has taken place on the soil of Palestine, and of the efforts which the United Nations has made to limit and control this conflict.

What should we do now? The Mediator, whose death we all deplore and to whose memory I would like to pay a sincere tribute of gratitude and respect, answered that question in his last report, when he said:

“What is indispensable is that the General Assembly take a firm position on the political aspects of the problem in the light of all the circumstances since its last session, and that its resolution be so reasonable as to discourage any attempt to thwart it and to defy the Security Council order by the employment of armed force”.

There are certain basic elements in the situation as we see it which must be recognized if the Mediator's advice is to be taken. There are certain facts which *must* be accepted, if peace is to be restored and maintained.

(1) The emergence of an independent Jewish state in Palestine as recommended by the Assembly a year ago is one such fact which must be taken into account in the consideration of any further developments.

(2) No indigenous Arab authority has emerged in Palestine which has yet demonstrated its ability to take over authority in areas which are not under the control of the Jewish state.

(3) The additional territorial and political adjustments which must now take place in Palestine must be made, as far as possible, by the people of that territory themselves. The United Nations can and should make available its good offices in a number of forms, but the people who live in that area must bear the main responsibility for working out the terms of their own association. They can do this either directly or through mediation, but *they* must take responsibility for the decisions which are finally reached. If those who are directly concerned, refuse to participate in such negotiations and decisions, they will take on themselves a very heavy responsibility.

(4) This further process of settlement *must* be a peaceful one. The whole effort of the United Nations over the past year has been to keep, so far as possible, the peace in Palestine. Unfortunately we have not been able to prevent fighting from taking place. By and large, however, the truce has prevented large scale and continuous war and, in its most recent action, the Security Council has reaffirmed its determination that neither party in Palestine shall renew its efforts to settle this issue by force. The Security Council has recently gone further, and has pointed the way to peace by directing the parties to change the truce into an armistice.

The acceptance of this analysis of the situation and the decision to proceed on this basis will, of course, place heavy obligations and responsibilities on the Arab peoples of the Middle East. Those peoples will have to admit the futility of continuing to threaten what clearly cannot be accomplished, that is the extinction of the Jewish state, or to insist that they will not negotiate, directly or indirectly, with the representatives of, or on the basis of any recognition of, any Jewish state in Palestine. Whether we like it or not, a large part of the territory of the former Mandate of Palestine is now under the control of the Provisional Government of Israel. There seems to be no likelihood in the foreseeable future that this control will be taken from them. The Arab states may hold, and may sincerely and tenaciously hold, that this is an evil consequence of injustices which took place thirty years ago, but, even if this is the case, they cannot expect the United Nations to right ancient alleged wrongs in the face of recent history, especially when the redress of such alleged wrongs would bring bitter reproaches that new and worse injustices were being created.

We must deal with the fact that a Jewish state has come into existence and has established its control over territory from which it will not be dislodged, and we must address ourselves to the problem of regulating the relations of this community with its neighbours. I do not deny for a moment that this is a difficult circumstance for the Arab states to accept, but it is nevertheless the case, and it does not seem to me that the United Nations would be doing those states any service if it encouraged them, or even permitted them, to continue their efforts to destroy by arms the Jewish state.

On the other hand, the Jewish community must also make difficult decisions which will involve certain concessions. At the moment, its armies seem to be in a position where they could, if they so chose, establish themselves in almost the whole Palestine. If they did so, they would be openly defying the wishes of the international community. Last year's recommendation clearly indicated that, in the judgment of the world, the territory

of Palestine should be divided between two peoples, and that these two peoples should then make arrangements as quickly as possible to work together for their common good. We cannot force them to work together, but we can keep insistently reminding them that this is what was intended, and that if they act in a way which will destroy all possibilities for such co-operation, they will do so without the support of, and indeed, against the will of the United Nations. The Jewish community should realize, therefore, that it cannot have it both ways—it cannot have *all* the territory which was given it by the November 29 resolution, together with *all* the additional territory which it has been able to take by force of arms. In the adjustments which must now be worked out in Palestine by which the boundaries of Israel will be defined, the Jewish state itself must, in the interests, not only of its relations with its neighbours, but also of the international community of which it will form a part, place self-imposed limits on its demands. In return for this, the Jewish state has the right to ask for peace and recognition. It can hardly be asked to enter into negotiations for a settlement unless it is given some right to expect that such a settlement will mean peace for itself in Palestine.

The occasion is one which calls for statesmanship, and I am sure that, while there are extremists on both sides counselling rash and disastrous courses, which have nothing to do with wisdom or common sense, there are also resources of statesmanship on both sides through which the issue could be settled on an equitable basis. I hope we shall not be told by anyone that he is prepared to be statesmanlike only if somebody else is, because no move towards political understanding can be successful if it is approached in this way. If, and I know that this is a big "if", wisdom and sense are forthcoming, the Palestine problem can be solved.

The establishment of peace—political and military—in this area is, furthermore, a matter of general international concern, because if present conditions of confusion and disturbance are permitted to persist, the only beneficiary will be those international forces of discord and division who do not want any peace or stability anywhere except through the establishment of their own revolutionary and reactionary rule.

There is a further fact that the people—the great mass of people in Palestine—Arabs and Jews—who are the chief sufferers from the fighting that has taken place, are anxious for peace; especially after the terrors and bloodshed of the last year. Because of what has happened—and in spite of certain statements made in this Committee—there is, I think, a better chance for peace now than there was six months ago. Those most concerned now realize acutely what will happen if peace is not established soon.

So far as the action of this Assembly is concerned, I should like to see a decision taken which would incorporate the following principles, all of which must be taken together:

First, a recognition of the existence of a Jewish state. Possibly we need not wait for this action until the boundaries of that state are precisely and finally defined. I think, however, that we have the right to know that the state which we are recognizing—and this recognition would make it eligible for membership in United Nations—has committed itself fully to the principles of peaceful settlement which are embodied in the Charter and has shown its acceptance of these principles by giving effect to the truce and armistice arrangements which have been laid down by the Security Council.

I hope, in the second place, that the United Nations will establish some body—perhaps a small commission as has been suggested in the United Kingdom resolution—to make available its good offices to both the Jewish state and its neighbours in working out the arrangements by which they can define their geographical and political relations. In establishing this body, I think the Assembly should indicate that a final settlement must now be negotiated in Palestine and that it should take place within the framework of the truce and mediation proceedings which have been worked out since November 29 by the Assembly and the Security Council.

Finally, I think the Assembly should reaffirm the recommendation which it has previously made that there should be international control of Jerusalem, and should call upon both parties to co-operate in implementing this recommendation.

For the purpose of bringing about a decision in the Assembly along the lines I have suggested, the United Kingdom draft resolution which has been placed before us provides, I think, a good basis of discussion. It would probably be necessary, however, as we see it at present, to broaden the functions of the conciliation commission which is proposed in Paragraph 5 of that Resolution so that it would become, in effect, a commission of good offices to bring about a settlement through negotiations either directly between parties or through some form of mediation. The negotiations which this commission should initiate or which it may conduct should not, I think, be limited quite so precisely as is now the case in Paragraphs 3 and 5 of the United Kingdom resolution. It should also be stated in the resolution that one of the primary functions of the Commission should be to initiate negotiations, and the negotiations themselves should take into consideration both the November 29 resolution and the Mediator's Report as well as the situation which exists in Palestine under the truce.

I hope that in our future discussion of the United Kingdom resolution, modifications along these lines may be considered.

These, Mr. Chairman, are only general and preliminary considerations; certain principles which should, in our view, be incorporated in any recommendation which comes from this Committee. I realize full well that there is nothing more difficult in a situation such as we have in Palestine, than converting a principle into a practice, into a performance. I venture to hope, however, that, in the light of the decisions which the United Nations have already taken and, above all, in the light of the tragic events of the last year, we can now make such a conversion, and by doing so make an effective and lasting contribution to peace in the unhappy Holy Land of Palestine.

**(7) General Assembly Resolution, December 11, 1948: Palestine :
Progress Report of the United Nations Mediator.**

The General Assembly,

Having considered further the situation in Palestine,

1. *Expresses* its deep appreciation of the progress achieved through the good offices of the late United Nations Mediator in promoting a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine, for which cause he sacrificed his life; and

Extends its thanks to the Acting Mediator and his staff for their continued efforts and devotion to duty in Palestine;

2. *Establishes* a Conciliation Commission consisting of three States Members of the United Nations which shall have the following functions:

(a) To assume, insofar as it considers necessary in existing circumstances, the functions given to the United Nations Mediator on Palestine by the resolution of the General Assembly of 14 May, 1948;

(b) To carry out the specific functions and directives given to it by the present resolution and such additional functions and directives as may be given to it by the General Assembly or by the Security Council;

(c) To undertake, upon the request of the Security Council, any of the functions now assigned to the United Nations Mediator on Palestine or to the United Nations Truce Commission by resolutions of the Security Council; upon such request to the Conciliation Commission by the Security Council with respect to all the remaining functions of the United Nations Mediator on Palestine under Security Council resolutions, the office of the Mediator shall be terminated;

3. *Decides* that a Committee of the Assembly, consisting of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, shall present, before the end of the first part of the present session of the General Assembly, for the approval of the Assembly, a proposal concerning the names of the three States which will constitute the Conciliation Commission;

4. *Requests* the Commission to begin its functions at once, with a view to the establishment of contact between the parties themselves and the Commission at the earliest possible date;

5. *Calls upon* the Governments and authorities concerned to extend the scope of the negotiations provided for in the Security Council's resolution of 16 November, 1948 and to seek agreement by negotiations conducted either with the Conciliation Commission or directly with a view to the final settlement of all questions outstanding between them;

6. *Instructs* the Conciliation Commission to take steps to assist the Governments and authorities concerned to achieve a final settlement of all questions outstanding between them;

7. *Resolves* that the Holy Places—including Nazareth—, religious buildings and sites in Palestine should be protected and free access to them assured, in accordance with existing rights and historical practice; that arrangements to this end should be under effective United Nations supervision; that the United Nations Conciliation Commission, in presenting to the fourth regular session of the General Assembly its detailed proposal for a permanent international regime for the territory of Jerusalem, should include recommendations concerning the Holy Places in that territory; that with regard to the Holy Places in the rest of Palestine the Commission should call upon the political authorities of the areas concerned to give appropriate formal guarantees as to the protection of the Holy Places and access to them; and that these undertakings should be presented to the General Assembly for approval;

8. *Resolves* that, in view of its association with three world religions, the Jerusalem area, including the present municipality of Jerusalem *plus* the surrounding villages and towns, the most Eastern of which shall be

Avu Dis; the most Southern, Bethlehem; the most Western, Ein Karim (including also the built-up area of Motsa); and the most Northern, Shufat, should be accorded special and separate treatment from the rest of Palestine and should be placed under effective United Nations control;

Requests the Security Council to take further steps to ensure the demilitarization of Jerusalem at the earliest possible date;

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to present to the fourth regular session of the General Assembly detailed proposals for a permanent international regime for the Jerusalem area which will provide for the maximum local autonomy for distinctive groups consistent with the special international status of the Jerusalem area;

The Conciliation Commission is authorized to appoint a United Nations representative who shall co-operate with the local authorities with respect to the interim administration of the Jerusalem area;

9. *Resolves* that, pending agreement on more detailed arrangements among the Governments and authorities concerned, the freest possible access to Jerusalem by road, rail or air should be accorded to all inhabitants of Palestine;

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to report immediately to the Security Council, for appropriate action by that organ, any attempt by any party to impede such access;

10. *Instructs* the Conciliation Commission to seek arrangements among the Governments and authorities concerned which will facilitate the economic development of the area, including arrangements for access to ports and airfields and the use of transportation and communication facilities;

11. *Resolves* that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or authorities responsible;

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to facilitate the repatriation, resettlement and economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees and the payment of compensation, and to maintain close relations with the Director of the United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees and, through him, with the appropriate organs and agencies of the United Nations;

12. *Authorizes* the Conciliation Commission to appoint such subsidiary bodies and to employ such technical experts, acting under its authority, as it may find necessary for the effective discharge of its functions and responsibilities under the present resolution;

The Conciliation Commission will have its official headquarters at Jerusalem. The authorities responsible for maintaining order in Jerusalem will be responsible for taking all measures necessary to ensure the security of the Commission. The Secretary-General will provide a limited number of guards for the protection of the staff and premises of the Commission;

13. *Instructs* the Conciliation Commission to render progress reports periodically to the Secretary-General for transmission to the Security Council and to the Members of the United Nations;

14. *Calls upon* all Governments and authorities concerned to co-operate with the Conciliation Commission and to take all possible steps to assist in the implementation of the present resolution;

15. *Requests* the Secretary-General to provide the necessary staff and facilities and to make appropriate arrangements to provide the necessary funds required in carrying out the terms of the present resolution.

**(8) Canadian Statement, Security Council, December 2, 1948:
Admission of Israel to the United Nations.**

My very few remarks on this matter will be limited strictly to the question of procedure. In this regard, we support the reference of this matter in the normal way to a special committee, where we hope it will be dealt with as quickly as possible.

However, like the representative of France, we feel that there is a relationship between this question of urgency and the questions which are now under discussion in the First Committee. We are not yet certain what resolution will come from the First Committee, what it will contain; and we do not know, therefore, what obligations it will lay upon the peoples of Palestine.

Article 4 of the Chapter provides that membership in the United Nations shall be open to peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the Charter and are able and willing to carry out these obligations. But, in the case of the application which has been received from the Israeli authorities, these qualifications can, I suggest, be judged only in relation to the resolution which the General Assembly carries on the subject of Palestine. Until that resolution has been formulated, we shall not know what it will be necessary for the Israeli authorities to do in order to fulfil their obligations to the Organization, nor can we tell, of course, whether they will be able and willing to carry out these obligations. If the First Committee should adopt a resolution which makes adequate provision for a peaceful settlement in Palestine through the appointment of a conciliation commission which will work out, in consultation with those concerned, the necessary details of such a settlement, and if the Israeli authorities agree faithfully to endeavour to carry out the provisions of that resolution, then it may be possible to give speedy and sympathetic consideration to its application. If, on the other hand, the action which is taken in the First Committee proves unacceptable to the Israeli authorities, we might have to give the matter further consideration. If—although I think this is unlikely—for some reason or other, the First Committee is prevented from reaching any decision, while we might still wish to act on the Israeli application for membership, I nevertheless think we should wish to consider our actions in terms of that specific situation.

Therefore, while agreeing that this matter should go to the special committee, I hope that that committee, when it begins its work, will keep these considerations in mind and relate its consideration of this matter to what is going on in the First Committee and, ultimately, in the Assembly on this question of Palestine.

**(9) Canadian Statement, Security Council, December 17, 1948:
Admission of Israel to the United Nations.**

The Canadian delegation realizes that the United Nations has placed certain obligations and responsibilities on the Provisional Government of Israel and it is not unreasonable that this Government should request the privileges and advantages of membership in the United Nations. We should like to give immediate consideration to this request but, in the circumstances surrounding the termination of the session of the General Assembly in Paris, we have found it more difficult than we expected to give this application the careful consideration which we find to be necessary. I shall give one example of the kind of problem that has arisen for us.

In the course of the discussions which have taken place here and in the Committee on Membership concerning the application of Israel for membership in the United Nations, the boundaries of the area under the control of the Israeli authorities have been mentioned on a number of occasions. The Canadian delegation does not think it necessary to delay action on the Israeli application until boundaries have been finally established. The question of boundaries, however, has been raised in a manner which we think requires reflection.

If I understand correctly the remarks which have been made on this aspect of the question by the representatives of the U.S.S.R. and of the Ukraine, these representatives regard the Assembly resolution of November 29 as definitive and binding in every regard, including boundaries. In his statement before the Security Council on Wednesday last, the representative of the U.S.S.R. said:

"In our opinion, the territory of the State of Israel has been determined and delimited by an international instrument, that is, the resolution of the General Assembly of 29 November, 1947, which has not been revoked by anybody, and which remains in force. Not only does that resolution delimit the territory and boundaries of the State of Israel, but the resolution has a map appended to it, which can be consulted at any moment by any member of the Security Council or by anybody else. Thus, this question is undubitable."

I am not sure, however, what the representative of the U.S.S.R. intends in regard to boundaries. In his statement on Wednesday, to which I have already referred, he used the word "enforcement" in relation to these boundaries. He may, therefore, believe that the Security Council should take action to make sure that the Israeli authorities withdraw from all areas which are not assigned to them by the November 29 resolution and that, without reference to the realities of the situation in Palestine, the Security Council should also adopt measures to bring an Arab State into existence, by force if necessary, to take over the territories not assigned to the Jewish State under the November 29 resolution. It would be logical to assume also, that he considers that the Security Council should take the necessary steps to enforce economic union and all the other details of the November 29 resolution.

It seems to us that it would be extremely difficult to carry out the programme which is implied by the statement by the representative of the U.S.S.R. which I have quoted. I am not sure either that the Provisional

Government of Israel would wish to be made a member of the United Nations on these terms, or that the process of settlement in Palestine would be assisted by accepting the implications of this statement.

The position of the Canadian delegation is somewhat different. We regard the Assembly resolution as having the force of a recommendation, and we do not consider that the settlement which we hope will emerge soon in Palestine need conform precisely to any resolution of the Assembly. On the contrary, we consider that the Conciliation Commission recently established by the Assembly should be within the general principles laid down by the resolution of the Assembly, to seek a settlement in Palestine on any basis on which agreement amongst the parties can be reached.

This aspect of the question is, as I have already indicated, one to which we should like to give attention in detail. We do not wish to defer consideration of the Israeli application indefinitely. We should be grateful, however, for an opportunity to give the question more careful consideration. I hope, therefore, that the Council will not insist on taking a vote now on the Israeli application. I am impressed also by the reasons which the representative of France has given for a further brief delay, and I therefore give my support to the proposal which he has placed before the Council.

Appendix III

A. Extract from Canadian Statement, Second Committee, October 18, 1948: Work of the Economic and Social Council.

The Canadian delegation will not attempt at this session to pass broad judgement on the work of the Economic and Social Council. It is too early in the life of the Council for us to do so. After all, the Council has not been able to do more than take its first steps. It has established its machinery; it has begun to collect and to edit economic information; its first surveys have been published.

However, if we have not yet found in ECOSOC a cure for the world's economic ills, we have at least been permitted to gain from the fine work of the economic secretariat and also from some of the commissions, a clearer conception than has heretofore been possible, concerning the nature of these ills and also some knowledge of their extent. It has been shown to us, if we need showing, that in the economic world an ill wind blows good to no one. Nevertheless, the great tasks of the Economic and Social Council remain to be attempted and it is when those tasks have been tackled that judgment can best be passed.

These is something relating to organization which we should say. The Economic and Social Council has decided that both regional and functional agencies will be employed in the conduct of its economic affairs. In the Canadian view, it is of the utmost importance that great care and close attention be given unceasingly to the division of the duties which the regional and functional organizations are respectively to perform and to the co-ordinating or their activities.

A clear division of responsibility for the work to be done by the regional and functional commissions is obviously essential to ensure that everything that needs to be done is being done somewhere, and by the agency best qualified to do it. This clear division is equally important for the purpose of avoiding the same work being done twice over, with all the confusion and expense that accompany duplication. We foresee considerable difficulty in bringing about effective co-ordination. We suggest the difficulty can be met not merely by providing that the commissions report frequently and fully to the Council, or indeed to each other, but also by making sure that there is close working contact, not only between the heads of commissions, but between the staffs of the various agencies at working levels.

We ought, however, to keep clearly in mind that there is far more at stake than order and economy. What is at stake is nothing less than the unity of purpose, the comprehensive world outlook, that has been the goal of the United Nations and must still, despite discouragements, remain the goal.

Most of us consider that in the economic field the prospects are at least as good as anywhere for us, some day, to establish real and living co-operation between all member states. Moreover, we have to recognize that in the same field the dangers of narrow sectionalism are likewise present. It is for this reason that the Canadian delegation emphasizes the vital importance of the division of responsibilities, and of co-ordination between

the functional and regional agencies, and urges that our judgment in both manners be guided by a zealous concern for the ideals of United Nations.

It is not necessary, in our opinion, to make a detailed reply to the criticisms and attacks of the Soviet delegate on the Charter of the International Trade Organization.

These Soviet complaints are not new; they have gained nothing by this latest of many repetitions. Their refutation has been complete over and over again. They have been refuted word by word, line by line.

We *do* consider that those of us who have worked so long, so hard, so successfully to establish the I.T.O. and to conclude the Tariff Agreements need to make it quite clear to the Soviet representatives that we, the 54 nations that have signed the Final Act of Havana, are quite capable of protecting the interests of the people we represent. The help of the Soviet authorities in this respect is not necessary. We believe we ourselves to be better judges of what is in the interest of our own people than are the critical Soviet representatives.

Canada signed the Final Act in Havana because we were convinced that it was in our interest and the world interest to sign it. It was a true agreement; true in the sense that *we* think of an agreement; that is, one where no party to it insists on receiving every possible benefit for himself, but one wherein each is prepared to forego some advantages for the general good, one which meets the reasonable, the moderate, and often the modified needs of each for the benefit of all.

Fifty-four nations in all signed the Final Act, but it appears that these 54 were not able, while reaching a large area of agreement among themselves, to satisfy the Soviet Union. It appears that in this great example of international co-operation, we were unable to meet the unique, and peculiar, requirements for international co-operation which the Soviet Union lays down. That is a pity, but if the 55th nation cannot see its way clear to co-operate then the 54 will have to do the best they can without it. . . .

B. Canadian Statement, General Assembly, December 10, 1948: Declaration of Human Rights.

Before a vote is taken on the Draft Declaration on Human Rights in the form which it has now taken, I wish to make clear the attitude which the Canadian government adopts, generally, towards it.

In the first place, we regard this document as one inspired by the highest ideals; as one which contains a statement of a number of noble principles and aspirations of very great significance which the peoples of the world will endeavour to fulfil, though they will make these efforts variously, each nation in its own way and according to its own traditions and political methods. In an imperfect world, it is clearly impossible to secure a perfect application of all these principles immediately. The Charter itself commits the members of the United Nations to principles which are not yet applied uniformly throughout the world. The difficulties in the way of a full and universal application of the principles of the Declaration of Human Rights will be even more complex. We must, however, move towards that great goal.

The Draft Declaration, because it is a statement of general principles, is unfortunately, though no doubt unavoidably, often worded in vague

and imprecise language. We do not believe in Canada that legislation should be placed on our statute books unless that legislation can indicate in precise terms the obligations which are demanded of our citizens, and unless those obligations can be interpreted clearly and definitely in the courts. Obviously many of the clauses of this Draft Declaration lack the precision required in the definition of positive obligations and the establishment of enforceable rights. For example, Article 22¹ which gives the right to public employment to people irrespective of political creed might, unless it is taken in conjunction with Article 31², be interpreted as implying an obligation to employ persons in public service even if it was their stated and open desire and intention to destroy all the free institutions which this Declaration of Rights is intended to preserve and extend. Without those free institutions, which can only flourish in a liberal democratic society, there can be no human rights.

It is our view that some of the difficulties and ambiguities in this Declaration might have been removed had this document been reviewed by a body of international jurists, such as the International Law Commission, before final action was taken by the General Assembly; and we regret that the general desire to expedite this important matter has made such a reference impossible. If the Soviet delegation had had this in mind in their amendment, we would have been able to support it. But in their speeches, Mr. Vishinsky and Mr. Manuilsky showed that, for them, a reconsideration of this Declaration would merely mean a further attempt to include in it ideas which, in our view, are far removed from human rights: as far removed as a town meeting from a slave labour parade. We do not accept—and never will accept—the doctrine that the rights of man include only those which are sanctioned and sanctified by communist doctrine; that all other rights are to be outlawed as “fascist”, a word which once had a clear, if dread meaning in the dictionary of despotism, but which now has become blurred by its abuse to cover any person or any idea of which communism does not approve.

So far as the position of Canada in regard to the maintenance and extension of human rights is concerned, we shall, in the future, as we have in the past, protect the freedom of the individual in our country where freedom is not only a matter of resolutions but also of day-to-day practice from one end of the country to the other.

The freedoms to which I refer have developed in Canada within the framework of a system of law derived both from statutes, and from the judgments of the courts. We have depended for the protection of the individual upon the development of this system rather than upon general declarations. Because this method is in accord with our tradition, we shall continue to depend on it and to expand it as the need may arise. While we now subscribe to a general statement of principles such as that contained in this Declaration, in doing so we should not wish to suggest that we intend to depart from the procedures by which we have built up our own code under our own federal constitution for the protection of human rights.

In this regard, there is a special circumstance which applies to Canada. When some of the articles of the Draft Convention were adopted in committee, the Canadian delegation abstained, explaining that the subject under consideration was in some of its important aspects within the field

¹ Article 21 in text of the Declaration as finally adopted.

² Article 30 in text as finally adopted.

of provincial jurisdiction in Canada. I wish to make it clear that, in regard to any rights which are defined in this document, the federal government of Canada does not intend to invade other rights which are also important to the people of Canada, and by this I mean the rights of the provinces under our federal constitution. We believe that the rights set forth in this Declaration are already well protected in Canada. We shall continue to develop and maintain these rights and freedoms, but we shall do so within the framework of our constitution which assigns jurisdiction in regard to a number of important questions to the legislatures of our provinces.

Because of these various reservations on details in the Draft Declaration, the Canadian delegation abstained when the Declaration as a whole was put to the vote in committee. The Canadian delegation, however, approves and supports the general principles contained in the Declaration and would not wish to do anything which might appear to discourage the effort, which it embodies, to define the rights of men and women. Canadians believe in these rights and practice them in their communities. In order that there may be no misinterpretation of our position on this subject therefore, the Canadian delegation, having made its position clear in the committee, will, in accordance with the understanding I have expressed, now vote in favour of the resolution, in the hope that it will mark a milestone in humanity's upward march.

C. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, approved by the Third Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, December 10, 1948, (and accompanying resolutions).

Preamble

Whereas, recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world;

Whereas, disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people;

Whereas, it is essential if man is not to be compelled to have recourse as a last resort to rebellion against tyranny and oppression that human rights should be protected by the rule of law;

Whereas, it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations;

Whereas, the people of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women, and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom;

Whereas, member states have pledged themselves to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

Whereas, a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

Now, therefore,

The General Assembly

Proclaims this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the people of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

Article 1

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience, and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional, or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 4

No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

Article 5

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 6

Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Article 7

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 8

Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

Article 9

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 10

Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Article 11

1. Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.

2. No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed.

Article 12

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 13

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

2. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14

1. Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.

2. This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 15

1. Everyone has the right to a nationality.

2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

Article 16

1. Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

2. Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

3. The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the state.

Article 17

1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.

2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Article 19

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 20

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
2. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 21

1. Everyone has the right to take part in the Government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.
2. Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.
3. The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of Government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Article 22

Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to the realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each state, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 23

1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.
2. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.
3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration, insuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.
4. Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

Article 24

Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 25

1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in

the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

2. Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Article 26

1. Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

2. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

3. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

Article 27

1. Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

2. Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 28

Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration can be fully realized.

Article 29

1. Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

2. In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

3. These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 30

Nothing in this declaration may be interpreted as implying for any state, group or person, any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

B.

Resolution relating to the right of petition

The General Assembly,

Considering that the right of petition is an essential human right as is recognized in the constitution of a great number of countries,

Having considered the draft article on petitions in document A/C.3/306 and the amendments offered thereto by Cuba and France,

Decides not to take any action on this matter at the present session;

Requests the Economic and Social Council to ask the Commission on Human Rights to give further examination to the problem of petitions when studying the draft Covenant on Human Rights and measures of implementation, in order to enable the General Assembly to consider what further action, if any, should be taken at its next regular session regarding the problem of petitions.

C.

Resolution relating to the fate of minorities

The General Assembly,

Considering that the United Nations cannot remain indifferent to the fate of minorities,

Considering that it is difficult to adopt a uniform solution of this complex and delicate question, which has special aspects in each State in which it arises,

Considering the universal character of the Declaration of Human Rights,
Decides not to deal in a specific provision with the question of minorities in the text of this Declaration;

Refers to the Economic and Social Council the texts submitted by the delegations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia and Denmark on this subject contained in document A/C.3/307/Rev. 2 and requests the Council to ask the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities to make a thorough study of the problem of minorities in order that the United Nations may be able to take effective measures for the protection of racial, national, religious or linguistic minorities.

D.

*Resolution relating to publicity to be given to the
Universal Declaration of Human Rights*

The General Assembly,

Considering that the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is an historic act destined to consolidate world peace through the contribution of the United Nations towards the liberation of individuals from the unjustified oppression and constraint to which they are too often subjected,

Considering that the text of the Declaration should be disseminated among all peoples throughout the world;

1. *Recommends* Governments of Member-States to show their adherence to Article 56 of the Charter by using every means within their power solemnly to publicize the text of the Declaration and to cause it to be disseminated, displayed, read and expounded principally in schools and other educational institutions, without distinction based on the political status of countries or territories;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to have this Declaration widely disseminated and, to that end, to publish and distribute texts, not only in the official languages, but also, using every means at his disposal, in all languages possible;

3. *Invites* the specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations of the world to do their utmost to bring this Declaration to the attention of their members.

E.

Resolution relating to the preparation of a draft Covenant and draft measures of implementation

The General Assembly,

Considering that the plan of work of the Commission on Human Rights provides for an International Bill of Human Rights, to include a Declaration, a Covenant on Human Rights and measures of implementation,

Requests the Economic and Social Council to ask the Commission on Human Rights to continue to give priority in its work to the preparation of a draft Covenant on Human Rights and draft measures of implementation.

Appendix IV

(A) Canadian Statement, Fifth Committee, September 26, 1948: Budget of the United Nations.

As other speakers before me, I have no intention of entering into a detailed analysis of the Budget nor of the Canadian position in relation to the other financial questions with which this Committee will have to deal. However, I do wish to intervene briefly to express my Government's general approval of the way in which those primarily concerned with the financial administration of the United Nations have carried out their tasks. I refer particularly to the Secretary-General and his subordinate officials, to the Advisory Committee, and to the Board of Auditors. There are, I am sure, many others whose work should be commended, but I am mentioning only those whose efforts come most obviously to attention.

It is unnecessary to indicate the importance my Government attaches to this question. From the beginning of the United Nations we have constantly emphasized the necessity for, and have supported, measures directed towards achieving efficient and economical standards for financial administration. We think a great deal of progress has already been made towards this end and we hope that this Committee, during its deliberations, may make some further contributions. In this connection, we were particularly happy to hear the Secretary-General state that, with one exception, he is prepared to accept the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. This spirit of co-operation and accommodation is to be highly commended. We hope it may be reflected in our discussions in this Committee.

In general my delegation approves the Budget and other financial recommendations, *subject to revision in the light of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and the Board of Auditors*. There will, of course, be a few items—mainly minor ones—on which we intend to make further suggestions for budgetary revisions. I do not propose to comment in detail on any of these items now as they can best be discussed in their proper context.

There are, however, two general observations which I should like to make at this time. In our opinion they are exceedingly important and merit the attention which I am sure will be given to them. The first has already been mentioned by a number of previous speakers, but I think that its great importance warrants some repetition here. It relates to the control of expenditures originating in the United Nations, its subsidiary organs, and the specialized agencies. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee and the representative of the United Kingdom have spoken of the necessity for national *delegations to maintain a consistent policy in all bodies of which they are members and to refrain from putting forward proposals which are not of an urgent nature and which might have the result of dissipating the limited resources available for essential international activity on projects which do not have a high priority*. With this suggestion the Canadian delegation is in complete accord. Nevertheless, in our desire for proper control and economy I would hope that we will not go to the opposite extreme and adopt the suggestion which the South African delegation seemed to make on this question. I understood him to recommend that a "work planning

committee" with broad powers to examine and exercise financial control over all the activities of the United Nations and specialized agencies might be necessary and desirable. As I recall, this matter was discussed at length last year, and it was as a result of those discussions that the Advisory Committee has reported to us on it. I wish to say now that my delegation strongly supports the conclusions reached by the Advisory Committee, that no further machinery should be created at this time.

In reaching this conclusion I am particularly mindful of the progress that has already been achieved towards attaining proper co-ordination in the works programmes and the financial procedures of the United Nations and the Agencies. In our opinion it is by such co-ordination, and by the exercise by national delegations of restraint and responsibility in putting forward proposals involving heavy expenditures that we shall attain the control over expenditures that is necessary. In this connection I should also like to refer briefly to the action taken by the Economic and Social Council, at its seventh session (just concluded), at which it approved a revision of its rules of procedure designed to bring the financial implications of proposals more quickly and forcibly to attention and also approved a resolution which lays stress on the principle that expenditures should be clearly limited to those for which provision has been made in the U.N. Budget, this latter principle to be waived only in cases of urgency specifically designated by the Council. It is our feeling that this move on the part of the Economic and Social Council goes far towards introducing a closer measure of financial control over its own activities, which represent a large proportion of the total expenditures of the United Nations. I have not yet seen any reference to this Council action in the documents before the Committee, but presumably this has been due to the late date at which the Council completed its work, and will be received later. However, I felt it necessary to mention this matter now because it is the feeling of my delegation that before more extensive or far-reaching suggestions are put forward the new procedure suggested by the Economic and Social Council should be given an opportunity to demonstrate its usefulness, and its application to the activities of the other Councils should be considered.

There is one other matter to which I would draw attention at this time. As you are all aware, there are now within the United Nations system a number of regional commissions, whose work is assuming an ever-increasing importance in the range of U.N. activities and whose expenditures show corresponding increases. Although Canada is not a member of any of these regional bodies, for reasons which are clearly known to all, we have taken a great interest in their activities. At the seventh session of the Economic and Social Council, just concluded, we felt it necessary to draw attention to the fact that unless steps are taken now to clarify certain of the financial aspects of the activities of the regional commissions they might ultimately give rise to certain procedural difficulties. As you know, the terms of reference of the regional economic commissions provide that their "administrative" expenditures shall be financed from the budgets of the United Nations. It is our feeling that an effort should now be made by the Secretary-General, and also possibly to the Advisory Committee, to study this matter and to recommend clear principles and procedures for determining those expenditures of the regional economic commissions which are to be considered as "administrative" and those which are not. I wish, Mr. Chairman, to assure my colleagues that in raising the question in the

Fifth Committee I have no desire to limit in any way the activities of these commissions. I know they are doing useful and important work, but I do feel that unless this particular question is considered fully, and proper procedures evolved, we may find ourselves in grave procedural difficulties in the future. It is not an issue which gives rise to immediate problems and perhaps therefore it will not require detailed discussion this session. My delegation felt, however, that it should be mentioned now so that this Committee might be appraised of the existence of this still theoretical question. I hope, however, that the Secretary-General, the Advisory Committee, and other delegations, will take note of this prospective problem, and will give it consideration in the course of their future work.

There are other matters on which my delegation will wish to make comments at a later stage but for the present we wished to make these preliminary remarks.

B. Canadian Statement, Fifth Committee, September 29, 1948: Scale of Contributions.

There are two separate proposals before us and I agree that they are organically related. In the opinion of my delegation the decision on the question of ceilings must vitally affect any decision we may finally make on the Report of the Committee on Contributions. I shall therefore first make certain general observations on the question of a ceiling.

The representative of the United States has requested that consideration should now be given to the establishment of a ceiling on the contribution of the United States. We understand the reasons for this request and we are in general agreement that the establishment of such a ceiling would be in the interests of the United Nations. We are also mindful of the fact that the United States has generously agreed these past two years to contribute a higher share of the budget than the proposed ceiling because of their recognition of the fact that many countries recovering from the effects of the war would have found it difficult, if not impossible, to increase their contributions at that time.

However, although we are in general agreement with the United States position on this matter, we feel that it would not be wise and indeed that it would be most impracticable to attempt to implement it before a more general revision of the scales of contribution is effected. Furthermore we feel that it would not be desirable to move too rapidly toward establishment of an absolute ceiling, but rather to consider it as an ultimate objective, to be attained as others are more able to bear the additional costs. For that reason, we were pleased that the United States representative formulated his recommendations on the basis that commencing in 1950, there will be a series of gradual reductions which, over a period of years, will result in the United States contribution being set at the desired figure.

There is, however, one major qualification which we must make at this time. It is the opinion of the Canadian delegation that under no circumstances should any country be required to make a greater per capita contribution to the budget of the United Nations than the United States or any other country which has reached the ceiling figure. Not only would it be most inequitable, but we would find it exceedingly difficult to justify to our parliament a payment which was higher on a per capita basis than

that of the United States. Accordingly, we shall support the United States position on this question, subject to the willingness of this Committee to accept as a corollary the principle that a ceiling shall be placed on the contributions of other Governments whose per capita contribution would therefore exceed that of the United States.

I submit that the acceptance of this principle need occasion no practical difficulties. A new formula could be devised and procedures worked out for computing contributions on a basis similar to those which were adopted when a ceiling was originally set on the contribution of the United States. It would merely necessitate the establishment of basic statistical series to reflect capacity to pay. This series would then be modified by reducing first the contribution of the United States to the general ceiling, and second, the contributions of other countries to a comparable per capita ceiling. Compensating adjustments would of course be made in the contributions of all other countries. I do not wish, Mr. Chairman, to unduly complicate this matter, but I think you will agree that the Canadian suggestion is a reasonable and equitable one, and introduces no insurmountable administrative difficulties. Accordingly, I hope that it will receive the support of other members of this Committee.

Having expressed our opinion on this general question, and assuming that this Committee will be studying this question further I should like the Canadian point of view on this question to be taken into consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the broader question of the contributions scale; last year when this Committee discussed the Report of the Committee on Contributions, the Canadian delegation agreed to accept its recommendations. Although we were not fully convinced that the scale adopted was fully equitable, we felt that it was probably the best that could be devised with the information available at that time. It was, however, our hope that by 1948 the Committee on Contributions would be in a position to recommend a scale which would be more in keeping with the facts, and which would more accurately reflect "capacity to pay" as defined in the Committee's terms of reference. Although we appreciate the difficulties which have made this impossible, we cannot help but express our profound disappointment at the absence of more definitive recommendations in the report which is before us today.

As you know, the share which Canada has assumed of the budget of the United Nations is an exceedingly heavy one in relation to our size, population and national income. By objective standards it is, in our opinion, higher than we should be required to pay. Nevertheless we have been quite happy to accept this additional load during the difficult post-war period because we have recognized the particular problems facing those nations devastated by the war, and because we have realized that, in many respects, Canada had been fortunate. We have gone further. In addition to paying a relatively heavy share of the budget of the United Nations we, along with certain other countries, have contributed large sums toward assisting other governments to overcome the difficulties brought on by the war. Now we feel that the time has come when it should be recognized that, to some extent at least, the dislocations and devastations of war are being overcome, and therefore the special exemptions granted to many countries should be subject to modification to reflect, in some small measure at least, the improvement in their position. We feel that our acquiescence in the original scales should not create a precedent which

would prejudice the establishment of more equitable scales at the earliest possible date. There are many countries which, by their own admission and by statements which have been given wide publicity, have admitted great improvement in their economic and financial position. While this situation is unfortunately, not universal, it is our opinion that, as quickly as possible, those countries should begin to absorb their fair share of the cost of maintaining this organization.

The Canadian delegation has expressed itself positively on this question because we feel strongly about it.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, we recognize that since the Committee on Contributions has not made definitive recommendations in its Report it would create serious procedural difficulties if we were to insist that the Fifth Committee attempt to develop a new scale on its own. Unless, therefore, this Committee decides that, despite the obvious difficulties, such an attempt will be made, we shall not press this year for the revisions which we consider are overdue but will conditionally agree to accept the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions that, for 1949, the existing scale, with minor modifications be adopted. In doing so, however, we must express the hope, or indeed, make the recommendation that a revised scale based upon the best statistics available should be put forward by the Committee on Contributions in its report next year so that by 1950, at the latest, the United Nations may have a more suitable basis for assessments. In this connection, we have noted that twelve countries accounting for 70% of the total contributions have published national income figures for 1947, and twelve others accounting for 13½%, had published estimates for 1946 or 1945. It is our impression that this represents an important proportion of the total contributions and we therefore feel that, regardless of whether a fully satisfactory scale can be devised next year, there can be important improvements on the existing scale. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, in signifying our qualified willingness to accept the recommendations for 1949 of the Committee on Contributions, we wish it to be known that we do so in a spirit of co-operation and accommodation, and with a desire to expedite the work of this Committee. We expect however that our desires for the future will be carefully taken into consideration by other delegations and by the Committee on Contributions. We must of course reserve the unqualified right to alter our position if, in the course of this discussion suggestions are made by other delegations which, if accepted, might involve significant variations in the present scales. Under no circumstances could my Government consider any contribution which would further increase the inequities within the present scale, and you will therefore appreciate that once the question of detailed changes is re-opened, we shall have to take a course which will safeguard our position.

Appendix V

A. Canadian Statement, Sixth Committee, December 7, 1948: Chilean Complaint against the U.S.S.R.

The Canadian delegation is in agreement with the Chilean delegation in the action which it has taken to bring before the United Nations a clear violation of the fundamental human rights to the guarantee of which members of the United Nations are committed by the Charter. My delegation wishes in particular to express its sympathy with the distinguished delegate of Chile, who has suffered so grievously himself from this violation of the right of a family to live together, a right which is the basis of society in all civilized countries—a right to which the Soviet Union, by its own laws and by its continuous instruction to its citizens, claims to be no less devoted than the other members of the United Nations.

While the Soviet Government has enacted increasingly strict legislation to strengthen the family and to discourage divorce in its own country,³ it has, on the other hand by the attitude it has adopted toward foreigners, broken up the families of persons legitimately married and created situations in which divorce has become inevitable. By refusing to grant exit visas, and by the exercise of those forms of pressure and intimidation which are the normal practice of the Soviet authorities, the Soviet Government has driven towards divorce husbands and wives who wish to live together and for whom divorce is contrary to moral and religious conviction.

We in Canada have had some experience with the paradoxical attitude adopted by the Soviet Union to the institution of the family. I have in mind the specific case of a former member of the staff of the Canadian Embassy in Moscow whose wife endeavoured for two years to secure an exit visa to join her husband and who eventually had to resort to divorce in circumstances similar to those which I have mentioned.

It is not only in its attitude towards Canadians who have recently married Soviet citizens that the Soviet Government has displayed its inhumanity. We too have experienced the frustration to which the delegate of the United States referred in seeking to communicate with Canadian citizens who find themselves—in many cases because of the misfortunes of war—trapped within the enlarged boundaries of the Soviet Union. Our persistent endeavours to reunite these persons with their families in Canada have been met with procrastination, prevarication, and in some cases with persecution of the persons concerned.

The Soviet authorities have never offered valid reasons for their behaviour. The Soviet delegate in this Committee has offered no answer now to the charges made by the Chilean and other delegates. Instead he has produced stale accusations and imaginative tales of happenings inside and outside his country, none of which is likely to appeal to those acquainted with the true facts of the cases which he has mentioned. It is perhaps not necessary for the Soviet delegate to give us the real reason, for it is—if I may borrow a Soviet phrase—well known. The Soviet Government consistently seeks to persuade its citizens that they enjoy a standard of life superior to that of any other country in the world. This illusion must not be destroyed

as it certainly would be, by contact with foreigners. As few Russians as possible must be allowed to go abroad, and none should be allowed to hope that he or she might escape from his rigorous life by marrying a foreigner—not even a citizen of those neighbouring states which are seeking to adopt the Soviet way of life.

My delegation is in agreement with the view cogently expressed yesterday by the delegates of Egypt and France. This is a question of the violation of fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person which we are all bound by the Charter to respect. I propose, therefore, to support the Chilean Resolution with the amendments proposed by Uruguay and France. Questions rightly have been raised in the Committee concerning the degree to which diplomatic privileges and immunities extend to the family of the Head of a Foreign Mission and as to whether the action of the Soviet Government in cases such as that raised by the Chilean delegate are breaches of international law. I am willing to agree with the proposal of the Australian delegation to refer these matters to the International Court of Justice, provided that such action is not considered simply as a means of disposing of the question. But whatever the Court might decide on the legal aspects of this case, we are here and now in a position to state that there has been a violation of the Charter by the Soviet Government and to ask the Soviet Government to rectify the wrong which they have done to all those who have been the victims of their policy with regard to persons within the Soviet Union who wish to join their families abroad.

Although, for these reasons, I do not wish to enter into the legal aspects of this matter, I should like to comment briefly on what the French delegate has referred to in his amendment as "excessive restrictions on diplomatic practices and also on the principle of reciprocity". I think that we should bear in mind, in judging the matter under discussion, that it is only one instance of the disregard of the principle of reciprocity in diplomatic relations practised by the Soviet authorities. The Soviet delegate has expressed surprise that the Chilean delegate has been so ungracious as to propose his resolution after he had enjoyed two years "hospitality" in Moscow. Mr. Pavlov must know, however, that his Government has increasingly abandoned the traditions of Russian hospitality by the discrimination it has practised against foreign diplomats and that foreign governments have shown the greatest forbearance in refusing to retaliate. There is surely no other government among the members of the United Nations which seeks to confine foreign diplomats to its capital city, which prevents its citizens from having any contact with the foreigners in its midst, which denies adequate customs privileges, which obliges foreigners to buy its currency at an outrageous rate of exchange arbitrarily applied and even on occasion confiscates the holdings of that currency by foreign missions. To justify these practices, and others more serious still which I shall not enumerate, the Soviet Government trumps up charges of spying which, in the eyes of the Canadian delegation are singularly inappropriate for the Soviet Government to level against any other countries.

My reason for mentioning Soviet behaviour towards diplomats in Moscow is simply to show that the case which has been brought to our attention is only one flagrant example of Soviet policy in this regard—a policy which is practised as much by subterfuge as by openly avowed discrimination. Such practices are in no way consistent with the obligations

of a country which has subscribed to the United Nations Charter, and the Assembly of the United Nations has every right to declare its disapproval in at least one case by supporting the complaint of the Chilean delegation.

B. General Assembly Resolutions, December 9, 1948: Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

A.

Resolution relating to the adoption of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and text of the Convention

The General Assembly

Approves the annexed Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and proposes it for signature and ratification or accession in accordance with its Article XI.

ANNEX

CONVENTION ON THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF GENOCIDE

The Contracting Parties,

Having Considered the declaration made by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolution 96 (I) dated 11 December, 1946 that genocide is a crime under international law, contrary to the spirit and aims of the United Nations and condemned by the civilized world;

Recognizing that at all periods of history genocide has inflicted great losses on humanity; and

Being convinced that, in order to liberate mankind from such an odious scourge, international co-operation is required;

Hereby agree as hereinafter provided:

ARTICLE I

The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

ARTICLE II

In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group;
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

ARTICLE III

The following acts shall be punishable:

- (a) Genocide;
- (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;
- (c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;
- (d) Attempt to commit genocide;
- (e) Complicity in genocide.

ARTICLE IV

Persons committing genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials or private individuals.

ARTICLE V

The Contracting Parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective Constitutions, the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present Convention and, in particular, to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III.

ARTICLE VI

Persons charged with genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the State in the territory of which the act was committed, or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those Contracting Parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE VII

Genocide and the other acts enumerated in Article III shall not be considered as political crimes for the purpose of extradition.

The Contracting Parties pledge themselves in such cases to grant extradition in accordance with their laws and treaties in force.

ARTICLE VIII

Any Contracting Party may call upon the competent organs of the United Nations to take such action under the Charter of the United Nations as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III.

ARTICLE IX

Disputes between the Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the present Convention, including those relating to the responsibility of a State for genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute.

ARTICLE X

The present Convention, of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall bear the date of

ARTICLE XI

The present Convention shall be open until 31 December, 1949, for signature on behalf of any Member of the United Nations and of any non-member State to which an invitation to sign has been addressed by the General Assembly.

The present Convention shall be ratified, and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

After 1 January, 1950, the present Convention may be acceded to on behalf of any Member of the United Nations and of any non-member State which has received an invitation as aforesaid.

Instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XII

Any Contracting Party may at any time, by notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, extend the application of the present Convention to all or any of the territories for the conduct of whose foreign relations that Contracting Party is responsible.

ARTICLE XIII

On the day when the first twenty instruments of ratification or accession have been deposited, the Secretary-General shall draw up a procès-verbal and transmit a copy of it to each Member of the United Nations and to each of the non-member States contemplated in Article XI.

The present Convention shall come into force on the ninetieth day following the date of deposit of the twentieth instrument of ratification or accession.

Any ratification or accession effected subsequent to the latter date shall become effective on the ninetieth day following the deposit of the instrument of ratification or accession.

ARTICLE XIV

The present Convention shall remain in effect for a period of ten years as from the date of its coming into force.

It shall thereafter remain in force for successive periods of five years for such Contracting Parties as have not denounced it at least six months before the expiration of the current period.

Denunciation shall be effected by a written notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XV

If, as a result of denunciations, the number of Parties to the present Convention should become less than sixteen, the Convention shall cease to be in force as from the date on which the last of these denunciations shall become effective.

ARTICLE XVI

A request for the revision of the present Convention may be made at any time by any Contracting Party by means of a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General.

The General Assembly shall decide upon the steps, if any, to be taken in respect of such request.

ARTICLE XVII

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall notify all Members of the United Nations and the non-member States contemplated in Article XI of the following:

- (a) Signatures, ratifications and accessions received in accordance with Article XI;
- (b) Notifications received in accordance with Article XII;
- (c) The date upon which the present Convention comes into force in accordance with Article XIII;
- (d) Denunciations received in accordance with Article XIV;
- (e) The abrogation of the Convention in accordance with Article XV;
- (f) Notifications received in accordance with Article XVI.

ARTICLE XVIII

The original of the present Convention shall be deposited in the archives of the United Nations.

A certified copy of the Convention shall be transmitted to all Members of the United Nations and to the non-member States contemplated in Article XI.

ARTICLE XIX

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the date of its coming into force.

B.

*Resolution relating to the study by the International Law Commission
of the question of an international criminal jurisdiction*

The General Assembly,

Considering that the discussion of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide has raised the question of the desirability and possibility of having persons charged with genocide tried by a competent international tribunal,

Considering that, in the course of development of the international community, there will be an increasing need of an international judicial organ for the trial of certain crimes under international law,

Invites the International Law Commission to study the desirability and possibility of establishing an international judicial organ for the trial of persons charged with genocide or other crimes over which jurisdiction will be conferred upon that organ by international conventions;

Requests the International Law Commission in carrying out this task to pay attention to the possibility of establishing a Criminal Chamber of the International Court of Justice.

C.

*Resolution relating to the application of the Convention on the
Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide
with respect to dependent territories*

The General Assembly recommends that Parties to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide which administer dependent territories, should take such measures as are necessary and feasible to enable the provisions of the Convention to be extended to those territories as soon as possible.

Appendix VI

Members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice and of Standing Committees of the General Assembly.¹

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Permanent Members

Canada
China
France
U.S.S.R.
United Kingdom
United States

Non-Permanent Members

Two-Year Term: Cuba
Egypt
Norway

One-Year Term: Argentina
Ukrainian S.S.R.

SECURITY COUNCIL

Permanent Members

China
France
U.S.S.R.
United Kingdom
United States

Non-Permanent Members

Two-Year Term: Cuba
Egypt
Norway

One-Year Term: Argentina
Canada
Ukrainian S.S.R.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Byelorussian S.S.R., Lebanon, New Zealand, Turkey, United States and Venezuela, to serve until December 31, 1949.

Australia, Brazil, Denmark, Poland, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, to serve until December 31, 1950.

Belgium, Chile, China, France, India and Peru to serve until December 31, 1951.

(i) *Economic and Employment Commission:*

Representatives of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Byelorussian S.S.R., Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Norway, Poland, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States.

Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability: Experts from Australia, France, Norway, Poland, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, to serve until December 31, 1949.

Sub-Commission on Economic Development: Experts from Brazil, China, Czechoslovakia, India, Mexico, U.S.S.R., United States to serve until December 31, 1949.

¹ Membership as of January 1, 1949, is given unless otherwise stated. For membership of these organs during 1948 see *Canada at the United Nations, 1947*, Dept. of External Affairs, Conference Series 1947 No. 1, pp. 272-276.

(ii) *Transport and Communications Commission:*

Representatives of Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, India, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Union of South Africa, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

(iii) *Fiscal Commission:*

Representatives of Belgium, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Lebanon, New Zealand, Pakistan, Poland, Ukrainian S.S.R., Union of South Africa, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States.

(iv) *Statistical Commission:*

Representatives of Canada, China, France, India, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States.

Sub-Commission on Statistical Sampling: Experts from France, India, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States to serve for an indeterminate period.

Committee on Statistical Classification: Experts from Canada, China, France, Netherlands, Norway, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States.

(v) *Population Commission:*

Representatives of Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Netherlands, Peru, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia.

(vi) *Social Commission:*

Representatives of Canada, China, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, France, India, Iraq, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Poland, Turkey, Union of South Africa, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia.

(vii) *Commission on Human Rights:*

Representatives of Australia, Belgium, Chile, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, Guatemala, India, Iran, Lebanon, Philippine Republic, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and the Press: Experts from Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Philippine Republic, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities: Experts from Australia, Belgium, China, Ecuador, France, Haiti, India, Iran, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States.

(viii) *Commission on the Status of Women:*

Representatives of Australia, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Greece, Haiti, India, Mexico, Syria, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela.

(ix) *Commission on Narcotic Drugs:*

Representatives of Canada, China, Egypt, France, India, Iran, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, Poland, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia.

(x) *Economic Commission for Europe:*

Representatives of Belgium, Byelorussian S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia.

(xi) *Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East:*

Representatives of Australia, Burma, China, France, India, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippine Republic, Siam, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States. (Certain other states are admitted to associate membership without voting privileges).

(xii) *Economic Commission for Latin America:*

Representatives of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

Member Governments:

Argentina	Netherlands
Australia	New Zealand
Brazil	Norway
Byelorussian S.S.R.	Peru
Canada	Poland
China	Sweden
Colombia	Switzerland
Czechoslovakia	Ukrainian S.S.R.
Denmark	Union of South Africa
Ecuador	U.S.S.R.
France	United Kingdom
Greece	United States
Iraq	Yugoslavia

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Administering Trust Territories

Australia	New Zealand
Belgium	United Kingdom
France	United States

Permanent Members of the Security Council Not Administering Trust Territories

China
U.S.S.R.

Elective Members

To serve until December 31, 1949:

Iraq

Mexico

To serve until December 31, 1950:

Costa Rica

Philippine Republic

THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

- To serve until February 5, 1958:
 Abdel Hamid Badawi Pasha (Egypt)
 Hsu Mo (China)
 John E. Read (Canada)
 Bogdan Winiarski (Poland)
 Milovan Zoricic (Yugoslavia)
- To serve until February 5, 1955:
 Alejandro Alvarez (Chile)
 José Philadelpho de Barros e Azevedo (Brazil)
 Jules Basdevant (France)
 José Gustavo Guerrero (El Salvador)
 Sir Arnold Duncan McNair (United Kingdom)
- To serve until February 5, 1952:
 Isidro Fabela Alfaro (Mexico)
 Green H. Hackworth (United States)
 Helge Klaestad (Norway)
 Sergei Borisovitch Krylov (U.S.S.R.)
 Charles de Visscher (Belgium)

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions

- To serve until December 31, 1949
 O. Machado (Brazil)
 Sir William Matthews (United Kingdom)
 William O. Hall (United States)
- To serve until December 31, 1950
 Andre Ganem (France)
 Jan Papanek (Czechoslovakia)
 N. Sundaresan (India)
- To serve until December 31, 1951
 Thanassis Aghnides (Greece)
 C. L. Hsia (China)
 Valentin I. Kabushko (U.S.S.R.)

Committee on Contributions

- To serve until December 31, 1949
 K. V. Dzung (China)
 Jan Papanek (Czechoslovakia)
 James E. Webb (United States)
- To serve until December 31, 1950
 Rafik Asha (Syria)
 H. Campion (United Kingdom)
 M. Z. N. Witteveen (Netherlands)
- To serve until December 31, 1951
 René Charron (France)
 P. M. Chernyshev (U.S.S.R.)
 Seymour Jacklin (Union of South Africa)
 G. Martinez-Cabanas (Mexico)

Board of Auditors

The Auditor-General or corresponding official of each of the following countries:

- Canada, to serve until June 30, 1950
- Colombia, to serve until June 30, 1951
- Denmark, to serve until June 30, 1952

Investments Committee

- Leslie R. Rounds (U.S.A.) until December 31, 1951
- Jacques Rueff (France) until December 31, 1950
- Ivar Roth (Sweden) until December 31, 1949.

Appendix VII

List of Non-governmental Organizations in Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council

Category A

American Federation of Labour (United States)
International Chamber of Commerce
International Co-operative Alliance
International Federation of Agricultural Producers
International Federation of Christian Trade Unions
International Organization of Industrial Employers
Inter-Parliamentary Union
World Federation of Trade Unions
World Federation of United Nations Associations
(transferred from Category B at the sixth session of the
Economic and Social Council)

Category B

Agudas Israel World Organization
All-India Women's Conference (India)
Associated Country Women of the World
Boy Scouts' International Bureau
Catholic International Union for Social Service
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
Commission of the Churches on International Affairs
Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations
Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations for Consultation with
the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
Econometric Society
Friends World Committee for Consultation
Howard League for Penal Reform (United Kingdom)
Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production
International Abolitionist Federation
International African Institute
International Alliance of Women—Equal Rights, Equal Responsibilities
International Association of Democratic Lawyers
International Association of Penal Law
International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women and
Children
International Bureau for the Unification of Penal Law
International Committee of the Red Cross
International Committee of Schools for Social Work
International Conference of Social Work
International Co-operative Women's Guild
International Council of Women
International Federation of Business and Professional Women
International Federation of Friends of Young Women
International Federation of University Women
International Institute of Administrative Sciences

Category B—*Continued*

International Law Association
 International League for the Rights of Man
 International Organization for Standardization
 International Organization of Journalists
 International Social Service
 International Statistical Institute
 International Student Service
 International Transport Workers' Federation
 International Union for Child Welfare
 International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues
 International Union of Family Organizations
 International Union of Local Authorities
 International Union of Official Travel Organizations
 International Union of Producers and Distributors of Electric Power
 International Voluntary Service for Peace
 Liaison Committee of Women's International Organizations
 National Association of Manufacturers (United States)
 Salvation Army
 Women's International Democratic Federation
 Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
 World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts
 World Federation of Democratic Youth
 World Jewish Congress
 World Power Conference
 World Women's Christian Temperance Union
 World Young Women's Christian Association
 World's Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations

Category C

International Association of Lions Clubs
 International Federation of Secondary Teachers
 Rotary International
 World Organization of the Teaching Profession

The total number of organizations listed above is sixty-nine; of these nine are in Category (A) fifty-six in Category (B) and four in Category (C). All of these organizations are international organizations except the four organizations that are followed by the name of a State.

Appendix VIII

The following is a list of publications issued by the Department of External Affairs during 1948 on subjects relating to the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

1. *Canada and the United Nations, 1947.* (Conference Series, No. 1.)

2. Reference Papers:

No. 25—The International Trade Organization.

No. 28—Canada and the General Assembly, 1947.

No. 34—Views of Canada on Matters before the United Nations.

3. Reprints:

No. 50—War or Peace? (reprint of an interview with General McNaughton appearing in "New Liberty", February 28.)

4. Statements and Speeches:

No. 48/2 —Peace Through the United Nations.

No. 48/5 —The United Nations.

No. 48/12—The Present Position in Regard to International Control of Atomic Energy.

No. 48/13—National and International Unity.

No. 48/22—Problems of Canadian Security.

No. 48/23—Review of World Affairs.

No. 48/26—The International Control of Atomic Energy.

No. 48/30—The United Nations—Its Structure, Its Defects and its Accomplishments.

No. 48/37—The Moral Support of the United Nations.

No. 48/40—The Role of the Middle Powers in the United Nations.

No. 48/41—Views of Canada on Matters before the United Nations.

No. 48/50—Statement by Rt. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King. United Nations General Assembly, Paris.

No. 48/52—Canada and the Report of the Atomic Energy Commission.

No. 48/53—The Canadian Reply to Soviet Proposals.

No. 48/54—Statement on Atomic Energy.

No. 48/57—Statement on Atomic Energy (II).

No. 48/61—Statement on Palestine.

No. 48/63—Statement on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

5. External Affairs Monthly Bulletin:

June —Report on the Geneva Conference on Freedom of Information.

Excerpts from a speech of General McNaughton, May 10, 1948, on the International Control of Atomic Energy.

- July —Report of the meeting of the United Nations Advisory Committee of Information Experts.
 Report of the Second General Assembly of ICAO.
 Texts of the Vandenberg Resolution and Article 51 of the Charter.
 Item on the United Nations Interne Programme.
- August —Report of the First Assembly of the World Health Organization.
 Report of the Thirty-First Conference of the International Labour Organization.
 Canada's Faith in the United Nations—Excerpts from an address by General McNaughton to the United Nations Summer Course Lecture Series.
- September—Article on the International Court of Justice.
 Report on the Seventh Session of the Economic and Social Council.
 Report on the Second Meeting of the Interim Commission of the International Trade Organization.
 Article on the provisional agenda for the United Nations General Assembly and list of Canadian delegation.
 Item on the Extraordinary Session of UNESCO.
- October —Statement by the Rt. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King at the United Nations General Assembly, September 28.
 Report of September meeting of the International Refugee Organization.
6. "External Affairs".
- November—Current Report of the Third Session of the General Assembly.
- December —Current Report of the Third Session of the General Assembly.
7. Press Releases. The following Press Releases were on United Nations matters and include announcements of meetings, composition of Canadian delegations, texts of statements, the report on the implementation by Canada of recommendations of the Social and Economic Council, etc.
 Nos. 2, 4, 6, 12, 19, 25, 37, 49, 60, 61, 63, 71, 75, 77, 81, 82, 84, 87, 90.
8. Biographies. A number of biographies of Canadian delegates to United Nations meetings were also issued during 1948.
9. Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on February 13, 1946. Canada Treaty Series, 1948, No. 2.

10. INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION:

Final Act of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment held at Havana from November 22, 1947, to March 24, 1948 (including the Havana Charter for an International Trade Organization). Canada Treaty Series, 1948, No. 32.

Protocols and Declaration concerning the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade of October 30, 1947. Signed at Havana, March 24, 1948. Canada Treaty Series, 1948, No. 12.

Additional Protocols concerning the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade of October 30, 1947. Signed at Geneva, September 14, 1948. Canada Treaty Series, 1948, No. 30.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade of October 30, 1947, (consolidated text). Canada Treaty Series, 1948, No. 31.

11. INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION:

Final Act of the International Civil Aviation Organization Conference on Air Navigation Services in Iceland, held at Geneva from June 9 to 25, 1948. Canada Treaty Series, 1948, No. 17.

12. UNITED NATIONS APPEAL FOR CHILDREN:

Agreement between Canada and the Secretary-General of the United Nations concerning the United Nations Appeal for Children. Signed at Lake Success, N.Y., August 27, 1948. Canada Treaty Series, 1948, No. 29.

Appendix IX

United Nations Documents, 1948

A Selected Bibliography

The printed publications of the United Nations listed below may be procured in Canada through The Ryerson Press, 299 Queen St. West, Toronto, Ontario.

A. Main Reports

1. *First part of the Report of the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea, Volume 1*; August, 1948; 47 pp., 60¢ (Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Supplement No. 9) *First Part, Vol. 2, Annexes 1 to 8*; August 1948; 99 pp. \$1.50.
2. *Report of the Security Council to the General Assembly, 16 July, 1947 to 15 July, 1948*; September, 1948; 144 pp. \$1.50. (Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Supplement No. 2).
3. *Second Report of the Atomic Energy Commission to the Security Council*; September 11, 1947; 263 pp. \$2.50. (Official Records of the Atomic Energy Commission, second year, Special Supplement).
4. *Third Report of the Atomic Energy Commission to the Security Council, 17 May, 1948; 27 June, 1948*; 71 pp. 75¢. (Official Records of the Atomic Energy Commission, third year, Special Supplement).
5. *Annual Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization, 1 July, 1947, to 30 June, 1948*; July 31, 1948. 135 pp. \$1.50. (Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Supplement No. 1).
6. *Report of the Trusteeship Council; 29 April, 1947, to 5 August, 1948*; August, 1948; 49 pp. 50¢. (Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Supplement No. 4).
7. *Report of United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans*; June, 1948; 36 pp. 50¢. (Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Supplement No. 8).
8. *Report of the Commission on Human Rights*; 59 pp. 60¢. (Official records of the Economic and Social Council, third year, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 1).
9. *Budget Estimates for the Financial Year 1949 and Information Annexes*; July, 1948; 271 pp. \$2.75. (Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Supplement No. 5).
10. *Report of the Palestine Commission, 10 April, 1948*; 39 pp. 50¢. (Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Special Session, Supplement No. 1).
11. *Report of the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly, 18 August, 1947, to 29 August, 1948*; September, 1948; 87 pp., 90¢. (Official records of the General Assembly, third session, Supplement No. 3).
12. *Reports of the Interim Committee of the General Assembly*; (5 January-5 August, 1948); October 26, 1948; 51 pp. 60¢. (Official Records of the General Assembly, third session, Supplement No. 10).

B. *Research Publications by the United Nations Secretariat*

1. *Economic Development in Selected Countries, Plans, Programmes, and Agencies*; October, 1947; 286 pp. \$3.00. (Department of Economic Affairs).
2. *Economic Report, Salient Features of the World Economic Situation 1945-47*; January, 1948; 354 pp. \$2.50. (Department of Economic Affairs).
3. *Supplements to the Economic Report, Salient Features of the World Economic Situation 1945-47, Discussion of the Report in the Economic and Social Council Sixth Session*; March, 1948; 140 pp. \$1.00. (Department of Economic Affairs).
4. *Foreign Exchange Position of Devastated Countries*; February, 1948; 85 pp. 50¢. (Department of Economic Affairs).
5. *Directory of Economic and Statistical Projects*; January, 1948; 130 pp. \$1.00. (Department of Economic Affairs).
6. *Reports on the Population of Trust Territories, No. 1; the Population of Western Samoa*; 17 January, 1948; 61 pp. 50¢. (Department of Social Affairs).
7. *Customs Union, a League of Nations Contribution to the Study of Customs Union*; 14 April, 1948; 98 pp. 75¢. (Department of Economic Affairs).
8. *International Cartel, League of Nations Memorandum*; April 15, 1948; 53 pp. 50¢. (Department of Economic Affairs).
9. *A Survey of the Economic Situation and Prospects of Europe*; April 15, 1948; 206 pp. \$2.50. (Prepared by the Economic Commission for Europe, and distributed by Department of Economic Affairs).

LIBRARY E A/BIBLIOTHEQUE A E



3 5036 20085217 9

REF

CA1 EA2 C17 ENG

1948

Canada and the United Nations

43205226