

# REFERENCE PAPERS

INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 28

May 10, 1948

## CANADA AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 1947

A brief survey<sup>x</sup> of the Canadian attitude to some of the main issues discussed at the Second Session of the United Nations General Assembly, held at Lake Success, N.Y., September 16 - November 29, 1947

### Canadian Attitude at the Second Session of the General Assembly

The Canadian delegation contributed to the constructive work of the Second Session of the General Assembly, giving its support to measures which were designed to strengthen the structure and operation of the United Nations and using its influence as much as possible to help offset the efforts of delegations which sought to obstruct the business of the Assembly. It also endeavoured to avoid the premature development of issues which might divide the Assembly to the point where the existence of the United Nations might be endangered.

In line with this policy, it supported proposals for increasing the usefulness of the Assembly, because of the extensive use of the veto, contentious issues for which the Security Council was intended to take primary responsibility were not being discussed or settled. Canada agreed that a continuing committee of the Assembly (subsequently set up as the Interim Committee of the General Assembly) could carry on some of the Assembly's functions between sessions and also provide the opportunity for frank discussion and thorough investigation of important issues not being dealt with by the Security Council. It also supported resolutions which called for the establishment of special commissions of the Assembly to investigate and observe and also assist in working out peaceful solutions to disagreements in the Balkans, Korea and Palestine.

In his opening statement before the General Assembly, the head of the Canadian delegation gave renewed assurances that membership in and support of the United Nations was a basic principle in Canadian foreign policy. Because it was considered by the Government that Canada should accept the responsibilities as well as the benefits of membership in the U.N., Canada decided to accept election to the Security Council. (Canada was elected to the Council on the first ballot with 41 of a possible 57 votes.) This decision was taken in full realization of the heavy obligations which would result, and of the Council's inability so far to provide any adequate means of ensuring international peace. It was suggested by the head of the delegation that if this failure continued, member nations in their search for peace and co-operation might have to seek greater safety in "an association of democratic and peace-loving states willing to accept more specific international obligations in return for greater national security." These could be formed within the United Nations. While not desirable, they might prove the only effective alternative to lack of international peace and security.

<sup>x</sup> The Department of External Affairs Report on the Second Session of the General Assembly (Conference Series, 1947, No.1) "Canada at the United Nations, 1947", will be available by May 31, 1948, and may be ordered from the King's Printer, Ottawa. Price, 50 cents.

## Composition of the Canadian Delegation

The Canadian delegation was headed by The Right Honourable L.S. St. Laurent, Secretary of State for External Affairs. The other representatives were: The Right Honourable J.L. Ilesley, Minister of Justice; Senator the Honourable Norman P. Lambert, Chairman of the Senate Standing Committee on External Affairs; Mr. Walter A. Tucker, Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs; Mr. Joseph Bradette, Chairman of the House of Commons Standing Committee on External Affairs.

The five alternate representatives were: Mr. L.B. Pearson, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs; Dr. George F. Davidson, Deputy Minister of National Health and Welfare; Mr. L.R. Beaudoin, M.P.; Mr. Sidney D. Pierce, Canadian Ambassador in Mexico; Mr. Escott Reid, now Assistant Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Instead of including members of the Opposition among the delegates as had been done for some previous Canadian delegations to international conferences during the formative stage of the United Nations, a new category of "parliamentary advisers" was established. One Progressive Conservative Senator and one Progressive Conservative Member of Parliament, a C.C.F., a Social Credit and a Liberal Member of Parliament were named to this group. The advice of the parliamentary advisers was sought and considered before any decision was made. The Government, however, accepted full responsibility for the policy of the delegation and made it clear that it did not expect opposition parties either to share this responsibility or to refrain from criticizing the decisions taken.

Other advisers were drawn from the Department of External Affairs and other government departments.

## BALKANS

On December 3, 1946, Greece brought before the Security Council the problem of guerrilla warfare along its northern border, alleging that assistance was being given by Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. In the ensuing debate, these countries denied the Greek charges, blaming the disturbances on a reactionary Greek administration, presence of foreign troops in Greece and the struggle for liberty that was being waged by free Greeks. The Security Council therefore set up a Commission of Investigation consisting of all members of the Council plus representatives of the four countries concerned. Its report was presented to the Council in June. The majority concluded that Yugoslavia, and to a lesser extent, Albania and Bulgaria, had supported the guerrilla warfare. The minority (the U.S.S.R. and Poland) defended the three accused countries and stated that the evidence supplied was untrustworthy. As no proposal could be agreed on in the Security Council, the matter was put on the agenda of the Assembly.

A majority of the members of the Assembly supported the findings of the majority group in the Commission. By a vote of 40 to 6 with 11 abstentions, the Assembly created a special Balkan Committee consisting of 11 members (representatives of Australia, Brazil, China, France, Mexico, the Netherlands, Pakistan, the United Kingdom and the United States, with places held open for the Soviet Union and Poland). The Committee, with headquarters in Salonika, was set up to maintain watch on Greece's northern border, observe the compliance by Greece, Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia with the Assembly's recommendation that they co-operate in peaceful settlement of their disputes and be available to assist the four governments concerned in implementing such recommendations.

The Soviet Union and other eastern European states which voted against the Committee announced that they would boycott it.

#### Canadian Position

Canada voted for the Resolution setting up the Special Committee for Greece. It was a Canadian proposal which resolved the problem of the composition of the committee. This proposal provided for Great Power membership on the Special Committee and its adoption ruled out the possibility of a committee composed only of representatives of the smaller states. It was the Canadian view that a committee on which the Great Powers were not represented might not enjoy sufficient prestige to enable it to perform its duties adequately in the troubled area of the Balkans. The principle of leaving places for the Soviet Union and Poland in case they changed their policy and decided to participate, was also made possible by the Canadian resolution.

#### KOREA

As the United States and Soviet Union failed during two years of attempts to agree on methods for establishing a Korean Government and ensuring the independence of Korea, the problem of Korea was put on the agenda of the General Assembly. The country had been divided, for occupation purposes, at the 38th parallel, with North Korea occupied by Soviet forces and South Korea occupied by the United States.

The United States proposed in the Assembly that a Temporary Commission on Korea, consisting of nine countries (Australia, Canada, China, El Salvador, France, India, the Philippines, Syria and the Ukraine), be set up. The Commission was to go to Korea to supervise the election of representatives of the people to consult with the Commission and to supervise a national election to be held not later than March 31, 1948, for a Korean National Assembly, which would form a Korean National Government. This Government would organize its own military forces and arrange for the withdrawal of all occupation troops in consultation with the Commission.

A Soviet proposal for simultaneous withdrawal of U.S. and Russian troops was rejected. The U.S.S.R. and other eastern European countries announced that they would boycott the Commission and all matters related to it and refused to participate in the voting.

#### Canadian Position

Canada supported the resolution for the setting up of a Commission rather than the Soviet proposal for the simultaneous withdrawal of troops, as it felt that the latter course would serve only to precipitate chaos and disunity if carried out before a national, democratically-elected government was formed.

#### TREATMENT OF INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA

During the 1946 General Assembly, India accused South Africa of discriminatory treatment of Asiatics in general and Indians in particular on the grounds of their race to such an extent that friendly relations between the two countries were impaired. A resolution was adopted which called on India and South Africa to work out a satisfactory solution to their differences in conformity with international obligations and the terms of the Charter, and to report back to the next session of the Assembly. The resolution, however, had no effect.

During the 1947 session, the Indian delegation introduced a resolution calling on India, Pakistan and South Africa to hold round-table discussions on the basis of the 1946 resolution. This failed to obtain the necessary two-thirds majority in the General Assembly. A proposal calling on the governments concerned to hold a conference to continue their efforts to reach conciliation (but without reference to last year's resolution) and, failing that, to submit the question to the International Court of Justice, was defeated. The Assembly therefore took no action in the matter since none of the resolutions secured the necessary majority to ensure adoption.

#### Canadian Position

The policy of the Canadian delegation at the Second Session of the General Assembly as regards the treatment of Indians in South Africa was to encourage a friendly settlement of the dispute between the two parties. It was the Canadian view that any resolution passed by the Assembly should not contain a judgment against either party since neither the facts nor the legal position in dispute had been established by an impartial tribunal. Canada therefore voted against the Indian resolution which implied such a judgment against South Africa, but supported a counter proposal which called upon the two governments and the Government of Pakistan to continue their efforts to reach an agreement through conference, mediation or conciliation and, failing that, to submit the question to the International Court of Justice. This resolution was defeated.

#### PALESTINE

The question of Palestine was referred to the General Assembly in April, 1947, by the United Kingdom, which asked for recommendations concerning the future government of the country. A special session of the Assembly set up a Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) consisting of the representatives of 11 countries, including Canada, which visited Palestine in June and July. It prepared a report incorporating majority (for partition) and minority (for federal state) proposals of how a Palestinian settlement could be achieved. The Arab states from the first gave no assistance to UNSCOP and maintained that Palestine should be a unitary state.

The General Assembly gave its support by a vote of 33 to 13, with 10 abstentions, to the plan of partition with economic union. Details of the partition plan were worked out by a sub-committee made up of countries, including Canada, which had declared themselves in favour of partition in principle. Under this plan, there would be separate Arab and Jewish states, with Jerusalem and its environs an international zone under the Trusteeship Council.

A second sub-committee made up of Arab supporters, all opposed to partition and in favour of a single government, recommended that a provisional government representing all important sections of the people in proportion to numerical strength be set up. This proposal was rejected.

The minority proposal for a federal state received no support from either Jews or Arabs and was not discussed seriously at the session. On the closing day, a Lebanese proposal for a federal state with separate Arab and Jewish cantonal governments was introduced, but as partition was voted on first, and adopted, no further consideration was given to this proposal.

### Canadian Position

The Canadian delegation considered that the plan of partition with economic union, which was the only proposal that seemed likely to receive the support of the Assembly, was, in the circumstances, worthy of consideration. It urged that any study of the partition plan should include an examination of methods for implementation and enforcement.

In discussions on the Palestine question, the Canadian representative attempted to ensure that any plan should be constitutionally sound, practicable and effective and that there should be an adequate legal basis for implementation. Canada also felt that responsibility for the maintenance of order in Palestine should devolve as quickly as possible on the people themselves. If this proved impossible, the problem should be dealt with in the Security Council, where big power support was necessary, by the methods provided in the Charter for settlements of threats to the peace.

In the General Assembly, Canada supported partition "as the best of four (partition, unitary state, federal state, no U.N. recommendation at all) unattractive and difficult alternatives". Canada's policy, admittedly pragmatic, was, if possible, to support a plan that did not make unrealistic demands on the United Kingdom nor leave Canada or other smaller states involved in an operation to which the permanent members of the Security Council did not give united support.

### WAR PROPAGANDA

In his opening speech before the General Assembly and on several later occasions, Mr. Vishinsky, Chairman of the Soviet delegation, made a number of allegations to the effect that efforts were being made in the United States and United Kingdom to incite a new war. He named individuals who, he said, were guilty of "war-mongering", and charged that a deliberate attempt was being made in the press of the western democracies to provoke an attack on the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet introduced a proposal making war-mongering a criminal offence and specifying that the United States, Turkey and Greece were the principal offenders. This was unacceptable to most delegations though it was felt that some more general resolution might be introduced. A joint Australian-Canadian-French resolution was finally adopted unanimously. It called on member nations to take steps to promote friendly relations and "to encourage dissemination of all information designed to give expression to the undoubted desire of all peoples for peace." It condemned all forms of propaganda designed or likely to provoke or encourage any threat to the peace or any act of aggression. Another resolution asked nations to study measures to combat the diffusion of false or distorted reports likely to injure friendly relations.

### Canadian Position

The Canadian delegation was of the opinion that no useful purpose would be accomplished by outright rejection of the Soviet resolution on war propaganda (as some countries wished), since it could then be argued that western states had rejected a proposal that propaganda inciting to war should be condemned.

The Canadian delegation therefore proposed a short resolution which dealt with the positive side of this question and urged members to promote, by all means of publicity and propaganda available, friendly relations among nations on the basis of the purposes and principles of the Charter. The joint Australian-Canadian-French resolution, which was adopted unanimously, was based mainly on the original Canadian proposal.

## INTERIM COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In his opening address before the General Assembly, the United States Secretary of State, General Marshall, said his delegation would introduce a resolution proposing the creation of a standing committee of the Assembly, consisting of all members of the United Nations. Because of the extensive use of the veto in the Security Council by the U.S.S.R., that body had frequently been unable to act even in matters of seemingly minor importance. Also, the agenda of each succeeding Assembly meeting was becoming heavier and it was increasingly difficult to cover all matters in the period allotted to ordinary sessions. Many delegations therefore agreed that some standing committee could well take on duties which would facilitate and expedite the work of the United Nations in general and make the General Assembly a more efficient working body.

As established, the Interim Committee of the General Assembly was to function until the next session. The advisability of making it a permanent "Little Assembly" would then be discussed. It was given power to consider matters referred to it by the Assembly, or any dispute or situation brought before the Assembly or Security Council, requiring preliminary study and rated as "important" by two-thirds of its members; to study methods of implementing Charter provisions for the study of methods of conciliation for the maintenance of peace; and to consider whether a special session of the Assembly should at any time be called to consider a particular matter. It could also conduct investigations and appoint commissions of inquiry provided the consent of the states concerned was given.

The U.S.S.R. and other eastern European countries declared that establishment of the Interim Committee was a violation of the Charter and that they would take no part in its work.

### Canadian Position

Canada supported the United States proposal to establish an Interim Committee of the Assembly. It was the Canadian view that the apparent failure of the United Nations to become an effective instrument for international co-operation was largely due to the failure of the Security Council to agree within itself and support was, therefore, given to the proposal to strengthen the functions of the General Assembly. The crowded agenda of each Assembly and the need for careful study of some of the more complicated items referred to the United Nations were other reasons which led the Canadian delegation to support this proposal. The Canadian representative was chairman of the sub-committee of 15 countries which drafted the resolution for the establishment of an Interim Committee. (The U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia did not take their seats). The resolution was finally adopted by a vote of 41 to 6 with 6 abstentions.

### CONSIDERATION OF THE VETO

During the 1946 Assembly session, the problem of the veto was discussed and a resolution adopted which requested the permanent members of the Security Council not to impede the effective operation of the Council by use of their special voting privilege. As the veto was still used frequently during the ensuing months, the Argentine delegation proposed a general conference to discuss possible amendment of the Charter so that the veto should be prohibited. The United States offered to waive its right of veto on all subjects except those concerning threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression, and suggested that the whole problem be referred for detailed study to the Interim Committee. Its resolution provided that the Interim Committee study the

veto in consultation with any committee the Security Council might designate, and report to the Secretary-General by July 15, 1948. Permanent members were also asked to consult on measures to ensure "prompt and effective exercise" of the Council's functions. The U.S. proposal was adopted by a vote of 38 to 6, with 11 abstentions.

#### Canadian Position

Canada supported the United States proposal to refer the veto problem to the Interim Committee for study and recommendation and opposed the proposal of the Argentine to call a general conference to abolish the veto. It was considered that the Argentine approach to this problem was neither opportune nor practicable since the abolition of the veto would require an amendment to the Charter which would be impossible without the concurring vote of the permanent members of the Security Council.

#### RELATIONS WITH SPAIN

At the 1946 session the Assembly passed a resolution which barred Spain from international agencies and conferences arranged by the U.N., asked members to recall their diplomatic representatives from Madrid and recommended that if a more democratic government were not formed, the Security Council should consider measures to be taken to remedy the situation. Since the Franco regime continued in power and the request for recall of heads of missions was not fully implemented (Canada had no diplomatic relations with the Franco government and was therefore not affected), the question of Spain was placed on the agenda again in 1947.

The resolution adopted by the Assembly expressed confidence that the Security Council would exercise its responsibilities as soon as it considered that the situation in regard to Spain so required. A paragraph in the resolution re-affirming last year's recommendation that members recall their diplomatic officials from Franco Spain failed to obtain the necessary two-thirds majority and was therefore deleted.

#### Canadian Position

A Polish Resolution (which was not adopted), calling for the imposition of sanctions against Spain, was opposed by Canada on the grounds that such action could not be taken except by the Security Council after it had been established that Spain constituted a threat to the peace. The Canadian delegation expressed the view that intervention might strengthen rather than weaken the Franco regime. Canada also considered that it would be unwise to re-affirm certain of the provisions of the 1946 resolution on Spain, particularly those which excluded Spain from membership in the various specialized agencies. Canada therefore voted against the paragraph in the final resolution which re-affirmed the 1946 decision of the General Assembly. However, as this section of the resolution was deleted in plenary session, Canada supported the proposal as a whole.

#### ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

During 1947 the Security Council considered for membership in the United Nations the following countries: Albania, Eire, the Mongolian Peoples' Republic, Trans-Jordan, Portugal, Hungary, Italy, Austria, Finland, Roumania, Yemen, Bulgaria and Pakistan. Yemen and Pakistan were unanimously recommended and all others turned down. On the conclusion of the peace treaty with Italy, the Soviet Union was asked to reconsider its

vote against that country. It was willing to agree to the admission of Italy on condition that Bulgaria, Hungary, Roumania and Finland were also admitted. This proposal was rejected by the Security Council.

In the General Assembly Yemen and Pakistan were admitted to membership. Following the Soviet veto of Eire, Portugal, Trans-Jordan, Italy, Finland and Austria, the Security Council was asked to reconsider these applications and the permanent members were requested to consult with a view to reaching agreement on applications. Another resolution asked the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion as to whether a member nation was entitled to make its support of one applicant subject to the condition that others be admitted, or to require conditions other than those included in the Charter.

#### Canadian Position

Canada voted for the admission of Pakistan and Yemen. During the discussions on the admission of new members, the Canadian delegation maintained that the conditions for membership in the United Nations should be those contained in the Charter (that a state should be peace-loving, also able and willing to assume the responsibilities imposed by the Charter) and not extraneous criteria such as were imposed by the Soviet Union. Canada initially opposed the suggestion that certain of the applications be sent back to the Security Council for reconsideration, on the grounds that this would be futile unless the permanent members of the Security Council would give an assurance not to exercise their veto power in relation to the admission of new members. In the committee debate, the U.S., U.K., China and France offered to waive their right of veto in this respect and the U.S.S.R. expressed willingness to consult on the matter but later expressed unwillingness to give up its veto. As the Committee decided to pass resolutions on this subject, Canada voted in favour of a re-examination by the Security Council of applications from Eire, Finland, Italy, Portugal, Austria and Trans-Jordan. Canada also supported the proposal to refer to the International Court of Justice the problem of what conditions could be imposed on the admission of new members.

#### TEACHING THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CHARTER

The Assembly unanimously passed a resolution which recommended that members encourage the teaching of the U.N. Charter, its purposes and principles, structure, background and activities in their schools. The proposal was introduced by the Norwegian delegate who felt that too much attention was given to political differences in the United Nations and that its positive work was largely being ignored.

#### Canadian Position

In the committee discussion, Canada abstained from voting when the resolution was adopted. In explaining the Canadian abstention, it was stated that "in Canada under our system of federation there is a federal government and nine provincial legislative assemblies. By our constitution the government of each province has complete jurisdiction and control over educational matters." Canada eventually supported the resolution in plenary session since attention had been drawn to the constitutional difficulties in committee and it was desired to support the principles contained in the resolution and to implement its recommendations as far as the Canadian constitutional system would permit.



## TRUSTEESHIP FOR SOUTH WEST AFRICA

At the 1946 session, the General Assembly passed a resolution, which was supported by Canada, with regard to South West Africa, "inviting" South Africa to place this mandated territory under trusteeship. South Africa, however, decided not to implement this resolution but instead permitted representatives of the territory to sit in the Union Parliament "as an integral portion" of that body.

The question was brought up at the 1947 session by India, which urged that a trusteeship agreement be submitted at the next session. In the plenary session, the strongly-worded Indian resolution was amended to express the "hope" that South Africa "may find it possible" to submit a trusteeship agreement by the next session.

### Canadian Position

Canada opposed the view of the Soviet Union that South Africa was under legal obligation to place South West Africa under trusteeship and quoted from records of the San Francisco Conference to show that the transfer of mandated territories to the trusteeship system was not obligatory. Canada voted against the Indian proposal which expressed disapproval of the failure of South Africa to comply with the Assembly resolution of 1946 inviting South Africa to propose a draft trusteeship agreement for the territory. This proposal was, however, adopted by the Trusteeship Committee. In the Assembly the resolution was somewhat modified, but Canada voted against it because it still seemed to imply that South Africa had refused to fulfil a legal obligation. It was also considered by Canada that the imposition of a time limit for submitting a draft trusteeship agreement would do nothing to help alter public opinion in South Africa. The resolution, however, was adopted by the Assembly.

### BUDGET

The 1948 budget of the U.N. was set at \$34,825,195, an increase of \$6,208,627 over 1947. The United Kingdom recommended an overall cut which would bring the total down to \$30,000,000, but it was decided instead to subject each item to a thorough examination in the interest of economy and efficiency. The Assembly approved the scale of members' contributions which ranged from .04% for many of the small countries to 39.89% for the United States. Canada's contribution is 3.2%, the seventh highest.

### Canadian Position

The Canadian delegation played an active part in the consideration of all administrative and budgetary questions. It was the Canadian view that the budget should not be reduced by an arbitrary figure but that individual proposals should be carefully examined to see whether economies could be effected which would not adversely affect the operation of the United Nations. The Canadian representatives were instrumental in focussing attention on a number of items in the proposed budget which proved capable of reduction. Canada was particularly concerned with the problem of budgeting control and proposed a rule of procedure whereby resolutions should not be recommended for approval by the Assembly until estimates of the expenditures involved had been obtained and considered. The substance of this proposal was adopted.

### SITE OF NEXT SESSION

It was agreed by the Assembly to hold the third regular session, opening on September 21, 1948, somewhere in Europe rather than in New York. The site was to be selected by a committee of nine countries in consultation with the Secretary General.

### Canadian Position

At the first session of the General Assembly in London, Canada favoured the permanent headquarters of the U.N. being established in Europe. As regards holding the third session in Europe, the Canadian delegation was of the view that the additional expense and the dislocation of the Secretariat overcame the advantages of the proposal. Since from the point of view of convenience Canada would have been better served by a decision to hold the next session in New York, the Canadian representative abstained from voting on this issue.

### RULES OF PROCEDURE

During the 1946 session of the General Assembly, the Canadian delegation urged that the Assembly's rules of procedure be revised. A Committee on Procedures and Organization was subsequently set up and instructed to meet two weeks before the opening of the second session to discuss the possibility of improving the existing rules. The Canadian representative was elected chairman. The report of this committee was discussed and amended in the administrative and budgetary and the legal committees during the 1947 session. The revised rules of procedure were adopted by the Assembly, to come into force on January 1, 1948.

---

(F.C.)

CANADIAN MEMBERSHIP ON MAIN UNITED NATIONS BODIES

1. The General Assembly - composed of all the members of the United Nations.
  - a) Interim Committee of the General Assembly - open to all members of the United Nations (six eastern European states - Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Ukraine, Yugoslavia and U.S.S.R. - refused to attend)
  - b) Temporary Commission on Korea - nine members. One of three special commissions set up by the 1947 General Assembly (other two: Special Committee on the Balkans, Palestine Commission)
2. The Security Council - eleven members, five permanent (the big powers) six non-permanent members elected for two-year terms. Canada a member until December 31, 1949.
  - a) Atomic Energy Commission - all members of the Security Council and Canada, which remains a member even when not on the Security Council.
  - b) Commission for Conventional Armaments - all members of the Security Council. Canada a member until December 31, 1949.
  - c) Committee of Experts (rules of procedure )  
Committee on the Admission of New Members )  
Standing committees composed of all members of the Security Council. Canada a member until December 31, 1949.
3. The Economic and Social Council - eighteen members, with six elected each year for three-year terms. Canada a member until December 31, 1948.
  - a) Commissions - of nine functional commissions under the Economic and Social Council, Canada is a member of five:
    - Economic and Employment Commission (15 members) - until December 31, 1949.
    - Statistical Commission (12 members) - until December 31, 1949.
    - Social Commission (18 members) - until December 31, 1950.
    - Commission on Narcotic Drugs (15 members) - until December 31, 1948.
    - Population Commission (12 members) - until December 31, 1949.
  - b) Sub-Commissions - of seven sub-commissions Canadian experts are members of two:
    - Committee on Industrial Classification (6 members) - indeterminate.
    - Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and the Press (12 members) until December 31, 1949.
  - c) Standing Committees - of four standing committees, Canada is represented on two:
    - Committee on Organization of the Council (all Economic and Social Council members) - until December 31, 1948.
    - Committee on Negotiations with Specialized Agencies (11 members) - indeterminate.
  - d) International Children's Emergency Fund (26 members) - indeterminate.
4. The International Court of Justice - fifteen judges, of whom five were elected for nine years, five for six years and five for three years. Canada is represented by John E. Read who was elected on February 6, 1946, to serve for three years.

CANADIAN MINISTERS OF THE CROWN

1. The General Assembly

- a) The House of Commons
- b) The Senate
- c) The Privy Council

2. The Executive Council

- a) The Prime Minister
- b) The Ministers of the Crown
- c) The Ministers of State
- d) The Ministers of the Privy Council

3. The Board and Social Services

- a) The Board of Health
- b) The Board of Education
- c) The Board of Social Services
- d) The Board of Social Services (continued)

4. The International Board

- a) The International Board of Health
- b) The International Board of Education
- c) The International Board of Social Services
- d) The International Board of Social Services (continued)