

## TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SIXTH PLENARY MEETING

*Held at Flushing Meadow, New York, on Saturday, 10 December 1949, at 10 a.m.*

*President: General Carlos P. RÓMULO (Philippines).*

### Budget estimates for the financial year 1950: report of the Fifth Committee (A/1232)

1. Dr. WITTEVEEN (Netherlands), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the report of that Committee on budget estimates for the financial year 1950, and the accompanying draft resolution (A/1232).

2. She pointed out that the report did not take account of the decision on Jerusalem which the General Assembly had taken the previous day. That matter would have to be dealt with at the current meeting.

3. The PRESIDENT drew attention to two matters before the General Assembly in connexion with the budget draft resolution. The first was an amendment to draft resolution II on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses, proposed by the delegations of Denmark, France and Lebanon (A/1233); it would be put to the vote in the usual way when draft resolution II was dealt with.

4. The second matter was the question of the inclusion in the budget draft resolution of the financial implications of the resolution on Jerusalem adopted by the General Assembly at its 275th plenary meeting. The normal procedure in such matters was for the Assembly, in adopting a resolution with financial implications, to take into account the opinion of the Fifth Committee on what those implications would be. When the Assembly had adopted the resolution on Jerusalem, it had had before it the opinion of the Fifth Committee on the budgetary implications (A/1234, paragraph 16).

5. The budgetary effects of the resolution had not been included by the Fifth Committee in its budget draft resolution, since at the time that it had drafted the budget resolution the Assembly had not yet taken a decision on Jerusalem. It would therefore be necessary for the budget draft resolution in document A/1232 to be modified by the introduction of an amendment to give effect to the resolution on Jerusalem. Inasmuch as the Fifth Committee had already advised the General Assembly of the financial implications, he would suggest that the Chairman of the Fifth Committee should submit a text for such an amendment.

6. He added that such a procedure was in complete harmony with the spirit and intention of the rules of procedure, and was not contrary to the letter of the rules.

7. Mr. KYROU (Greece), Chairman of the Fifth Committee, proposed that a new section, section 6 (b), should be added to part II of draft resolution I proposed by the Fifth Committee (A/1232). It should be entitled "Permanent international régime for the Jerusalem area and protection of the Holy Places", and would be for the amount of 8 million dollars. The total appropriation for part II would thus be increased from 3,808,300 dollars to 11,808,300 dollars, and the

total budget appropriation for 1950 would be increased from 41,641,773 dollars to 49,641,773 dollars.

8. It would, of course, be understood that in appropriating that sum the General Assembly would be endorsing the conclusions expressed by the Fifth Committee in its report on financial implications of the draft resolution proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/1234), including the proposal that there should be a special assessment of one-half of the total estimated expenditure under the new section 6 (b), and that a second assessment of the balance should depend upon the date of the implementation of the General Assembly's resolution concerning Jerusalem, as also on the probability of offsetting revenues and on the conditions that might exist later in the financial year.

9. Mr. CHAUVEL (France) wished to say a few words regarding the joint amendment submitted by Denmark, France and Lebanon (A/1233).

10. In raising a question which had already been the subject of two debates in the Fifth Committee and of two unfavourable votes,<sup>1</sup> the French delegation was aware that it might weary those representatives whom it had not been able to convince. If that were the case, it wished to apologize for its persistence and to ask representatives to listen patiently to the short statement which the French delegation felt it should make to justify the submission of the amendment which, together with the delegations of Denmark and Lebanon, who were associating themselves with that draft, it regarded as being of real importance.

11. If any justification were needed for bringing the question before the General Assembly, it would be found in the fact that the problem had not yet been discussed by a body capable of appraising all its aspects.

12. The Economic and Social Council wished to hold its eleventh session in Geneva for important political reasons. Those reasons had been repeated so often in the Council and at the General Assembly that it would be irksome to restate them. Moreover, they had been expressed forcefully and clearly by President Truman at the 237th plenary meeting when he had stressed the importance of people of other nations learning at first hand about the work of the United Nations and hence the value of sessions being held in other countries from time to time.

13. There was no question of asking that the main centre of the Organization's activities should be elsewhere than at New York, but since its activities were numerous and varied, it would be advisable, even necessary, in accordance with the spirit of President Truman's statement, that certain of the most important meetings should be held elsewhere than in New York.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly, Fifth Committee, 210th and 232nd meetings.*

14. So far that question had been discussed at the current session only by the Fifth Committee. The latter had to be the jealous guardian of the use of the Organization's funds, and had to be guided by a spirit of economy. But, while that spirit was necessary, it should not be the only reason for a decision on a problem which affected the influence of the Organization and which the President of the United States of America had felt was important enough to mention on one of the very few occasions when he had been with the Members of the General Assembly. Political considerations and those affecting the policy of the Organization should certainly be borne in mind.

15. That aspect could have been brought up before the Joint Second and Third Committee when the part of the Economic and Social Council's report which referred to its schedule had been discussed in a joint meeting with the Fifth Committee.<sup>1</sup> During that meeting, however, delegations had limited themselves to noting the Economic and Social Council's decision to hold its eleventh session at Geneva. No delegation had thought of contesting the soundness of that decision and even less of calling for its reconsideration.

16. The French delegation was therefore justified in asserting that the question—which it regarded as important—of the place of the meeting of the Economic and Social Council had not been discussed in all its aspects and that it had so far been subjected only to criteria of a technical or financial nature, the criteria of the Fifth Committee.

17. There was one aspect of the question which should not be neglected by the General Assembly, and that was that the decision before the Assembly raised a delicate constitutional problem. The Charter and the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council seemed to indicate that the Council itself was entitled to decide where it should meet. Article 72 of the Charter provided that the Economic and Social Council should adopt its own rules of procedure; rule 6 of the Council's rules of procedure said that each session should be held at the seat of the United Nations unless, in pursuance of a previous decision of the Council or at the request of the majority of its members, another place was designated. Nevertheless, while the Council had had permanent and extensive powers conferred upon it by the Assembly, it had not been given budgetary or financial independence. It was for the Assembly, therefore, to vote the appropriations required for the functioning of the Council.

18. There was thus some overlapping of jurisdiction, if not a contradiction of terms of reference. There would, therefore, seem to be some call for a constitutional adjustment, which the Assembly should endeavour to carry out. If, on strictly legal grounds, it invoked its absolute right to refuse appropriations to the Council, what became of the freedom to adopt its own rules of procedure, conferred on the Council by the Charter? The difficulty must be solved diplomatically and in a spirit of compromise. The Assembly should be careful not to overrule Council decisions, at

least when no extravagance was involved. It would be wrong in that connexion to assume that the Economic and Social Council might be forgetful of purely financial considerations, when its members had to bear not only their share of the general expenses, but also the travelling expenses of their delegations.

19. The French delegation, therefore, was not asking for the restoration pure and simple of the appropriations which the Secretary-General had proposed as a result of the Council's decision, and which the Fifth Committee had withheld. Mr. Chauvel thought that the Economic and Social Council should be asked to reconsider its previous decision in the light of the discussion which had taken place in the Assembly. If, after carefully weighing all considerations, it still maintained that decision, the Secretary-General should be authorized to draw upon the Working Capital Fund for the necessary amount. Authority for such a procedure could, moreover, be found in precedents established in circumstances which had been very similar.

20. Such would appear to be the logical and reasonable solution, ensuring at the same time respect for the rights of the Assembly and for the privileges of the Council; that was the purpose of the amendment submitted jointly by the delegations of Denmark, France and Lebanon.

21. Mr. Chauvel wished to recall briefly why the Economic and Social Council had been led to choose Geneva rather than any other place. There was no question of giving Geneva some sort of monopoly; but in the case at issue Geneva, thanks to its administration and premises, provided an answer in advance to any objections of a technical nature which might obscure the general and political aspects of the problem.

22. It was a fact that had never been disputed, certainly not by delegations taking part in its work, that the Council worked more easily and efficiently at Geneva than it did at Lake Success. Delegations were not obliged to spend a great deal of time in travelling; the heavy agenda of the summer session left no spare time for travelling to and fro, and the amount of working time was thus necessarily reduced. Moreover, in Geneva delegations had offices in the building in which they held their meetings, where they could prepare their work for the meetings in quiet and comfort and correspond with their Governments.

23. Political, constitutional and technical reasons united in favour of the amendment before the Assembly. It was those reasons which the French delegation was asking the Assembly to weigh against the strictly financial arguments governing the decision of the Fifth Committee. The French delegation hoped that, in view of the higher interests of the United Nations, a majority would be found in the Assembly to follow its example.

24. Mr. MUNIZ (Brazil) wished to make a statement on the report of the Fifth Committee. His delegation regretted that the solution proposed to the General Assembly regarding the repercussions of the devaluation of the florin on the remuneration of the members of the International Court of Justice would not make it possible to give immediately full effect to Article 32 of the Statute of the Court. The members of the Court would thus be left in a state of uncertainty,

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly*, Joint Second and Third Committee, 43rd meeting, and Fifth Committee, 220th meeting.

which, for reasons of justice and courtesy, should not have arisen.

25. The Brazilian delegation was confident that the Secretary-General would give careful consideration to the question of adjusting the remuneration of the members of the Court and that in doing so he would abide by the provisions of Article 32 of the Court's Statute.

26. It was furthermore convinced that he would take into account the economic changes which had taken place since the establishment of that remuneration, the eminent position held by the Court in the United Nations, the importance of its task and responsibilities, the obligations imposed upon its members and the position which it should be assured in The Hague so that it could enjoy there the status befitting the only principal organ of the United Nations situated outside New York.

27. His delegation trusted that the General Assembly, enlightened by such a report, would not fail at its fifth session to settle speedily and satisfactorily the question of the remuneration of the members of the International Court of Justice.

28. Mr. CRISTÓBAL (Philippines) said that the Fifth Committee had on two occasions voted against holding the meetings of the Economic and Social Council away from the New York headquarters. It was clear from the amendment submitted by the delegations of Denmark, France and Lebanon (A/1233) that an attempt was being made by certain delegations to reopen that question in another form. The amendment was couched in such apparently innocent language that it seemed at first sight to have no financial implications for the 1950 budget. A careful analysis of the proposal, however, revealed hidden financial implications.

29. To some delegations it would no doubt be a surprise to learn that the insignificant words "Unforeseen and extraordinary expenses" in the title of the amendment concealed the enormous sum of 200,000 dollars, which would be the additional expenditure involved if the Economic and Social Council was allowed to meet in Geneva. That was the sum the General Assembly was called upon to approve.

30. In support of his contention, Mr. Cristóbal pointed out that the budgetary term "Unforeseen and extraordinary expenses" meant expenses not included in the United Nations budget proper. Hence, when such expenditure was incurred, it was withdrawn from the Working Capital Fund of 20 million dollars. At the end of the 1950 fiscal year, that extra expenditure, including the amount set aside for the Economic and Social Council session in Geneva, would be shown against the Working Capital Fund of the United Nations, which the General Assembly was called upon to replenish every year.

31. The 1950 expenditure would, therefore, be increased by a sum of approximately 200,000 dollars. The sub-title of the proposed amendment "Unforeseen and extraordinary expenses" was plainly at variance with its object, since expenses could scarcely be classified as unforeseen when their purpose was clearly indicated by the amendment itself. The fact was that the United Nations budget for the next fiscal year having already been decided, the Working Capital Fund had been

the only heading under which that expenditure, albeit incorrectly, could be classified.

32. Such a procedure was not only an abuse of the Working Capital Fund; it also set a dangerous precedent for future budgets of the United Nations. The most peculiar feature of the amendment was the complete absence of any reference to dollars, although it involved a substantial financial implication of approximately 200,000 dollars. The last item on the Fifth Committee's agenda had dealt with the financial implications of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's report on the internationalization of Jerusalem and the protection of the Holy Places. That item alone would withdraw a modest minimum of 8 million dollars from the budget of the United Nations, thus bringing the total amount of the 1950 budget estimates far above the 1949 figures.

33. Sessions held away from the United Nations headquarters inevitably involved additional expenditure. If sessions were held elsewhere in Europe or in soft-currency countries, the effect of devaluation would at least render the additional expenditure less burdensome, but it scarcely seemed reasonable to meet in Geneva, where the currency was as hard, if not harder, than the dollar. While every attempt was being made to provide facilities in the United Nations headquarters, requests were made for meetings of subsidiary organs to be held elsewhere. There was no justification for holding the session in Geneva. Geneva would be a crowded city and the services provided, while less efficient than at headquarters, would cost more.

34. The Economic and Social Council had met in Geneva as recently as the previous year, and the Philippine delegation could see no reason why it should meet there again. Such a step would result in an unwarranted increase in the respective contributions of delegations for the 1950 fiscal year. The Philippine delegation, well aware of the difficult financial situation in which many countries were placed, could not vote for the amendment, which constituted a dangerous precedent for future budgets of the United Nations.

35. Mr. ARCE (Argentina) felt that the various organs of the United Nations should be able, within the limits of the budget, to select the place where their sessions should be held. For that reason, and in view of the fact that the Economic and Social Council was responsible for one of the most important branches of the United Nations duties, his delegation would vote in favour of the amendment presented by Denmark, France and Lebanon.

36. Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand) said that he had come to the rostrum to say a word for the forgotten man—the unfortunate and long-suffering taxpayer; and to oppose and analyse, in a spirit of mixed levity and indignation, the reasons which had been advanced, or which could be advanced, why the Trusteeship Council, in particular, should hold a meeting in Geneva in 1950. He wished to make it clear that he was equally opposed to any removal of the Assembly or of the Economic and Social Council from the headquarters of the United Nations. Accordingly, with great regret, he would vote against the amendment which had been presented to the Assembly and supported by the representative of France.

37. New Zealand had not selected New York as the headquarters of the United Nations, but it had accepted it. His suggestion was that once that matter had been decided, the only course was to accept it and abide by it.
38. He asked Members to consider the reasons that had been advanced for the proposal to take the Trusteeship Council to Geneva; he would draw attention to three points in particular.
39. There was a sum of \$36,000 provided in the budget for the extra cost of the proposed move. That was not the cost of meeting in Geneva; that was over and above what the cost would be were the meeting to be held in its normal place, namely, Lake Success. Thirty-six thousand dollars might not be much, but it was \$36,000 too much. Nor was \$36,000 the whole of the cost involved in the scheme. There was provision elsewhere in the budget for certain additional costs for the Geneva establishment, and to all that must be added the extra-costs involved for the delegations which would be represented, nearly all, if not all, of whom had officers who were stationed in New York for the purpose of attending the meetings and dealing with the business of the Trusteeship Council. They would all have to be sent to Geneva and given a subsistence allowance—a good one, for Geneva was an expensive place.
40. It was idle to claim that going to Geneva would save dollars, which were so hard to obtain; Swiss francs were just as difficult to obtain, as everybody knew.
41. One of the reasons that had been advanced was that it was good for the United Nations that its organs should meet throughout the world, so that the people could see what was being done. That was true as far as it went, but it did not go very far. Geneva was in Switzerland, the only country in the world that had decided that it wanted no part in the Organization. It could hardly be seriously suggested that the work of the Trusteeship Council was going to be so inspiring that the people of Geneva and the people of Switzerland would decide that they had made a mistake and that they must join the United Nations forthwith.
42. Nor could anyone imagine that a meeting of the Trusteeship Council would attract visitors from all over Europe and that because of the inspiring attraction of the Trusteeship Council, Europe would have a higher and deeper sense of the importance of the Organization. The Council had never drawn large audiences in New York.
43. It had also been suggested that, if the Council were to meet in Geneva, it would be nearer to some of the Trust Territories and that therefore it would be easier for them to be represented. It had been suggested especially in connexion with the proposal that the Council should meet in Geneva in January; that that would suit the convenience of the African Trust Territories. There was something in that; not very much, but something. It would be a little nearer for the Trust Territories in Africa—and, of course, it would be a good deal further for a number of others.
44. It had even been suggested that the Council should meet in Geneva in order to allow the Africans to see the transactions of the Council. Such an argument was the height of absurdity.
45. That led him to a very serious point. He was not opposed to the Trusteeship Council's travelling, but to its travelling unnecessarily. Members of the Assembly would have difficulty in believing that perhaps half the representatives in the Trusteeship Council had never seen a Trust Territory—and that was not confined to representatives of the non-administering Members. Very few had seen more than one or two, and in Sir Carl's opinion it should be made compulsory for every representative in the Trusteeship Council to see every Trust Territory, so that the problems would not be dealt with, as unhappily they so often were, as problems of paper. They were problems of flesh and blood—the most intricate, difficult and moving problems of human relations.
46. Thus, if the Trusteeship Council wanted to go travelling his suggestion would be that it should travel to a Trust Territory and hold its meetings there. That would have two beneficent results. It would enable the members of the Trusteeship Council more intimately to understand the problems with which they were confronted, and it would enable the peoples of Trust Territories, the wards of the Council, to see what the Council was doing and what it hoped to do.
47. There was another strange development. The original idea had been that the Trusteeship Council ought to go to Geneva in January because the African Trust Territories were to be considered at that time. But it had since been suggested to members of the Trusteeship Council that that was wrong, and that suggestion had been made after the Italian colonies decision and before the Jerusalem decision. It was now suggested that the Council should go there, not in January but in June.
48. Some very odd reasons, with which he would not waste the Assembly's time, had been advanced for that proposal. He would only say that if the Council proposed to go in June, then the only valid reason put forward, namely, that the Council was going to discuss the African Territories, was ruled out.
49. If he could see one adequate reason why the United Nations should spend an extra \$36,000, plus the additional sums that would be involved both for the United Nations and for the Members, he would raise no objection. But he could see none. No doubt in the course of the debate an endeavour would be made to show the representatives where the advantages were, and if the Assembly was convinced by those arguments it would vote for the proposal—experience showed that it would probably vote for it in any event.
50. He wanted very seriously and very earnestly to suggest that at a time when every Government was concerned as to where its funds were to be found, meticulous care should be taken to see that the Organization wasted nothing. He wished to move that draft appropriation resolution I for the financial year 1950 (A/1232) should be amended by the reduction of the appropriation provided under part I, section 4, "The Trusteeship Council and Commissions and Committees thereof", by an amount of \$36,000 to a total of \$139,750.
51. He asked that a roll-call vote should be taken on the proposal, so that the General Assembly, and the world, could see who was in favour of

careful and economical expenditure of United Nations funds, and who was not.

52. Mr. C. MALIK (Lebanon) said that he was opposed to the proposal to eliminate the budget appropriation for a meeting of the Trusteeship Council in Geneva in January 1950, and would vote against it.

53. He believed it was very important for the Trusteeship Council to meet in Geneva, particularly for the session of January 1950, because its agenda for that session would be filled with very important items, including the decision adopted by the Assembly at its preceding meeting if the Council did not dispose of that matter at its current special session.

54. It should be obvious to any Member who had the full success of that decision at heart that its discussion in the Trusteeship Council should take place in an atmosphere of calm, away from conditions which were not conducive to successful results. Mr. Malik was therefore opposed to the proposal just submitted by the representative of New Zealand.

55. Turning to the proposal before the General Assembly concerning the possibility of holding the eleventh session of the Economic and Social Council in Geneva (A/1233), of which his delegation was joint sponsor together with the delegations of France and Denmark, he stated that while several arguments had been adduced against it, some by the representative of the Philippines and some by the representative of New Zealand, the only real argument they had produced had been that of expense and the need for economy. The representative of France had explained very clearly that the matter was not merely one of expenditure, but had very important political implications. If the United Nations, which was pre-eminently a political body, were to disregard political considerations for the sake of purely economic considerations, it would not be fulfilling its functions.

56. The Economic and Social Council had already met in Geneva twice, in the summer of 1948 and the summer of 1949. The representative of New Zealand would recall that it had been under the eminent chairmanship of one of his own colleagues, who had been President of the Council in Geneva in the summer of 1949, that the Council had held one of its most fruitful sessions. There was no doubt that the Council's most successful work had been done at the two sessions held in Geneva.

57. Mr. C. Malik did not wish to disparage the meetings of the Council held in New York; there could be no doubt, however, that much time had been saved in Geneva, and that the splendid weather and the quiet atmosphere were very conducive to productive work. A change of scenery was also very helpful. Mr. Malik believed that political considerations, as well as those of efficiency, should be put above the question of expense; he was therefore convinced that the Council should be given a chance, if it so desired, to meet again in Geneva.

58. Europe was just recovering from the great and harrowing experience of the war; Europe remained, if not the centre of the world, then at least one of its major centres. The problems being

dealt with by the Economic and Social Council touched the very heart of the post-war European situation. By denying the Economic and Social Council the right to meet in Geneva, the Assembly would deprive Europe, as also the Economic and Social Council, of a possible great advantage. That was the real political significance of the issue.

59. With regard to the question of expense, Mr. Malik thought the arguments were exaggerated. In particular, he had made enquiries from authoritative sources concerning the figure of \$200,000 mentioned by the representative of the Philippines, and had been told that it was somewhat excessive. Competent authorities had told him that the maximum additional expenses that the resolution might entail, if the Economic and Social Council decided to meet in Geneva in summer 1950, would amount to \$120,000; it was quite possible that it would be below \$100,000. What was \$100,000, or even \$200,000, compared with the political advantage of holding a session of a major organ of the United Nations in Europe at the present time?

60. Mr. Malik added that, so far as the travelling expenses of the members of the Council were concerned, a considerable saving would be effected: in the case of most members, the cost of travel to Geneva would be less than that to New York. Furthermore, Geneva was less expensive than New York so far as the expenses of the members themselves were concerned.

61. The problem was not, however, a financial one. To adduce financial considerations in order to prevent the Economic and Social Council from meeting in Geneva was really to make use of more or less irrelevant pretexts in order to cover other possible hidden motives. It was important, as President Truman had said, and as the representative of France had quoted earlier in the meeting, that organs of the United Nations should meet from time to time in various centres of the world.

62. The representative of New Zealand had suggested that there were other countries the Trusteeship Council might visit. Mr. C. Malik would indeed be very willing to invite the Trusteeship Council to his own country, and he extended to the representative of New Zealand and other members of the Trusteeship Council a cordial invitation to meet in Lebanon in 1950. Members could be sure of being given every possible facility and they would find Lebanon far less expensive than either Geneva or New York.

63. He urged members to support the amendment submitted by Denmark, France and Lebanon (A/1233). Experience had shown that Geneva was a city eminently suited for sessions of the Economic and Social Council. The Council had already held two sessions there and they had proved a great success. Geneva was situated in the heart of Europe, which remained the centre of culture and of progressive international politics. It was also highly suitable for a summer session.

64. In conclusion, Mr. C. Malik associated himself with the view advanced by the representative of France that the United Nations should hold frequent meetings in various parts of the world so that its activities might be felt by people everywhere.

65. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) stated that although he had not intended to speak on the French amendment to the report, which his delegation supported, the statement made by the representative of New Zealand forced him to do so. The speech of the representative of New Zealand had no doubt been very amusing, but it was a speech which was an offence to all the members of the Economic and Social Council who had taken part in the two sessions which the Council had held in Geneva. Anyone who had listened carefully to the representative of New Zealand might have come to the conclusion that those who had participated in the meetings in Geneva had done nothing but amuse themselves and enjoy all the entertainment which Geneva could offer. He must make a very strong protest against that, and he was sure that all those who had been in Geneva would support his protest.

66. He had participated in both the Geneva sessions, which had been extremely difficult meetings. There had often been three meetings a day. The Council had met early in the morning and had adjourned late in the evening, using the time saved on travelling for further study and for more extensive work. Very few had used that time for amusement; probably less time had been spent on amusement than was spent in New York. Both sessions had proved that it was much better and more fruitful to work in Geneva than it had been at the two sessions in New York in which he had also participated.

67. The representative of Lebanon had spoken of a sum of \$120,000. It was important, however, to compare that sum with the expenses in New York, because it was estimated that the sum in the budget would not be sufficient for the meetings in New York and additional allowances from the Working Capital Fund would probably have to be made, so that in practice the sum came down to \$75,000. He wondered whether the discussions which had been evoked by the representative of New Zealand and by the opponents of holding a session in Geneva had not added quite significantly to the expense.

68. A further aspect of the matter was that the Economic and Social Council had decided by a majority vote to meet in Geneva. The Economic and Social Council was considered to be an important organ of the United Nations. It seemed scarcely wise to force the Economic and Social Council to reverse its decision, simply because of expenses which appeared quite slight in comparison with other and less important expenses. It would surely be more advisable to uphold that decision, since in so doing the Assembly would be upholding the authority and dignity of the Council.

69. Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) said that his delegation had listened with interest to the New Zealand representative.

70. For reasons of principle, however, it would vote against the New Zealand amendment and in favour of that of France, Denmark and Lebanon, which advocated that the Economic and Social Council should meet in Geneva.

71. Any decision of a political nature necessarily involved expense, but the Assembly and the other main organs of the United Nations could not be prevented from meeting away from the

permanent headquarters when they decided that it was appropriate to do so. In no case should financial reasons take precedence over political considerations. Anyway the expense entailed in the case in point was insignificant.

72. The delegation of Mexico would therefore vote in favour of the joint amendment of France, Denmark and Lebanon.

73. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the amendment proposed by the representative of New Zealand (paragraph 50).

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, India, Israel, Netherlands, New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand.

*Against:* Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Pakistan, Paraguay, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria.

*Abstaining:* Uruguay, Yemen, Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, Greece, Haiti, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Turkey.

*The amendment was rejected by 32 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.*

74. The PRESIDENT put to the vote part I of draft resolution I (A/1232).

*Part I was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

75. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the statement by the Chairman of the Fifth Committee (A/1240) with regard to part II of draft resolution I. It contained three modifications made necessary by the Assembly's decision to establish an international régime in Jerusalem. He would put those three items to the vote.

76. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel) asked for a separate vote to be taken on item (1), which proposed a new section 6 (b) for part II of draft resolution I.

77. The PRESIDENT put to the vote item (1) of document A/1240.

*Item 1 was adopted by 39 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions.*

78. The PRESIDENT put to the vote items (2) and (3) of document A/1240.

*Items (2) and (3) were adopted by 38 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.*

79. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the remainder of draft resolution I, from part II to the end.

*The remainder of draft resolution I was adopted by 49 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

80. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution I as a whole to the vote.

*The resolution was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

81. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution approving the United Nations budget for 1950 because it authorized the granting of funds for activities which contributed nothing to the maintenance of international peace and security and which violated the provisions of the Charter. In particular, that was the case with the appropriations for the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans, the United Nations Commission on Korea, the Interim Committee and the United Nations Field Service.

82. The USSR delegation had outlined its attitude on those questions in detail both in the General Assembly and in the First Committee and the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

83. It believed that the decisions taken by the majority on those questions represented violations of the Charter of the United Nations. It protested against the granting of credits for the above-mentioned activities and had, therefore, abstained from voting on the budget and on the supplementary appropriations.

84. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the amendment submitted by Denmark, France and Lebanon (A/1233) to draft resolution II on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses.

*The amendment was adopted by 37 votes to 9, with 5 abstentions.*

85. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution II, as amended.

*The resolution was adopted by 53 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

86. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution III, on the Working Capital Fund.

*The resolution was adopted by 53 votes to none, with no abstentions.*

87. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution IV.

*The resolution was adopted by 46 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

88. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution V.

*The resolution was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

89. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) drew attention to paragraph 45 (a) of the report of the Fifth Committee on the budget estimates for the financial year 1950 (A/1232).

90. The representative of the Secretary-General had stated at the last meeting of the Fifth Committee<sup>1</sup> that in his view that paragraph gave the Secretary-General the power to implement in part the report of the Committee of Experts on salary, allowance and leave systems. It was obvious that such an interpretation was in contradiction with the previous decision of the Fifth Committee that the report of the Committee of Experts should be examined by the Advisory Committee for report to the Fifth Committee at the fifth session of the General Assembly.<sup>2</sup> He therefore declared

that, without in any way wishing to curtail the authority vested in the Secretary-General by the Charter, his delegation considered that a decision of the Fifth Committee could not be reversed by the implementation of a plan which had yet to be studied by the Advisory Committee, the more so in that it had been on the initiative of the Advisory Committee itself that the report of the Committee of Experts had been drawn up.

91. Mr. VAN LANGENHOVE (Belgium) had three brief remarks to make. He wished first to pay tribute to the Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, Miss Witteveen. Her excellent and admirably clear report would be most useful to all those who had no close knowledge of the details of budgetary matters and who wished to have a general picture of the financial implications of the main activities of the United Nations.

92. His second remark was retrospective in character: his delegation associated itself with the Brazilian representative's observations and the regret he had expressed in connexion with the salaries of judges of the International Court of Justice.

93. His third remark concerned the point dealt with by the Polish representative in his last statement. Paragraph 45 (a), to which he had referred, invoked the authority of the Charter in connexion with staff salaries.

94. It was self-evident that the powers of the Secretary-General, in the question of salaries as well as in all other questions, derived from the Charter. The Assembly could do nothing outside the framework of the Charter. With regard to salaries, in particular, the powers of the Secretary-General had been defined by resolution 13 (I) of the General Assembly dated 13 February 1946. That resolution had not been cancelled; it was still in force and conferred on the Secretary-General the powers necessary to give effect to the proposals of the experts in so far as he deemed that necessary. The Belgian delegation had full confidence in the Secretary-General. It was convinced that, if he showed judgment and discretion in the use of his powers, he would be able to avoid confronting the Assembly with a *fait accompli* in the carrying out of a general salary reform.

### **Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner in Libya (A/1235)**

95. The PRESIDENT, speaking as the Chairman of the Committee established by the General Assembly by its resolution 289 B (IV) to nominate a candidate for the post of United Nations Commissioner in Libya, presented the report of that Committee (A/1235).

96. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) pointed out that resolution 289 B (IV) adopted in connexion with the disposal of the former Italian colonies stated: "The General Assembly, to assist it in making the appointment of the United Nations Commissioner in Libya, decides that a Committee composed of . . ." It further provided that if no agreement could be reached the Committee should nominate three candidates. In accordance with that resolution a candidate had been nominated by the Committee.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly, Fifth Committee, 235th meeting.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 228th meeting.

97. The Chilean representative asked in what manner the General Assembly could indicate its opinion in case it did not agree to the candidate proposed by the Committee; whether it could present other candidates and whether in that case rule 84 of the rules of procedure, providing that elections should be held by secret ballot, would apply.

98. The PRESIDENT replied that under resolution 289 B (IV) a Committee had been designated to nominate a candidate for the position of Commissioner in Libya. The Committee had reached a unanimous agreement, and the name of the candidate unanimously nominated was submitted to the General Assembly.

99. If the General Assembly desired to express its views on the subject, there would be an election. Rule 84 of the rules of procedure specified that all elections were to be held by secret ballot, and there were to be no nominations. The Assembly would therefore vote by secret ballot.

100. Mr. J. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to explain the vote he was about to cast. The USSR delegation had voted for the immediate granting of independence to Libya and it was therefore unable to accept the proposal for the appointment of a High Commissioner for that country.

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Borberg (Denmark) and Mr. Dendramis (Greece) acted as tellers.*

*Number of votes cast, 59;*

*Valid votes, 51;*

*Abstentions, 8;*

*Simple majority, 26;*

*Number of votes obtained:*

*Mr. Adrian Pelt, 28;*

*Dr. Jose Arce, 20;*

*Sir Mohammad Zafrulla Khan, 3.*

*Mr. Adrian Pelt was elected United Nations Commissioner in Libya.*

101. The PRESIDENT, on behalf of the General Assembly, wished Mr. Pelt every success in his new work.

### **Statement concerning the Greek question**

102. The PRESIDENT, speaking as Chairman of the Conciliation Committee, informed the General Assembly that the Committee had further informal conversations with the representatives of the Governments primarily concerned in the Greek question. It appeared from those conversations that there were encouraging prospects of peace. He was confident that the progressive improvement of relations between the States concerned could be assured if all parties would abide in good faith by the resolutions of the General Assembly and the provisions of the Charter. It was his hope that all parties would, of their own free will, do all in their power to heal the wounds left by the conflict of the last few years.

103. He had been informed by the representatives of Greece that no death sentences had been carried out in Greece since the enactment of the

recent clemency legislation. The Committee had expressed to the Greek representatives its belief that that fact might help to improve the situation between Greece and her Northern neighbours. The Committee hoped that the situation would continue to improve. Attitudes of humanitarianism and tolerance, compatible with security and public order, could not but help to facilitate the work of conciliation which must eventually take place among the States involved in the problem.

### **Closing of the fourth session of the General Assembly**

104. Mr. COOPER (United States of America) stated that the fourth Session of the General Assembly was to be judged in the context of modern times. All Members would wish that a greater spirit of harmony and understanding had prevailed, yet a remarkable degree of unity had been achieved. Fifty-three nations had united on the "Essentials of Peace." The demonstration that fifty-three nations were united gave him hope and faith that fifty-nine nations might become united. The General Assembly could never cease its efforts to turn unity into unanimity.

105. The Assembly had been unanimous in its action to initiate the technical assistance programme for the peoples of under-developed areas. It had also responded without dissent to other humanitarian needs, as in the case of relief for the refugees of Palestine. But the peoples of the world were also hungry for peace. He looked forward to the day when the Assembly would be able to duplicate in the political field the unanimity it sometimes achieved on economic and social problems. If it could extend that co-operative spirit over the whole range of its problems, a better world could be created.

106. The onward march of history had been dramatized by the decisions regarding the future of the former Italian colonies. A most constructive precedent had been established when the great Powers, finding themselves unable to agree, had undertaken to carry out the recommendations of the General Assembly. He regarded the decision to establish Libya as a free and independent State as a very important accomplishment. The current session of the General Assembly had also seen Indonesia approach the threshold of nationhood. He hoped that at its fifth session the General Assembly would be able to welcome as colleagues the representatives of the United States of Indonesia.

107. The Assembly had been grateful for the leadership and guidance of its President, General Carlos P. Rómulo, throughout its deliberations. The standard which he had set for himself and for the Assembly had inspired all members to give their best to the expedition of the work. The business-like way in which the General Assembly had performed its work, the serious-minded progress of debates within a rigorous schedule, had reflected his capable leadership. By his fairness towards all and his devotion to the ideals of the United Nations, General Rómulo had brought credit to his country, to himself and to the office of President of the United Nations General Assembly.

108. Mr. Cooper also wished to pay a tribute to the work of the Secretariat under the direction

of the Secretary-General and his able assistant, Mr. Cordier. The members of the Secretariat, pioneers in the international civil services, did more than serve; they inspired the Assembly by their devotion to a common cause.

109. Progress had been made on many issues during the current session, but the problems which confronted the Assembly were profound. They were rooted in the separate histories, cultures, economies, religions and philosophies of the different Member States. They would be resolved only by patience, hard work and a constant desire to co-operate towards their solution. The common cause of all Members was the peace and well-being of all peoples of the world.

110. The SECRETARY-GENERAL stated that, although the fourth session of the General Assembly had faced a heavier agenda than any previous session, the Assembly had completed that agenda without having to postpone any items to a second part of the session. It had, furthermore, in his opinion, taken action on a greater number of important problems than had any previous session.

111. It sufficed to mention such concrete and positive actions as the plan for the disposition of the former Italian colonies; the United Nations programme of technical assistance for economic development; the establishment of the United Nations Field Service and Panel of Field Observers; the decision to create a United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East; and the many resolutions strengthening the administration of the United Nations Trusteeship System and extending the scope of United Nations assistance to dependent peoples everywhere under Chapter XI of the Charter.

112. That solid and constructive record could not have been achieved without the skill, the tact and the dedication of that supremely eloquent spokesman of the United Nations, the President, General Carlos P. Rómulo.

*The Secretary-General proceeded to present to General Rómulo a specially mounted gavel, produced in the workshops at Lake Success, bearing the following inscription:*

"To General Carlos P. Rómulo, President of the General Assembly of the United Nations at its fourth session, with deep appreciation from the Secretariat."

113. Continuing his statement, the Secretary-General noted that the high degree of efficiency with which the Assembly had functioned had made an important contribution to the success of its work. Even with the heaviest agenda in its history, the Assembly had completed its fourth session in much less time than either the first or the third session.

114. One of the reasons for that greater efficiency was the experience gained at previous sessions. During no session had there been such close and happy co-ordination of effort between the officers of the Assembly and the responsible officials of the Secretariat. In that important function of co-ordination, the President and the Secretary-General had had the invaluable support of the Executive Assistant to the Secretary-General, Mr. Andrew W. Cordier, who, as in the past, had done so much to ensure that the work of the

Assembly was carried forward efficiently and under the best possible conditions.

115. The Secretary-General also commended the members of the staff—the Secretariat rank and file who had worked hard to provide the many essential technical services.

116. There were hundreds of other people who had helped the United Nations in its work during the preceding years. Among others, the Secretary-General paid a tribute to the members and secretariats of the Special Commissions and Committees which had sought to carry out the Assembly's bidding in trouble spots all over the world; in Korea, the Balkans, Kashmir, Indonesia, Palestine, and elsewhere.

117. The Secretary-General also expressed appreciation of the work of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, which had performed its difficult task devotedly and with good results under the leadership of its distinguished Chairman, Mr. Aghnides.

118. The Headquarters Advisory Committee and the Headquarters Planning Office deserved commendation for all that they had done to advance the building of the permanent headquarters in Manhattan. Stirring memories of the meeting held at 42nd Street on United Nations Day, 24 October—a day expressive of solid faith in the future of the United Nations and of renewed dedication to the achievement of its purposes—would be carried away by all delegations.

119. He expressed gratification at the growing practice of referring matters of law to the International Court of Justice for its opinion and judgment. It was a salutary trend for the judicial arm of the United Nations to be taking its rightful position in the general framework of the United Nations system as an instrument for the development of a world rule of law.

120. The fourth session of the General Assembly had demonstrated more convincingly than ever before the capacity of the United Nations to do constructive work for the progress of people toward a better life. It had taken decisions which would help hundreds of millions of human beings and which would also help to strengthen the United Nations itself, in that they provided for the development and use of additional tools of international administration, investigation and conciliation. The Assembly was thus building up the armoury of peace with new weapons against war and poverty and inferior status.

121. While there had been few recent signs of a lessening of tension in the great-Power conflict, the Secretary-General recalled that the adjournment of the first part of the third session of the General Assembly almost exactly one year previously had occurred in the shadow of the most dangerous great-Power conflict of all: the deadlock in Berlin. On that occasion the Secretary-General had expressed the belief that the real desire of the peoples of the world had been best expressed at that third session in the resolution introduced by Mexico and unanimously adopted [resolution 190 (III)]—the appeal to the great Powers to renew their efforts to compose their differences and establish a lasting peace.

122. The Secretary-General expressed the view that the great Powers had taken some positive

steps towards carrying out the spirit of that resolution during the year since its adoption. The Berlin deadlock had been broken, the Council of Foreign Ministers had met in June and the deputies had been carrying on their work towards agreement on an Austrian peace treaty in New York during the current session of the Assembly.

123. The General Assembly's resolution 299 (IV), asking the permanent members of the Atomic Energy Commission "to explore all possible avenues and examine all concrete suggestions with a view to determining whether they might lead to an agreement" on the question of atomic energy was in the spirit of the resolution introduced by Mexico the preceding year. So was the unanimous vote, in which East and West had united, in support of the United Nations programme of technical assistance for economic development (242nd plenary meeting).

124. If great progress had not been made towards settling or adjusting the basic conflict that had delayed peace and hampered the United Nations since the end of the war, the Secretary-General felt that it might fairly be said that in 1949 the United Nations had at least moved forward to a point where the world had reason to hope for a step-by-step resumption of real negotiation between both sides. That, in itself, would be a substantial improvement on the situation that had prevailed over the past three years—the mere reiteration of fixed positions instead of that flexibility and willingness to compromise in the common interest which were so essential to peaceful progress.

125. As the year 1950, the half-way point in the twentieth century, approached, the Mexican resolution of 1948 continued to stand as the expression of the unanimous will of the Members of the United Nations.

126. The Secretary-General expressed the sincere hope that the Governments of the great Powers, with the help of the smaller Powers, might make the coming year a true turning-point on the difficult road to a secure peace.

127. Mr. J. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in assessing the results of the General Assembly's fourth session, the USSR delegation saw no cause for satisfaction. The results of the session had not been very satisfactory mainly because the General Assembly had refused to condemn the preparations for a new war which were being made by certain countries, notably the United States and the United Kingdom.

128. Instead of making the fourth session of the General Assembly a session for the strengthening of peace, the Anglo-American bloc had done its utmost to use it to cover up aggression and preparations for a new war. While in the General Assembly the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom had made every effort to reject the proposals of the USSR which were calculated to strengthen international peace and security, the Anglo-American militarists were preparing, behind the back of the United Nations, a sinister plot against peace and were laying their plans of aggression against peaceful States.

129. The General Assembly had ignored those facts, although the attention of all the peace-

loving peoples of the world had been drawn to them.

130. The majority of the General Assembly had adopted a series of decisions contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and to the aims that Organization had set itself for strengthening international peace and security.

131. The delegations of the USSR and other peaceful countries had defended the cause of peace to the best of their ability. In the future they would continue to fight with all their strength against the warmongers and the enemies of peace.

132. Sir Alexander CADOGAN (United Kingdom) spoke of the long agenda of the closing session, which had, on the whole, been completed in a comparatively short space of time. Not the least among the items with which the Assembly had dealt and which it had approved were some modifications of the rules of procedure which would come into force at the following session and which he hoped would assist the President's successors in the conduct of the business of the Assembly.

133. On behalf of his own delegation and, he felt sure, on behalf of the other delegations, he would like to tender to the President his special thanks for the ability, efficiency, unfailing courtesy, tact and firmness with which he had conducted the debates. He wished also to address to the Secretary-General and to the whole of the Secretariat his thanks for the manner in which they had performed so efficiently the tasks devolving upon them in connexion with the fourth session.

134. In conclusion, he stated that he would not care to follow a precedent which had just been set, and which he hoped would not prove to be a permanent one, of returning to some of the decisions of the General Assembly and taking exception to a decision adopted by an overwhelming vote.

135. Mr. VITERI LAFRONTÉ (Ecuador) said that, at the end of the fourth session of the General Assembly, he did not wish to make a detailed analysis of the work accomplished or to judge the merit of the resolutions approved or rejected by the Assembly. Such judgment depended upon the particular criterion of each delegation and on the policy adopted by each State. In many cases, compromise resolutions had been adopted which, without fully satisfying each one of the parties, had made it possible to take into account the various points of view on the possibilities and realities of the situation. What could not be accepted was the generalization which had just been heard that a great number of the resolutions which had been approved were contrary to the Charter of the United Nations. On the basis of such a criterion, any delegation might say that resolutions which did not meet with its approval were violations of the Charter and that only those resolutions of which it approved were in keeping with the Charter.

136. The representative of Ecuador stated that the firm, definite and intelligent attitude with which the President had directed the discussions must, in justice, be praised. He also wished to congratulate the Vice-Presidents for the manner

in which they had presided over the meetings on the occasions when they had had to replace the President. He also wished to express his appreciation of the Secretariat and his gratitude to the Secretary-General, who had been able to give a professional and technical stamp to the work of the Secretariat. The Secretariat's efficiency had been demonstrated by the extreme accuracy with which they had prepared the Assembly documents. He wished to pay special tribute to the interpreters, whose difficult work had been accomplished in a spirit of integrity and accuracy.

137. In conclusion, Mr. Viteri Lafronte praised the task of conciliation which the President of the General Assembly had performed.

138. The PRESIDENT said that the General Assembly had come to the end of an agenda consisting of sixty-eight items, the heaviest since its first session. The fourth session had been the shortest but one of any session so far, with a total of 384 meetings of the Main Committees and fifty-seven plenary meetings.

139. All might take justifiable pride in the dispatch that had characterized the Assembly's labours. That had been achieved without the thoroughness of the deliberations having been prejudiced in any way, as a result of the experience gained during the preceding three sessions, on the basis of which a number of new rules of procedure, calculated further to improve the conduct of future sessions, had been adopted.

140. Apart from improvements in procedure, there was evidence that the work was being continually facilitated by the enriched experience of the various delegations themselves, by the increasing use of the practice of consultation among delegations, resulting in the more speedy adjustment and approximation of views, and by the contributions of a maturing Secretariat resulting in a more efficient machinery for handling the details of the work.

141. He was sure, therefore, that he spoke for all the representatives to the Assembly when he expressed the Assembly's heartfelt appreciation to Mr. Trygve Lie, the Secretary-General, to Mr. Andrew Cordier, his able Executive Assistant, to all the Assistant Secretaries-General, and to the entire staff of the Secretariat.

142. The Organization was fortunate to have a Secretary-General of the integrity, ability and loyalty of Mr. Trygve Lie. He had laid the foundation for an international civil service that was a credit to the United Nations. He had administered its affairs with tact, prudence and statesmanship and it had been a privilege to work with him. It was to be hoped that his steady and firm hand would continue to steer the Organization.

143. He also extended warm congratulations to the Chairmen of the seven Main Committees and to their co-workers, the Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteurs, for the devotion with which they had performed their share of the common task. Finally, he thanked His Honour, Mayor William O'Dwyer of the City of New York, and his assistants, and the correspondents of the Press, radio, television and newsreels, whose unceasing efforts had given the fourth session better coverage than any that had preceded it.

144. The achievement of the Assembly must of course in the end be measured in terms other than mere improvements in the machinery of its deliberations. The question was whether it had approached more closely the goal of its efforts, and how far the results of its work measured up to the objectives set in the beginning.

145. The road to permanent peace was a long, weary, and tortuous one; humanity must traverse every foot of it, step by patient step, undismayed by dead-ends and giddy precipices, hacking away at the many obstacles before it with a perseverance born of the consciousness that mankind would be doomed if it yielded to despair and acknowledged failure.

146. The Assembly had neither yielded to despair nor acknowledged failure. The time had not come to make a final assessment of the work that had been done, for the reason that many decisions and recommendations, whether on new or continuing problems, still waited to be implemented, and for the further reason that it was not for the Assembly but rather for the peoples of the world to measure subsequently the wisdom and efficacy of its actions. However, it was proper to indicate the characteristic trend of the work of the United Nations which the Fourth session of the General Assembly had done so much to emphasize and advance.

147. Firstly, there was the sensitiveness and vigour with which the General Assembly had applied itself to various proposals designed to improve the work, livelihood, health and welfare of mankind, thus giving firm support to the efforts of the various specialized agencies, which were dedicated to the most fruitful though often also the least spectacular activities of the United Nations. It could not be repeated too often that permanent peace must rest ultimately on established norms of co-operative and collective action among the nations in the solution of economic, social and cultural problems. In view of the many barriers to such co-operative action which existed, most of them deeply rooted in anachronistic traditions, it was gratifying to know that so much success was being achieved in breaking down some of those barriers in order to enable the nations to help one another, through the interchange of information and technical knowledge, in promoting production, enhancing opportunities for work, curbing existing evils, and raising standards of living throughout the world. It was heartening to be able to say of the United Nations that its various organs and agencies were quietly and persistently laying the foundations and erecting the framework for peace among the nations under any and all conditions of the world's political weather.

148. Next to be noted was the growing disposition on the part of the General Assembly and other organs to implement to the fullest possible extent the enlightened principles of the Charter concerning the inhabitants of Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was not long since, in San Francisco, that a revolutionary declaration regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories had been included in the Charter, under which the metropolitan Powers and Administering Authorities had accepted as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost the well-being of the inhabitants of those Territories,

and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions towards the eventual goal of self-government. In the intervening period, the scope and implementation of those principles had been discussed at great length. During the past three years and, in particular, during the fourth session, an unmistakable determination had been revealed to give the humane and generous intentions of the Charter the fullest possible play, and to establish the principle that the entire international community was responsible for the welfare of the inhabitants of Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. There had been a marked recession of the contrary principle of single and unshared responsibility, and no doubt that attitude would yield more and more to the pressure of world opinion. The settlement granting independence to the United States of Indonesia before the end of the year, the decision to establish the independence of Libya in two years and of Italian Somaliland in ten years had all been reached within the United Nations, either directly by the General Assembly or as a result of the pressure of its moral authority. All men of good will must recognize that that heartening development was part of the emerging pattern of peace, and that the cause of peace was advanced by everything that was done to give justice and freedom to the forgotten stepchildren of mankind.

149. The third mark of progress which should be noted was the continuing interest which the General Assembly had shown in the progressive development of international law and its systematic codification. It was slow, back-breaking work, and yet it was nevertheless moving apace, adding little by little to the growing body of the modern law of nations, and crystallizing in the process the conviction that international peace and security could not be established except under the reign of law and justice. That was not a new concept, since the need for some kind of international law and order was as old as the nations. What was new and without precedent was the extreme urgency of the need, the fact that the world could no longer afford the luxury of error in the interpretation and application of just law in international relations. In the past, when the breakdown of law had resulted in war among the nations, the limited power of the weapons at man's disposal had given him a margin of safety. In the age of atomic weapons, bacteriological weapons and supersonic planes,

that margin of safety had all but disappeared. Man could no longer permit the break-down of law without endangering his very existence.

150. Finally, note should be taken of the steady and persistent pressure which world opinion through the General Assembly had exerted upon the great Powers to settle their disputes by peaceful means and to reach agreement on pending political problems through conciliation and accommodation. Believing that on that question he spoke for all the plain and humble peoples of the world, he had tried, in his capacity as President of the General Assembly, to help to mitigate the rigours of the political struggle and create a more salutary atmosphere for reasonable and business-like negotiation. No startling results had been achieved so far, and nothing of the sort should be expected, for, as he had said before, conciliation was a workman's tool and not a magician's wand. It would grow more efficient with use, provided it was used at every opportunity in preference to the weapons of challenge and defiance, of denunciation and propaganda. It was clear that the peoples of the world, and no mere so-called "mechanical majority", were determined that every possibility should be explored that could lead them out of the deadlock that had developed on the problem of the control of atomic energy, the prohibition of atomic weapons, the reduction of armaments of all kinds, and all the other related problems. Each year the pressure of that opinion grew, and in seizing upon it during the session he had done no more than dramatize the anxiety of mankind and the fateful responsibility that rested upon the great Powers and upon the United Nations.

151. As President of the fourth session of the General Assembly, his official duties were at an end. But no one could preside over that body and participate in the formulation of important decisions affecting the welfare of humanity without developing a very special concern for the faithful implementation of those decisions. He would remain in close touch with the Secretary-General in regard to the fruition of the Assembly's work and would support him in every possible way to achieve maximum implementation of all that had been started during the session.

152. He declared adjourned the fourth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.  
on Saturday, 10 December 1949.