



*Tuesday, 20 March 1951, at 3 p.m.*

*Lake Success, New York*

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Tribute to the memory of Mr. R. G. Riddell, permanent representative of Canada to the United Nations.....	709
Place of meeting of the sixth session of the General Assembly; note by the Secretary-General (A/1788/Rev.1) .....	710

*President: Mr. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (Iran)*

**Tribute to the memory of Mr. R. G. Riddell,  
permanent representative of Canada to the  
United Nations**

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): It is my sad duty to announce the death of our distinguished friend and colleague Mr. Riddell, permanent representative of Canada. We all knew his great qualities and the devotion with which he served his country and the cause of the United Nations. I myself had the privilege of getting to know him well when he was working with us in the Group on Cease-Fire in Korea. His frankness, his modesty, his intelligence and his untiring efforts gained the confidence, admiration and affection of all his colleagues. His death deprives the United Nations of a devoted servant and us all of a great friend.

2. I am sure that I am voicing the unanimous feeling of the General Assembly when I express our deep sympathy with Mrs. Riddell and her children, the Canadian Government and the Canadian delegation. I would ask them to believe that we join sincerely in their sorrow.

3. I call upon the members of the Assembly to observe one minute's silence in memory of Mr. Riddell.

*The representatives observed one minute of silence.*

4. Mr. HILL (Australia): The Australian delegation wishes to join with the President in expressing its sympathy to the Canadian delegation for Mr. Riddell's sudden and tragic death. We all knew Mr. Riddell extremely well and admired his many fine qualities, which will be greatly missed in the United Nations.

5. On behalf of the Australian Government, of the Australian delegation and of its acting permanent representative, Mr. Shann, who is today attending Mr. Riddell's funeral in Ottawa, I wish to convey our deep feeling of sympathy to the Canadian delegation.

6. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom): I am sure that all members of the General Assembly will wish to associate themselves with the tributes which the President and the representative of Australia have already paid to our late friend and colleague, Mr. Riddell. It is a tragedy indeed that as young and brilliant an official should have been taken from us so unexpectedly.

7. Our sympathy goes out to his widow and his family and indeed to the Canadian delegation which has been deprived of one of its most able servants. Mr. Riddell was an outstanding figure at Lake Success. His influence was always exerted on the side of wisdom and moderation. We are all the poorer for his loss.

8. Mr. LACOSTE (France) (*translated from French*): The French delegation would not like to let this occasion go by without publicly expressing its great sorrow on learning of the sudden death of the head of the Canadian delegation. It held Mr. Riddell in very high esteem. He was outstanding in the activities of several of the most important organs of the United Nations. His death is a great loss to us. May I add that I was bound to him by personal friendship, and it is not without emotion that I remember that I shall not see him again.

9. I ask Mrs. Riddell, the Canadian Government and the Canadian delegation to regard my words as an expression of the profound sympathy of the French delegation and of myself in particular.

10. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): On behalf of the delegation of the United States I should like to pay tribute to Mr. Riddell. We think that the close ties which bind the United States and Canada were reflected in the relationship between Mr. Riddell and those of us in the United States delegation who had the honour to work closely with him.

11. We who knew him, respected and loved him very much, because of the person that he was and because

of the devotion which he always showed to the work in which he was engaged and in which we were delighted and honoured to work with him.

12. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa): I too should like to join the President in paying tribute to the memory of our colleague, Mr. Riddell. Not only have we lost a colleague, we have lost a friend. Therefore, on behalf of the South African delegation, I should like to express our sincerest sympathy to his family, to the Canadian Government and to the Canadian delegation here.

13. Mr. DAYAL (India): On behalf of the Indian delegation, I should like to express our deep sense of sorrow at the sad and untimely death of Mr. Riddell. It is particularly tragic that a career so young and promising should have been cut short so prematurely. For myself, the loss has been very painful as Mr. Riddell and I were colleagues together at Oxford some fifteen years ago.

14. My delegation would like to join with the members present in expressing its deepest sympathy to Mrs. Riddell in her great loss.

15. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation associates itself with the statements of other delegations on the death of our colleague, the representative of Canada.

16. We shall always remember his spiritual and intellectual qualities and his warm friendliness, and wish to extend our heartfelt condolences to the Canadian delegation.

17. Mr. CARTER (Canada): On behalf of the Canadian Government and the Canadian delegation I wish to say a few words in reply to the kind statements of sympathy which have been made by the President and by so many representatives regarding the loss of Mr. Riddell. I wish to assure those who have spoken here or who have written to our delegation that arrangements will be made to transmit their remarks and their messages to Mrs. Riddell and her family. I know that the messages will be a source of comfort to them.

18. I can only add that we on the staff of the Canadian delegation have no words to express our sense of loss in regard to one who was both a personal friend to us and an inspiring public servant of our country. Again I wish to thank both those who have expressed their kind sentiments in statements and those who have written to us.

**Place of meeting of the sixth session of the General Assembly: note by the Secretary-General (A/1788/Rev.1)**

19. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The delegations will have received the letter the French delegation addressed to the Secretary-General and to me. It appears in document A/1788/Rev.1.

20. As there was no draft resolution before the General Assembly, I have taken the liberty of submitting a draft [A/1790] which is obviously only a suggestion and subject to all the amendments that the Assembly may decide upon. Before opening the discussion on the draft, I call upon the representative of France, who

wishes to give some additional explanations on the subject matter of the letter.

21. Mr. LACOSTE (France) (*translated from French*): I have asked to speak for a few moments at the beginning of this discussion on the question of the place of meeting of the sixth session of the General Assembly in order to make some comments on the letter I addressed last Saturday, 17 March 1951 on that subject, to both the Secretary-General and the President.

22. Those comments are particularly necessary because some errors crept into the English version of the document as originally distributed. I asked the Secretariat to issue a corrigendum and I thank it for having done so. It was only yesterday afternoon that I discovered the errors in the original translation. In the meantime some inaccurate ideas had inevitably entered the minds of a number of delegations and had been published in the Press. It is important that such notions should be corrected.

23. As the Assembly well knows, various considerations prevented the French Government from giving a definite reply, as promptly as it would have liked, to the Assembly's expressed wish that its sixth session should be held in France, and preferably in Paris. The reason was not only the circumstances of French internal politics, although these circumstances were such that the French Government would have preferred, in principle, that the Assembly should not be held in Paris this year. The government's main concern—and I am sure that the Assembly will fully appreciate it—was not to undertake for a second time, as it had to do in 1948, the considerable and very expensive task of preparing temporary facilities for a session of the Assembly lasting a few weeks or at most a few months. Hitherto the primary task of reconstruction, made necessary by the terrible devastation suffered in French territory during the last war, has prevented my government from erecting in Paris or near-by permanent buildings especially suited to national or international congresses or conferences of a political, economic, social, scientific or other character.

24. Even if my government had been in a position to decide to begin constructing a permanent building as soon as the Assembly expressed its desire to meet in Paris this autumn, it would not have been sufficient time—by a long way—to accomplish such a task satisfactorily. That is why it asked for all other possibilities to be considered first, in the hope that the Assembly might realize its desire to hold its sixth session in Europe, but in another city among those which had been contemplated—Edinburgh or Geneva, for example—without the French Government being again obliged to resort to makeshift arrangements, with all the cost and inconvenience—partly to no purpose—which inevitably results from such a procedure.

25. However, when it became clear that no other choice was possible—as the Secretary-General, in particular, had found after his last transatlantic trip—and when the Assembly once again expressed its desire to hold the next session in Europe, the French Government, taking also into account the wishes of many groups in its legislative bodies to meet the General

Assembly's request, decided to reply favourably and to welcome the Assembly to Paris for the duration of the sixth session.

26. That is the exact meaning of the first paragraph of the letter which I addressed on 17 March 1951 to the Secretary-General and to the President. The simple words I used say nothing else and express the realities of a situation familiar to everyone here. For the reasons I have just given there could be no question of the French Government "inviting" the Assembly. If the French Government had itself been inviting the Assembly, it would not have waited until this very late hour. And, as I said in the third paragraph of my letter, it would not have asked the United Nations to lighten the burden the French Government will have to bear if the Assembly finally decides to go to Paris.

27. The second paragraph of my letter points out that the French Government is obliged to make its willingness to receive the Assembly dependent on two conditions.

28. The first is that the sixth session in Paris should not open earlier than 6 November. The reason for this is obvious: we are now in the second half of March and all the arrangements have still to be made. If the representatives will reflect on what organizing a session of the Assembly involves—even in Paris, a city with so many resources and which had experience of it as recently as 1948—they will all, I think, understand that it is not unreasonable to ask for less than eight months to fulfil the task. For it goes without saying that if Paris is to be the Assembly's host in 1951, it wishes to discharge that duty fittingly.

29. I think that the second condition is also very natural. If the French Government is to undertake the trouble and expense to which I have just referred, at least the fruit of its efforts should be used to the full. It would be quite unreasonable if, after doing so much, and having had so much done, to hold the session in Europe, the Assembly were to split the session in two and go elsewhere, even to New York, to finish what it had begun in Paris. That is why I wrote that, if the Assembly had not finished its work before Christmas of this year, the French Government would expect the session to continue in Paris until the end, until January 1952 and, if necessary, until February.

30. I now come to the third paragraph of my letter, which also expresses a simple idea: although the French Government gladly bows to the wish the Assembly has expressed to it and appreciates its great significance, it is obliged to take into account the exceptionally heavy financial burdens which various circumstances impose upon it at the present time. I shall refer only to one among many, the one I have already mentioned, and that is the problem of reconstruction. While, thanks to enormous efforts, a great part of the task has already been accomplished in the field of public works, and especially in regard to transport (bridges, roads, viaducts, harbours, etc.), the French economy is still faced with a tremendous housing problem. The Assembly will understand that the French Government is very anxious not to divert too great sums from that work. That is the meaning of the sentence in which I said that the French Government would be constrained to count on the co-operation and understanding of the

United Nations for a substantial lightening of its burdens when the agreements on the organization of the sixth session of the Assembly in Paris are drawn up.

31. In that connexion, and in order to answer some questions the Secretary-General asked me, I should like to add the following information which I requested from my government and have received since I wrote my letter of 17 March. The French Government would like the United Nations to make its financial contribution out of the credits the Assembly has already voted upon. As to the amount of the contribution, the French Government proposes that the Secretary-General should decide on the matter at the appropriate time.

32. Finally, I should like to add to the preceding explanations some information I have just received on the arrangements the French Government intends to make to receive the Assembly this autumn. I think it will be of interest to the Assembly and it will usefully supplement the information I have already been able to give on the extent of the work that is to be done.

33. In 1948 it was possible to use the museum halls of the Palais de Chaillot, which had not yet been restored. This year new buildings will have to be erected in the Trocadero Gardens. This shows again how necessary is the time that the French Government has requested. The general arrangements now contemplated will nevertheless be about the same as in 1948. Plenary meetings will be held in the theatre of the Palais de Chaillot, but Committees and Secretariat offices will not be in the museums, but in temporary buildings erected in the Trocadero Gardens and connected with the Palais. Thus there will be a connected whole, which will be more convenient than in 1948 and all the Assembly's activities will be concentrated at the same point and in the same area as during the third session.

34. That is all I wished to say to give the Assembly as complete information as I can at the present time on the question with which it is dealing today.

35. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): the draft resolution to which I have referred will be distributed shortly. Meanwhile, I should also like to add a few words of explanation myself.

36. In my opinion it was not necessary for the General Assembly to adopt another resolution since its resolution of 14 December 1950 [resolution 497 (V)] remains in effect. The reason I have taken the liberty of proposing another draft resolution is that the sixth session of the General Assembly must not meet before 6 November, in accordance with the French Government's request. However, rule 1 of the rules of procedure lays down that "the General Assembly shall meet every year in regular session commencing on the third Tuesday in September". A General Assembly resolution is needed to meet that point.

37. At the same time I should like to explain how the Secretariat proposes to offer financial assistance to the French Government when it discusses the sixth session. It will be stated that this help must not go beyond the credits already approved. That, in brief, is the purpose of the draft resolution which will be submitted to you in a moment.

38. A number of delegations have asked to speak. If they wish to do so before receiving the text of the draft resolution, I shall be glad to call upon them.

39. Mr. GRAFSTROM (Sweden): The Swedish delegation voted against Europe as the site of this year's session of the General Assembly. We did so solely for reasons of economy when it was explained to us, first, that facilities for holding a session in New York would be available, and, second, that transfer to Europe would involve considerable extra expense. When the decision to go to Europe was taken by the General Assembly last December, the Assembly was obliged to appropriate an additional \$1,700,000 in this year's budget to provide for the extra cost.

40. We all know from our last meeting [*328th meeting*] of the difficulties encountered by the Secretary-General in his endeavours to find a suitable European site for this year's session. The French Government, after having given the matter long and careful consideration, has now welcomed us to Paris. However, the French Government, for reasons, I am sure — and I want to stress this point — which are fully understood and appreciated by all of us, has attached one very important condition to its invitation. We are informed that the French Government will not be able to receive the General Assembly before Tuesday, 6 November. The condition thus attached to the only European alternative before us has, in the opinion of my delegation, created an entirely new situation which makes it necessary for us to review carefully the decision taken in December.

41. I suppose it is true that rule 1 of our rules of procedure, which sets forth the third Tuesday in September as our opening date, does not in itself create an insuperable obstacle. We are masters of our own procedure. But let us think of the practical inconveniences linked with a decision to postpone the opening of our work for almost seven weeks. This year, the General Assembly, due to unforeseen and unavoidable circumstances, has dragged out to an extent which will hamper the ordinary year-round activities of our Organization. Would we be justified in repeating that state of affairs this year without any unforeseen or unavoidable circumstances being present? I think the answer is clear.

42. We must not forget either that many delegations will find it extremely difficult to keep a sufficient number of representatives available for the different committees if the session is split in two — and the session will be split up by Christmas and the New Year if we decide to go to Paris in November.

43. In view of what I have said I express the hope that the General Assembly will give the most careful consideration to the grave inconveniences of a practical nature entailed in holding a session in Paris this year.

44. Mr. VON BALLUSECK (Netherlands): Before stating the views of my delegation on the matter that is to be decided today, I should like to express our deep appreciation for the welcome the French Government has extended so generously, and, I may add, so valiantly, to the General Assembly.

45. As we know, the French Government at a previous stage had not felt that it was in a position to

invite the General Assembly to hold its sixth session in France — and one can well understand the difficulties facing any government when it comes to extending such an invitation. It is indeed no small matter to provide the costly facilities necessary for such a large body as the General Assembly meeting away from its own headquarters.

46. However, France has now decided that under certain conditions it will be able to receive the General Assembly in its splendid capital, and my delegation wishes to thank the French Government, through its distinguished representative here, for what it is now offering us. Those who took part in the third session in Paris will always retain a very happy and grateful memory of the way in which they were received and of the excellent facilities placed at their disposal. We are convinced that, if it should be decided to hold the next session in Paris, the participants may again anticipate a very pleasant stay, thanks to the traditional and gracious hospitality of the government and the people of France.

47. Notwithstanding all this, I now wish to state the reasons for which my delegation feels that it cannot vote in favour of accepting an invitation to meet in Paris in the autumn of this year. I do not intend to reopen a discussion on the general question whether or not the coming session should take place in Europe, but I want to point out that we are in fact confronted with a situation which differs considerably from that to which the previous decision referred. This new situation arises from three points mentioned in the letter from the acting representative of France.

48. I do not wish to be misunderstood; it is not my intention to raise objections to any of those three points in themselves, which in the circumstances seem to be entirely understandable and entirely justifiable, but they only confirm my delegation in the attitude which it had taken previously.

49. A decision to begin the session on or after 6 November will inevitably mean that the General Assembly will not be able to finish its work before Christmas nor before the end of the year, even if it were possible to shorten the duration of the session by holding more meetings daily and by working longer hours, as less time would be spent in daily travelling than is the case when our meetings are held in Lake Success. Even then my delegation feels that it would be much too optimistic to expect the completion of our tasks in about six weeks. The session will undoubtedly extend, therefore, into the New Year and will probably last until well into February. That means that much time and money will be wasted on account of a Christmas and New Year recess.

50. In this connexion, I should like to be informed on the way in which the rule concerning travelling expenses for delegations to the General Assembly should be interpreted. For instance, would an extra trip be paid for in certain cases and what would be the financial implications involved?

51. Furthermore, I presume that, as a consequence, it would be necessary to postpone the session of the Economic and Social Council, which might not be able to meet before the month of March. This in turn will

affect the whole calendar of meetings, not only of the United Nations but perhaps also of the specialized agencies.

52. There is another matter to which I desire to refer. As the final decisions with respect to the budget cannot be taken before the General Assembly has finished or virtually finished its business, it is clear that whatever budget the Fifth Committee might be able to study before the end of the year, and whatever decisions might be taken in that respect by the General Assembly, would only cover part of the expenses for 1952, and it would be necessary to vote an additional budget at the end of the session.

53. In connexion with the last paragraph of the letter from the representative of France, my delegation would wish to be informed of the entire extra cost involved in holding the 1951 General Assembly away from Headquarters on the basis of the proposal now before us. If the amount appropriated in December would still have to be increased, as I expect will be the case, the General Assembly will have to study revised estimates so as to have quite exact information on the financial implications of the decision to be taken. I feel that it would be desirable to request the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, which I understand is meeting at present, to examine the estimates and submit a report thereon.

54. Furthermore, I should like to hear from the Secretary-General whether the additional sums, if necessary, would be covered by the terms of the resolution on the use of the Working Capital Fund for unforeseen and extraordinary expenses [*resolution 473 (V)*]. If the Working Capital Fund is to be used for this purpose, we should realize fully that such heavy inroads are already anticipated upon this Fund that its use has had to be strictly limited to a number of purposes, such as assistance to Palestine refugees and reconstruction in Korea. We feel that it would be undesirable and dangerous to deplete the fund still more, especially for a purpose which in the view of my delegation, does not fall under essential and urgent activities of the United Nations.

55. In conclusion, we feel that the proposed change in the opening date so greatly affects the picture which the General Assembly had before it when it took its decision in December 1950, that there would be every reason to reconsider the matter. In any case, my delegation will have to vote against accepting the gracious welcome so valiantly extended to us by the representative of France. Our former objections to a meeting of the General Assembly away from Headquarters were based upon our general point of view that, on account of the serious financial and administrative implications, such a meeting could only be justified for very worthy reasons and as an exceptional measure. Those objections still stand and are reinforced by the new factors with which we are now confronted. We feel that there is but one decision which the General Assembly would be justified in taking and that is not to meet in Paris but at Headquarters where sufficient facilities are available.

56. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan): I am sure that the French Government is entitled to our gratitude for the welcome it has offered to the sixth session of the

General Assembly. I think it was very clear from the explanation given by Mr. Lacoste that that welcome, although very gracious indeed, was not offered by the French Government on its own initiative but in response to the desires of a large number of people who insisted on being the guests of the French Government. We know that the French Government has been very hospitable and is prepared to be hospitable again, but I think it was not difficult to read in Mr. Lacoste's speech a certain amount of embarrassment which was felt by the French Government at the considerable handicaps it faced in accommodating the General Assembly during a very important post-war reconstruction period in France.

57. My delegation voted last December [*324th meeting*] against a similar resolution to hold the session in Europe and I am afraid that my delegation will be obliged to vote against the present draft resolution as well; in its opinion, with much added justification. We realize now that it is impossible to hold the session before 6 November and the disadvantages of that fact in respect of dislocation not only of the session itself but of the programmes and schedules of other bodies of the United Nations, have been noted.

58. We are not convinced that the last paragraph of the draft resolution before us is quite as innocuous as it sounds, because if you take into account the last sentence, which provides for additional funds which are unknown at the present time, we shall be voting for a resolution the full consequences of which cannot yet be foreseen.

59. I do not think it is fair to ask the General Assembly to vote on an item of expenditure whose magnitude is not known at the present moment. It is perfectly obvious that inroads will be made upon the funds of the General Assembly, diverting them from causes which are more worthy, especially in view of the fact that we are not convinced that there are any sound reasons for not holding the session at the proper Headquarters of the United Nations.

60. For those reasons, as well as for the reasons which have been so ably put forward by the representatives who have already spoken, my delegation will be constrained to vote against this draft resolution.

61. General ROMULO (Philippines): The Government of France, true to its tradition of hospitality, of which the General Assembly availed itself once before—and those of us who attended the third session in Paris are deeply grateful to the Government and to the people of France — has extended a kind invitation to us to hold our next session in Paris. The invitation is all the more precious because it has come after considerable delay, not for want of hospitality but precisely because the spirit of hospitality finally triumphed over certain considerations of some weight to the people and the Government of France. If, therefore, I am going to say — as I must — that the Philippine delegation is opposed to the holding of the sixth session outside of Headquarters, it is not because we are insensitive to the graciousness of the French invitation or indifferent to the many attractions which Paris offers us as our workshop for the three months of our next session. Gratefully again we recall our sojourn in Paris in 1948,

and it was an experience so pleasant that it could bear repeating.

62. However, there are valid, practical reasons why we must strongly resist the temptation to meet outside of Headquarters this year. First, there is the additional cost of such a meeting. The original estimate of the Secretary-General as to such additional cost was \$1,821,600. In view of the implied request of the French Government that its share of the expenses should be reduced, we may assume that this figure will be in the neighbourhood of \$2,000,000. In fact, the draft resolution before us fixes the ceiling at \$2,350,400. Some may ask: how much is \$2,350,400? Of course, in terms of the astronomical national budgets of certain Member States, it is but a drop in the bucket. But in terms of the modest budget of the United Nations, it represents about 4.5 per cent of the total.

63. To bring the figure closer down to earth, it is nearly twice the annual cost of servicing the General Assembly, the councils, commissions and committees. It is more than the total cost of maintaining all the regional economic commissions for one year, and half a million dollars less than the cost of maintaining the United Nations Office at Geneva. That \$2,350,400 would cover the cost of all the printing jobs of the United Nations during one year. And we do quite a bit of printing, considering some of the very long speeches to which we have to listen here. It would maintain the International Court of Justice for three and a half years. Finally, and this comparison should be of some interest to a great many delegations, \$2,350,400 is slightly more than twice our annual appropriation for the Technical Assistance Programme—certainly one of the brightest achievements of the United Nations.

64. It is true that, if you distribute *pro rata* the \$2,000,000 among sixty Member States, our respective national shares become comparatively small. But we have done some figuring in our delegation and our Foreign Office in Manila has done some figuring of its own. We find that, in addition to our share of the extra cost, the Philippine Government would have to spend approximately \$50,000 more for its own delegation—and we can hardly afford that.

65. Each of the delegations will have made its own estimates. I believe that, in this time of general financial stringency, an appeal to economy will strike a responsive chord in many of our national parliaments back home. I am confident that the many voices that have been raised in the Fifth Committee in support of economy measures will not fail to be heard at this meeting.

66. The invitation of the French Government states that Paris will not be ready to receive the Assembly until 6 November. This would delay the session by six weeks. We must consider whether it would be wise to permit so long a delay in view of the many vital questions that will be on the agenda of the General Assembly and will require urgent consideration. Moreover, to start the session during the second week of November would mean that there would be only five weeks in which the Assembly could meet before the Christmas holidays. This would require the representatives to stay in Paris through the Christmas holidays or to take a quick trip home, at their own expense, to

be with their families. Meetings would then be resumed and carried on until the middle of February, with the result that the entire schedule of meetings of the various organs and subordinate bodies of the United Nations to which our governments have become accustomed, would be completely dislocated. I ask the Assembly whether there is any reasonable justification for imposing so serious an inconvenience on the representatives and for creating this major disturbance in our accustomed schedule and procedures.

67. The Secretary-General more than implies in his original report [A/1778] that nowhere in Europe would the facilities for the accommodation and work of the representatives be as adequate as they would be in New York—and there is no better expert in such a matter than our Secretary-General. What I am mostly concerned about are the facilities available for our work and the work of our colleagues of the press and radio. I am sure the feeling is quite universal that, even with the best of intentions on the part of the Secretariat and the host Government, it would be impossible for them to provide us with facilities in Paris which would be comparable to those available at Headquarters.

68. References have been made to the advantages of the Parisian atmosphere of Europe in general over the New York atmosphere or of America in general as conducive to better harmony during the session. I wish I could believe that. United Nations bodies have met everywhere in the world outside of New York—in Geneva, Paris, London, Santiago, Bangkok and Baguio in the Philippines. In Baguio, we took the representatives to one of the coolest and loveliest spots in the tropics, and I doubt that anyone can prove that the change of scenery soothed the temper of any representative or induced him to change his position, or his vote, led to more agreements or made anyone deliver a shorter speech.

69. Paris is as heavily littered as New York, relatively speaking, with the bones of conferences that have failed. I am sorry to have to say that right now one more bright dream of agreement is fading fast in the supposedly magical atmosphere of Paris. The point is that New York is going to be the permanent home of the United Nations, and it seems rather fatuous to hope that by holding the sixth session in Paris we could change the destiny of mankind or of the United Nations. New York is the home of the United Nations. I repeat, New York is the home of the United Nations, and this lingering home-sickness for Europe will get us nowhere. The sane and practical thing to do is to get used to our surroundings, endeavour to do our best work here, and learn to like it.

70. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom): As the President is aware, the United Kingdom delegation voted against resolution 497 (V) adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1950, which provided for the sixth session of the General Assembly to be held in Europe. We took the view that it would be possible to hold the sixth session in New York and that, consequently, the additional expenditure, which is inevitably incurred if the session is held away from Headquarters, would not be justified. Nevertheless, the resolution was adopted by a large majority, and we are fully prepared to accept the Assembly's decision.

71. After some doubts, it now appears from the communication addressed by the representative of France on 17 March to the Secretary-General that, subject to certain conditions, the French Government has decided to welcome the General Assembly in Paris for its sixth session. I need hardly say that if the Assembly is to meet in Europe, there could be no better place for it to meet than in Paris. We all have the happiest recollections of the third session in Paris in 1948, and of the admirable arrangements that were then made by the French Government, which I am sure will be repeated if the sixth session is held there as well.

72. There are, it is true, certain considerations which Mr. Lacoste has made clear, the first being that the session should not start before 6 November. This will, of course, involve a departure, as the President has said, from rule 1 of the rules of procedure. But this in itself will present no difficulty, as I think it is provided for in the President's draft resolution. It might indeed be argued that since the present session is still continuing and seems likely to go on for a further period of some weeks, if not months, the Assembly might well be justified in postponing somewhat the normal opening date of the next session beyond the third Tuesday in September.

73. There are, of course, certain disadvantages in starting the sixth session so late in the year, since it seems most unlikely that the General Assembly will complete its work before Christmas. I would hope, therefore, that the French Government might find, on further reflection, that the opening date could be advanced to mid-October. Nevertheless, if this does prove to be impossible, my delegation would be prepared to accept an opening date of 6 November, and it would also agree to the second condition laid down by the French Government, namely, that if the Assembly has not completed its work before the end of 1951, it should continue to meet in Paris during the early part of 1952, though, I should certainly hope, for not too long into 1952.

74. The question of finance admittedly raises some difficulties, and, having just read the draft resolution, I see how the President has proposed to deal with that question. It seems to me and to my delegation to be correct in principle and not open to serious objection. In so far as I understand it, what it means is that the total expenditure for the sixth session of the General Assembly will, in fact, be no more than we have already voted upon. That is really the principle which underlies the President's draft, and with that principle my delegation, I need hardly say, entirely agrees.

75. The draft resolution also says that if the Secretary-General does find, on examination, that certain sums—and I am sure they can only be small sums—could be made available by economies in other headings and consequent transfer to this particular heading, that could be done, provided always that our Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions agrees. I am quite certain that that Committee will not agree unless there is good reason—and no doubt there may be good reason—for the transfer of such small sums as the Secretary-General may indicate are available. But I am sure that we shall hear the Secre-

tary-General himself on that particular paragraph before voting on the draft resolution.

76. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Before calling upon the representative of the Union of South Africa, I should like to say that the United Kingdom representative's interpretation corresponds exactly with the spirit in which the draft resolution I am submitting to the Assembly was drawn up.

77. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa): I should like to associate the South African delegation with the general remarks made by the representatives of the Netherlands and Sweden. We do greatly appreciate the welcome which the French Government has extended to the United Nations to hold its next session in Paris. As Sir Gladwyn Jebb said, if we have to meet anywhere in Europe, I cannot think of a nicer place to meet than in Paris. But our delegation voted against the resolution which provided for holding a session in Europe, mainly because of the financial implications. At a time of financial stringency, it is perhaps asking a great deal to provide for a budget of \$2,350,400, which would be \$1,700,000 more than a session would ordinarily cost at Headquarters.

78. There is also the question of the late date on which the opening of the General Assembly would take place. I need not say much on that. I think that the representatives of the Netherlands and Pakistan have amply demonstrated how that may dislocate the work of the General Assembly. Apart from that, there is, for the South African delegation, another reason why we cannot support the proposal before us, and that is that our Parliament normally assembles in January, and it would mean that if a cabinet minister were to lead the delegation, he might have to return to South Africa before the work of the Assembly was finished. That would be an inconvenience, and it is an additional reason why we would not be able to support the draft resolution.

79. Finally, while I am going to vote against the resolution in any event, I would also like to join the representative of the Netherlands in asking the Secretary-General whether it would be possible to make the financial arrangements envisaged in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution before us within the framework of the \$2,350,400, plus such additional amounts as may be authorized by borrowing from other sections, and also whether the Secretary-General is satisfied that it would not be necessary to resort to the Working Capital Fund if this draft resolution is adopted.

80. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia): I regret that the Australian delegation will have to vote against the draft resolution that has been distributed. I should like to make it clear at the outset that in doing so it is in no sense out of any lack of appreciation for the very generous gesture of the French Government. I feel sure that the representative of France will not misunderstand any remarks of mine which may follow. It is quite in keeping with the traditional hospitality of France that this invitation should have come and that it should have been given at a time when, I may say candidly, it is not entirely convenient for the French Government. That only heightens our appreciation of the generosity of the offer.

81. I may say personally also that very many members of the Australian delegation would like to go to Paris for the next session, and if the next session is held in Paris I think there will be a lot of jockeying for position to get on the delegation. However, we do feel that, for reasons which I propose to give, we shall have to vote against the draft resolution. I am sure that we will not be misunderstood and that our vote will not be taken in any way as a reflection on the generosity and co-operation of the French Government.

82. I should like to recall that the decision that the next session of the General Assembly should be held in Paris was based on administrative considerations. The resolution which the General Assembly adopted recited the fact that some doubt existed on the adequacy of facilities in New York; accordingly, the General Assembly decided that it would hold its next session in Europe.

83. At the time that decision was made my delegation felt that there was no doubt at all that facilities would be available in New York and, so far as I am aware, that fact was never contested. Not only were facilities available in New York, but in many respects these had advantages over the facilities we had previously enjoyed in New York. Much of the travelling between Manhattan and Lake Success would have been obviated and consultation among delegations and with the Secretariat would have been facilitated. We were somewhat at a loss to understand exactly what these administrative difficulties and shortcomings were.

84. Another consideration is that, at the time the resolution was adopted, there was really no alternative to New York. It was not a question of weighing the respective merits of New York and some other place; it was a question of weighing the merits of New York and an invitation from a government which at that time had not extended any. We had very great difficulty in agreeing that the facilities in New York were not as good as they were somewhere else, or anywhere else, so to speak, because no concrete proposal had been put up as an alternative to New York.

85. The General Assembly did, however, adopt a resolution in due course that it would meet in Europe, and the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly were requested to see what facilities could be arranged in Europe. In effect, we decided to go to Europe and we then passed the hat around among the member delegations. After some time, the hat returned and, I am sorry to say, it was empty. But at a crucial stage in the negotiations, we heard that there was a possibility that the French Government would respond to the suggestion that had been made that we meet in Europe. In due course, the French Government very kindly agreed to make facilities available in Paris.

86. The French Government has placed some conditions on this invitation and I have the greatest sympathy for those conditions. The Australian Government would not for one moment suggest that they are anything other than perfectly reasonable and proper conditions. But they do pose certain difficulties. I would recall that resolution 497(V) which was adopted last December said that "considering that in these circumstances" (as they existed in New York) there may

arise technical difficulties liable to impede the normal functioning of the General Assembly and the convenience of its deliberations..." Following that paragraph in the preamble, the General Assembly made a certain decision.

87. It does appear to me, and again I wish to repeat my reservation to the representative of France, that the conditions which it has been necessary for the French Government to impose on this invitation would impede the normal functioning of the General Assembly and the convenience of its deliberations. It likewise appears to the Australian Government that the General Assembly could be held in New York with no impediment to its normal functioning or to the convenience of its deliberations. For this reason we feel it is very difficult to accept the proposal that we should meet in Paris.

88. A particular condition of the French Government to which I should like to draw attention is the one affecting the date of the opening of the session. We fully understand the reasons which have compelled the French Government to impose this condition, but to set the date at that time would practically amount to postponing the opening date of the General Assembly by almost two months; I think that would also postpone the closing of the General Assembly by at least that length of time, and possibly more, because there is likely to be an interruption over Christmas and the New Year. Some representatives may be compelled for a variety of reasons, such as parliamentary duties at home or other compelling necessities, to leave Paris, at least temporarily. The closing date of the session might be something in excess of two months.

89. In those circumstances, it seems to me that there would indeed exist a very serious impediment to the normal functioning of the General Assembly. Furthermore, it is quite likely that the Economic and Social Council might wish to hold its first meeting in 1952 before the conclusion of the General Assembly, and that certainly would be an impediment to its normal functioning. The Economic and Social Council could not properly hold a session in the early part of the year if the General Assembly were still in full swing.

90. Likewise, there is the question of the specialized agencies, many of which hold their general conferences in the early part of the year. There would be no time for discussions and decisions of the General Assembly to be conveyed to the general conferences of the specialized agencies if the likelihood existed of the session dragging on until late February.

91. Thus, I do not feel that we can conscientiously consider that we have arrived at a decision on the place of the next meeting which will impose no impediment to the normal functioning of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. I should like to point out too that the decision that we should meet in Europe next year was the third of three decisions affecting the meeting of United Nations organs away from Headquarters. Two sessions of the Economic and Social Council, at least, were under consideration in the Fifth Committee and, indirectly, in the General Assembly. The first of those sessions was to be held in Santiago, Chile, and, in fact, the Economic and Social Council has met there; the other was the second session in 1951 of the Economic and Social Council.

92. One consequence of the decision to hold these meetings away from Headquarters, as many delegations pointed out, was that senior officers of the Secretariat would be continually absent from Headquarters for an unbroken period extending over many months. They have to be in Santiago, Chile, for the meeting of the Economic and Social Council; they have to attend a meeting of one, and perhaps more, of the regional commissions of the Economic and Social Council; following that, they have to attend the summer session of the Economic and Social Council in Geneva, and that would no sooner have concluded when these people would have to be in Paris for the next session of the General Assembly. That is an inconvenience not only to the men themselves but also to the delegations which find it impossible to get in touch with them or to secure their opinions on major matters of policy which have to be considered and discussed and which will be the subject of subsequent decisions in bodies of the United Nations.

93. If it is proposed that the General Assembly should not only meet in Paris but that it should postpone its opening date by two months, all those difficulties will be accentuated far beyond what was ever anticipated when the General Assembly arrived at its decision in December that it would meet in Europe.

94. There is one other minor matter. This decision to meet in Paris, if it is arrived at, will involve two changes in the rules of procedure. One is in the rule which requires that meetings shall be held at Headquarters, and the other is in the one which requires that the sessions of the General Assembly shall open on the third Tuesday in September. The mere deviation from those rules is not important in itself. This Assembly is master of its own procedure, as has been pointed out, and is quite at liberty to change or depart from its rules, as it sees fit. But this is not the point. The point is that these rules of procedure had a very solid basis in reason at the time that they were adopted. If we authorize departures from them, we have to evaluate not so much the breaking of a rule as the departure from the very substantial reasons which led us to adopt the rules in the first instance.

95. It is quite apparent, for example, that the date of one meeting affects the dates of quite a number of other meetings. There is a calendar of conferences for all the subsidiary organs of the United Nations and for all the specialized agencies. These things are very closely interlocked; they are an organic whole. You cannot depart from one of them without seriously interfering with the others. That is the reason why I suggest that we should give very serious consideration to the matter before we ultimately take a decision involving a departure at two points from the rules of procedure which we very carefully adopted some time ago.

96. Coming to the particular draft resolution that is before us [A/1790], there are certain questions that are left unanswered as, for example, the question of cost. The representative of the Philippines has gone into that subject at great length, and his figures were very enlightening. The Australian delegation stated its views on the question of cost at some length last December [324th meeting] and I shall not repeat the

opinions that have already been expressed. In any event, they would add little to what has just been said. However, it is a fact that on the budget figures the cost of holding the Assembly in Paris would be three times the cost of holding it in New York. I do not think that we should pass over this fact lightly. That is not all. In the draft resolution before us, there is a proviso in the last paragraph—or something in the nature of a proviso—that the Secretary-General is to be authorized to conclude with the French Government certain arrangements. One of the understandings is that the arrangements will not involve us in costs exceeding the amount of some 2 million dollars which have already been provided in the 1951 budget—and here is the proviso—“plus such additional amounts as may be authorized by transfer from other sections of the 1951 budget by the Secretary-General with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions”.

97. We all know that it is not an uncommon thing for transfers to be made from one section of the budget to another with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. We vote the budget by sections. If it is found that we have spent a little more in one section than we anticipated and a little less in another section, it is common practice—in fact, it is the rule—for the Secretary-General to make up these deficiencies by transferring funds from the light section to the heavy section with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee.

98. I am not questioning that principle. What gives me concern is that we see written into this draft resolution express authority for additional funds to be expended, subject to the ordinary rules being complied with. That seems to me to indicate very clearly that the Secretary-General has very serious misgivings as to his ability to keep the costs for the Assembly in Paris within the figure of \$2,350,400. If he did not have those misgivings, I do not think he would have inserted that saving clause. He would not have done that if only a slight amount were involved. If he saw fit to write it in specifically in those terms I do think it indicates that he has very grave doubts as to whether he can keep within that amount. If, at a later stage, the Secretary-General wished to make any comment on this draft resolution, the Australian delegation would welcome any opinion he may desire to express on that particular aspect of the matter.

99. On this question of cost, we might also recall something that the Secretary-General himself wrote as a foreword to his budget note two years ago.<sup>1</sup> In writing the foreword, as he usually does, he makes some very succinct and valuable comments. These are never very long and are confined to those budgetary issues which he believes to be of the greatest importance. Two years ago, when he was writing the foreword to his budget, he saw fit—and I commend him for it—to say that the Secretary-General could not be held responsible for administrative economies if delegations consistently adopted the policy of deciding to hold meetings away from Headquarters with consequent increases in the costs of those meetings. I could not agree more.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Supplement No. 5.*

If bodies decide to meet away from Headquarters, the cost will inevitably rise and it is most unfair that the Secretary-General should be held responsible; and invariably he is held responsible. It is the more unfair to the Secretary-General because, in addition to having to pay the price for an increased budget—not in a financial sense but in a sense of responsibility—he always has to put up with the added inconvenience of having his most senior and most experienced advisers scattered to the four corners of the globe.

100. I have dealt at some length on the administrative considerations of this particular question because, as I said at the outset of my intervention, the decision to go to Europe in the first place was based on administrative considerations. The Australian Government felt that if the matter was viewed purely administratively, only one decision was possible: the decision to meet in New York. It still feels the same way. The invitation that has now come before the Assembly confirms this in our view.

101. It is now no longer possible for us to hold the session in Europe in any manner which will allow the proceedings of the General Assembly to go forward with a reasonable measure of convenience and efficiency and with any reasonable certainty that our deliberations are likely to come to an end within a reasonable period of time.

102. I should like to pass on to the political considerations in case there are some representatives who are influenced by them. I do not wish lightly to brush aside the views of those governments which feel that there is considerable value in rotating meetings from one country to another. There is considerable merit in that and the Australian Government, on previous occasions, has voted in support of proposals that the principal organs of the United Nations, or some of them, should hold meetings away from Headquarters. But I do feel that the political considerations and the administrative considerations are interlocked. I think that it would be very short-sighted indeed to insist that meetings should be held in New York because it was administratively convenient if, for any reason, it were politically unwise to hold them there. Similarly, I think it is unwise to insist that meetings should be held away from New York on the grounds that it is politically valuable or expedient when all the administrative considerations would point to the overwhelming desirability of meeting in New York, and I believe that to be the case today.

103. While it may be true that there are political advantages in holding a session of the General Assembly in Europe, I do feel that this year is not the year to do it. There will be other years when, perhaps, invitations can be extended in circumstances which will enable us to hold our deliberations with convenience and efficiency. Those considerations do not exist today.

104. Mr. WENDELEN (Belgium) (*translated from French*): In December last [324th meeting], when resolution 497 (V) was adopted, whereby the General Assembly decided to hold its sixth session in Europe, my delegation abstained from voting.

105. The financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the President of the General Assembly do

not seem to be of a kind to prompt the Assembly to go back on its decision. It is probably because the members have the first resolution before them that several delegations have been encouraged to take up again today the arguments which failed to convince the General Assembly in December. Some of those arguments were the cause of our abstention. We regarded them as cogent at the time. We think they are still good arguments, but it would be presumptuous to hope that the majority will be convinced simply by hearing arguments it has already heard. The fact that the Belgian delegation was not then in favour of the decision taken does not absolve it today from keeping in mind the fact that the decision was adopted.

106. In the circumstances, my delegation welcomes the French Government's invitation to the Assembly because it will permit that body to put its decision into effect, and to do so under the best possible conditions. The Belgian delegation wishes to make clear that it fully appreciates an invitation which, as we all know, implies considerable sacrifices on the part of the Government giving it.

107. The draft resolution before us is sufficiently clear and simple to relieve us of the necessity of a long discussion. It has the advantage of giving the Secretary-General explicit instructions while at the same time enabling him to make any necessary financial adjustments, subject to the agreement of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

108. I should add that we hope that the French Government will interpret paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which provides for the opening of the sixth session on 6 November 1951 at the latest, as a reflection of the General Assembly's wish not to delay the regular opening date more than is absolutely necessary for practical reasons. If the delay could be reduced to four or five weeks instead of six, the weight of the objections made here today would be diminished.

109. My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Assembly.

110. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) (*translated from French*): As all the previous speakers have heaped bouquets upon the French Government and praised the marvellous hospitality of Paris, I hardly dare add my thanks to that Government for the welcome it has given to the suggestions emanating from this Assembly. Nevertheless, they all said that they would vote against the draft resolution: *in cauda venenum*.

111. In the circumstances, I should like to place the following on record: all the representatives who have spoken against the resolution seem to have ignored the fact that there is a resolution which was voted by thirty-one countries on 14 December 1950. Consequently, all the arguments invented at that time have no value.

112. However, since those arguments have been advanced, I should like all the same to remind the General Assembly that when my delegation, together with the delegations of Peru and Colombia, submitted a draft resolution [A/1593] they did not do so in obedience to a whim, in a spirit of fantasy, as was rumoured in the corridors of this Assembly. On the contrary. Because of certain technical difficulties which the Assembly would encounter if it met in New York in 1951, it seemed to

as necessary to suggest that the General Assembly might meet in Europe. Why? Because, at this time, Europe is in fact a sick continent. It would be displaying great political wisdom if the United Nations were to say: "Sick continent, I am coming to sit at your bedside, to try to find a remedy for your ills."

113. I arrived from Europe two days ago. While I was over there, I was able to get in touch with all kinds of people, from the highest to the lowest. I have talked to financiers, statesmen, workers and taxi-drivers. All of them said that if the Assembly of the United Nations were to meet in Paris in 1951 it would mean that war was not yet imminent. I saw a kind of new hope in their eyes.

114. This is the great psychological effect which the delegations of Bolivia, Peru and Colombia seek to bring about: to make it known to the peoples of Europe, already buffeted by tendentious propaganda, that war is not near, that it is not inevitable and that sixty nations, meeting together under the aegis of the Charter, are going to Europe so that all Europeans will be able to see them working loyally in an attempt to reconcile completely divergent views and to find remedies for grave ills.

115. I remember that Bismarck once said that force was the great midwife of society. Now that international organizations have been set up, this sinister, disastrous expression must be erased. Peoples of goodwill must meet, smooth out all the obstacles, pull their weight and work to ensure that the United Nations, thanks to the goodwill and the understanding of the peoples, becomes the midwife of society.

116. While listening to the arguments of my colleagues from the Netherlands, Australia, the Union of South Africa, Sweden and other countries, I realized that they had only one thing in mind: the budgetary question. Not one word has been said about the advantages of the United Nations going to Europe, about the psychological effect we are all searching for. What can be said about the United Nations? That it spends money? But this money is spent to bring the peoples together, to overcome difficulties and smooth down corners. The money will be well spent. I cannot therefore agree with their point of view.

117. I remember once in the League of Nations, at the time of the Italian-Ethiopian conflict, a representative—I think it was the representative of one of the countries which intervened in this discussion today—took the Secretary-General to task because the latter had spent, if I remember rightly, \$35,000 on telegrams. Thereupon Lord Cecil, one of the symbols of human brotherhood, rose and said: "If a million pounds had to be spent to wipe out all seeds of war, it would be money well spent". I can only agree with Lord Cecil. The fact of the United Nations going to sit, as I said, at the bedside of a sick continent is not merely adventitious; it is also a duty.

118. I shall not do as some representatives have done and draw a sort of comparison between New York and Paris. Comparisons are always odious. We have been charmingly received in New York. We have spent long periods here and we have never complained. Some representatives have not been able to go home to their countries for the Christmas holidays. I am among them

and I have not complained. I stayed in New York to do my duty. Thus, if some representatives perhaps had to spend the Christmas holidays in Paris, they would be wrong to complain; they would only be doing their duty too.

119. Moreover, the fact of going to Europe is not simply a duty; it is also a way of approaching a number of European countries which unfortunately do not have seats in the United Nations. It is a way of getting to know their wishes better and making ourselves better known to them. In this way, we shall broaden the horizon of our discussions.

120. In the circumstances, I do not see what point of principle can be brought up against the resolution of 14 December 1950 which, I repeat, remains in force and could only be repealed by a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly.

121. Having said this, I want to thank the French Government for the rapidity with which it has let us know it will receive the United Nations in Paris in November 1951. I should point out that if I said in this Assembly on 13 February 1951 [328th meeting] that the French National Assembly was on the point of dealing with the matter and asked the General Assembly to postpone any decision, it was in order that the will of the French people could make itself felt. So much so—I am very proud now of having intervened at that moment—that the French National Assembly unanimously adopted the suggestion that the French Government should agree to receive the United Nations in Paris next autumn. If the General Assembly of the United Nations is held in France, it will be through the unanimous will of the French people as expressed by 650 deputies in the National Assembly.

122. When I hear representatives question the resolution of December 1950, and express the belief that it might be justifiable to vote against accepting the invitation from the French Government, I say to them: If the General Assembly listened to you, it would be taking an absurd, illogical and, what is more, discourteous decision. I do not think that my colleagues could lightly resolve to vote against the draft resolution which has been submitted by the President of the General Assembly. It is a clear statement of the only problem to be discussed. The budgetary questions have, in fact, been settled by virtue of the decision of December 1950. We cannot go back on that. There are only two points to be considered.

123. The first is the date. The French representative has made the position on that point quite clear and I shall refrain from adding anything at all. If I might express one wish, it would be to suggest that, should certain conditions be fulfilled and should it be possible to put forward the date by one or two weeks, the General Assembly would favour such an advance. In that, I agree with the United Kingdom representative's pertinent observation.

124. Secondly, I fully understand why the French representative told us that it might be unwise to ask a government to receive us and to make quite considerable preparations for only three or four or, at the most, six weeks. It is natural that the whole of the Assembly should be held in Paris. No representative could find anything to say against that.

125. I think the draft resolution is very clear. The arguments used against it are those which were advanced last year and have already been stated before the General Assembly in December 1950. They were not accepted by the General Assembly since thirty-one delegations voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Colombia, Peru and Bolivia. As the Belgian representative rightly pointed out, arguments which some people might have regarded as valid at that time no longer carry any weight. What now remains for us to do is simply to accept the date of 6 November and to thank the French Government for the hospitality which it has kindly offered to the General Assembly as from 6 November 1951, or at an earlier date if possible.

126. Mr. J. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): It is a well known fact that on 14 December 1950 the General Assembly decided to hold its sixth session in Europe. In paragraph 2 of the operative part of the resolution, the President of the General Assembly and the United Nations Secretariat were instructed "to select the city most suitable for the above purpose and to make the necessary arrangements". The preamble to this resolution states that "the building intended for the holding of the General Assembly will not be completed until 1952", and that consequently "there may arise technical difficulties liable to impede the normal functioning of the General Assembly".

127. Not one of the orators who spoke here and endeavoured to show the so-called advantages of New York over Paris took the trouble to explain why he thought that those advantages would be available this autumn and one and all confined themselves to a brief and unfounded statement on the subject. It is common knowledge, however, that at the rate at which work on the new Headquarters is proceeding, building operations on the New York site will be in full swing next autumn and the sixth session of the General Assembly and its Committees would probably have to work amid the clang of excavating machines and hammers. Thus, conditions at the New York Headquarters will hardly be conducive to the normal conduct of the work of the General Assembly's sixth session.

128. We have therefore absolutely no reason to reconsider the views set forth in the preamble to the General Assembly resolution adopted in December; those views still stand, for the factors which led the General Assembly to include them in the preamble remain unchanged. This is so clear that there is no need to dwell any further on the matter.

129. Considering, however, that the French Government, in welcoming the suggestion to hold the General Assembly's sixth session in Paris, proposed as one of the conditions that the opening date of the session should be postponed until 6 November, we might decide to adopt a separate resolution—albeit there would appear to be no special need for it—to the effect that the General Assembly has no objection to a postponement of the opening date of its sixth session.

130. Some speakers have tried to prove to the Assembly that such a step would lead to a dislocation in the work of United Nations organs. Nothing, however, justifies such a statement, which is merely couched in

high-sounding terms and is not founded on or supported by any considerations or arguments. For we all know that the fifth session of the General Assembly has been going on for seven or eight months, that the other organs of the United Nations have continued to function and that there has been no dislocation of their work.

131. This, it should be noted, is not what threatens the collapse of the United Nations. The dislocation and downfall of the United Nations are threatened by other contingencies to which Generalissimo Stalin called attention in a recent interview when he pointed out that the aggressive bloc in the United Nations was trying to transform this Organization, designed as it is to promote peace and friendship among nations, into an instrument of war. This is what is leading towards the disintegration of the United Nations and not the fact that the General Assembly's sixth session will begin on a Tuesday in November instead of a Tuesday in September. So much for the argument of those opposed to holding the General Assembly in Paris, which hardly carries enough weight or conviction to warrant a protracted Assembly debate.

132. In view of the fact that those who spoke against holding the sixth session in Paris merely restricted themselves to general statements without putting forward any concrete arguments in support of their objections, it is essential to draw attention to the general trend on this matter which is characteristic and cannot be disregarded.

133. How did the whole affair develop? First, there appeared a trend to reconsider the decision taken on 14 December 1950 to hold the sixth session in Paris. That tendency made itself clearly felt in February, when the opinion was expressed that "there is no suitable place" in Europe. Poor Europe! It was also alleged that "Geneva is inadequate". Thus, there was a definite tendency to frighten us with the idea of insurmountable difficulties in Europe. At today's meeting of the General Assembly, however, it has become perfectly clear that that attempt at intimidation was unfounded. It now appears that the sixth session of the General Assembly could be held just as well in Geneva, as may be seen from an official document, as in Paris, where the French Government welcomes the holding of the General Assembly's sixth session.

134. Thus, the initial attempt to plead the existence of insurmountable obstacles due to the alleged absence of a suitable place in Europe and the unsuitability of Geneva has fallen flat and has proved to be worthless.

135. Now, new arguments are being dragged out—questions of economy. In this connexion, it may be opportune to dwell for a moment on the initial arguments advanced by those who desire to scare the General Assembly with the supposedly insurmountable difficulties which would attend the holding of the sixth session in Europe.

136. We know that there is an official letter from the World Federation of United Nations Associations, dated 5 February 1951, which has been circulated to the heads of all delegations to the United Nations. In that letter, the Federation's Secretary-General, Mr. John Ennals, states that, in view of the General Assembly resolution of 14 December 1950, the General Council of the World Federation of United Nations

Associations had adopted, at its tenth session on 4 February 1951, a resolution approving the General Assembly's decision to hold its next session in Europe and declaring that the Geneva area is well able to provide the General Assembly with all the necessary facilities, including hotel accommodation.

137. The General Council of the Federation informed the General Assembly of that fact and expressed the hope that the United Nations would be in a position to accept the warm invitation extended to it by the Geneva authorities to hold the General Assembly's sixth session in Geneva, where it could meet under normal conditions in peaceful and quiet surroundings. The conclusions set forth in the letter from the World Federation of United Nations Associations completely refute therefore the assertions that Geneva is unsuitable.

138. Obviously, there is more reason to rely on the Genevese, who adopted this resolution in Geneva itself, than to believe casual visitors who went there only on a flying trip.

139. While on the subject, it was the Australian representative who spoke here, if I am not mistaken, of a hat which had been passed round and had failed to collect any invitations. However, from the document mentioned by me, it is clear that those who went to Europe never removed their hats and kept them so firmly on their heads that no proposal was dropped into them. If their hats had been removed, an invitation would have dropped inside. However, despite everything, the invitation has been received in an official document. As it is, events are following their natural course, hat or no hat!

140. It is evident that the sixth session of the General Assembly can be held not only in Geneva but also in Paris. The French Government officially invited the General Assembly to hold its sixth session in Paris and said that it would be happy to welcome it there, as Mr. Lacoste, acting representative for France to the United Nations, stated in his letter.

141. It is now quite clear that the alleged difficulties raised by certain persons in connexion with the place of meeting of the General Assembly's sixth session prove that pressure is being brought to bear by some outside force. There is an attempt to convince somebody of something and to intimidate us with talk of insurmountable difficulties. On investigation it appears, however, that no such difficulties exist and the whole argument, based on imaginary difficulties, therefore falls to the ground.

142. The first two arguments—that "there is no suitable place in Europe" and that "Geneva is inadequate"—have thus been disposed of. There are two possibilities in Europe: Geneva and Paris. We even have a choice.

143. However, after the first two arguments have failed, a third one based on financial considerations is now put forward.

144. With regard to the financial considerations, let us look at the cost of the General Assembly's third session in Paris, which was unhappily not concluded there but was transferred to New York. According to the official report for the financial year ended 31 December 1948 and the report of the Board of Auditors,

the total cost to the United Nations of holding the General Assembly's third session in two parts in Paris and New York, was \$2,329,000. This is almost as much as is contemplated for the next session in Paris. According to the draft resolution, we are being offered \$2,350,400, whereas the third session—which began in Paris and finished in New York two years ago—cost the United Nations \$2,329,000. The difference is not very great, in all, about \$21,000.

145. It would be foolish to assert that prices will not have risen between 1948 and the end of 1951. The reason for this rise in prices is universally known. It is no secret to anybody and least of all to the broad masses, including housewives, who are at present forced to pay higher taxes and higher prices. It is due to an armaments race unparalleled in history and started by a country, the name of which we need not give, for it is known to everybody. Thus, the tens of millions of dollars set aside for rearmament here in this country since the beginning of this session speak for themselves.

146. It is therefore inevitable that there should be some increase in the cost of holding the General Assembly's sixth session in Paris. The cost of holding that session in New York would also appear to be considerably more than for former sessions held there as prices in the United States have risen while taxes have become much higher.

147. In the light of those facts, any talk of the "dislocation" of the work of the organs of the United Nations—I believe this was the word used by the representative of the Philippines, General Rómulo—due to the sixth session being held in Paris is unfounded. Those organs of the United Nations which, according to the calendar of meetings have to meet in November-December 1951 or in January-February 1952, can easily advance their meetings to September-October 1951 if the sixth session of the General Assembly is not being held at that time. Such a course would be possible and it is within the powers of the United Nations Secretariat to revise the calendar of meetings accordingly, should it be decided to convene the sixth session of the General Assembly in Paris on 6 November 1951. As I have already said, these are not the reasons for disruption and dislocation, as General Rómulo, and indeed all of us, are well aware.

148. So much for the organizational and financial aspects of the question. In view of these considerations, the USSR delegation feels that there is no need to review the decision of last December.

149. We could of course do without a special new resolution on the subject, but taking into account the rules of procedure and other considerations, we could adopt an additional resolution to the effect that the General Assembly has no objection to postponing its sixth session until 6 November 1951.

150. In view of its statement on the financial aspect and the practice so far followed by the United Nations, the USSR delegation does not see any need for paragraph 3 of the operative part of the draft resolution. Obviously, those responsible for handling the budget cannot go beyond the appropriations made, namely, the total mentioned in the budget.

151. If in view of the increase in prices, taxes, etc. to which I have referred, there is need for additional expenditure in connexion with holding the sixth session

in Paris, that expenditure can of course be authorized with the consent and by the decision of the relevant United Nations organs, including the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Such is the established practice and there is therefore no need to take a special decision on the matter. No one has the right, without the concurrence of that Committee, to transfer funds from one section of the United Nations budget to another or to exceed the funds which have been appropriated. If any additional expenditure were to arise, then those who deal with such questions would discuss the matter with the Advisory Committee. I should also like to draw the delegations' attention to General Assembly resolution 184 (II) concerning the place of meeting of the third session of the Assembly, which was held in Paris. The resolution contained no special provision in that respect. The operative part of that resolution merely stated:

*"The General Assembly*

*" . . .*

*"Decides that the third regular session of the General Assembly shall be held in Europe;*

*"Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with a committee of nine members designated by the President of the General Assembly, to choose the city where the third regular session of the General Assembly shall be held."*

And there the matter ended. That was the decision and the session was held in Paris without any additional discussion or financial considerations.

152. As I see it, there is little need to take any special decisions now regarding the meeting place of the sixth session; we should therefore merely say that the General Assembly confirms its earlier decision of December last to hold its sixth session in Europe—to be precise, in Paris—adding a statement to the effect that the General Assembly has no objection to commencing its sixth session on 6 November instead of in September. Nothing more need be said.

153. As regards the expenditure involved, that is covered by definite financial rules which may not be broken by anyone. Should additional funds be required, those dealing with such matters will have to prove conclusively to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions that additional allocations are really needed. That is how matters really stand.

154. Consequently, if we are not to give in to those who would like to intimidate the General Assembly with references to insurmountable political and local obstacles, or at least to financial difficulties, it might perhaps be best to maintain only the first two paragraphs of the operative part of the draft resolution and to delete paragraph 3, although the latter does not call for any objection of substance.

155. As is well known, when we discussed the place of meeting of the General Assembly's sixth session [324th meeting], the USSR delegation voted for Europe. The USSR delegation considers that the General Assembly's decision of last December is quite sufficient and sees no particular reason to adopt at this time any other decision.

156. The USSR delegation has no comments to make on the considerations set forth in Mr. Lacoste's letter

and agrees that the General Assembly's sixth session should be held in Paris. In that connexion, it is impossible to pass over the strange remarks of some speakers, which really make an odd impression. Certain representatives, after thanking the French Government for its hospitality, declined, in the same breath, that hospitality. Such behaviour makes a poor impression, to say the least. In my opinion, the General Assembly has every reason to take advantage of the hospitality which has been offered it and to convene its sixth session in Paris.

157. The USSR delegation will therefore vote for the first two paragraphs of the operative part of the draft resolution but does not see any special need for the inclusion of paragraph 3.

158. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We have already heard ten speakers and there are four more on my list: the representatives of Haiti, Israel, United States and France. If there is no objection, I shall close the list of speakers. Before putting to the vote the draft resolution now before the Assembly, I shall call upon the Secretary-General who will answer some questions put to him.

159. Mr. Dantes BELLEGARDE (Haiti) (*translated from French*): I apologize for intervening in this discussion. I am a newcomer to the United Nations and, although I am a "veteran" of the League of Nations, I regard myself as a "freshman" in this Assembly. I should, however, like to say why I shall vote in favour of the draft resolution before us.

160. The General Assembly adopted a resolution in December last, and it is valid, as the President has stated and most of the previous speakers have confirmed. We have been called together simply to decide whether France's proposal should be accepted. We had decided that the next session of the United Nations' General Assembly should be held in Europe. The Secretary-General told us in his report that he had not found any government in a position to invite the Assembly to meet in its capital or any other of its cities.

161. Now the Assembly has a formal invitation from the French Government which is all the more appreciated because it comes from the French National Assembly. It is the French nation itself, through its government, which is inviting the United Nations to hold its next General Assembly in Paris in November.

162. There is undoubtedly some value to the arguments put forward during the discussion of the resolution adopted last December, and I do not see any ill will on the part of some of our colleagues who have used the same arguments again this afternoon. I do not regard that as a disloyal move: all those who have spoken against adopting the proposal are honourable men, guided solely by the interests of the United Nations and of peace throughout the world. Nevertheless, the arguments advanced in December were not considered valid then by the General Assembly and they are not valid this afternoon.

163. The only question which now remains is the date of the General Assembly's opening. The French representative has given the compelling reasons which prevented, and still prevent, France from inviting the United Nations before November. Many representatives have stressed the point that that date would place them in a difficult position. Some are accustomed to spend

Christmas and the New Year with their families—I might say that we are all in that position. But this argument is valueless when considering the importance of the task before us. During a war do soldiers, officers, generals ask that hostilities should be suspended so that they can go and spend Christmas and the New Year with their families? We are engaged in a war for peace, and all personal considerations must be set aside when we have to serve the cause of peace.

164. Unfortunately, the old formula has reappeared: "If you want peace, prepare for war". We want to obtain peace by preparing for peace. We have also heard references made to the armaments race. It is terrible that millions of dollars should be spent for the work of death instead of for the work of peace and those who are really responsible for this armaments race must be sought out.

165. The Bolivian representative's argument that we must go to Europe because Europe is today a "sick man" impressed me very strongly. We must go to Europe in order to show that continent that the United Nations was established not for war, but for peace. We must give Europeans a living proof of the fact that we are working for peace. This morning, I read that the Economic and Social Council's session at Santiago de Chile had made a strong impression on the Chilean people. In our countries, we read the papers, listen to speeches on the radio and even watch the speakers on television, but the kind of work we are doing is not fully appreciated. We must bring to the peoples as often as possible a living illustration of our work, of our labour for peace and for the whole world.

166. That is why I am whole-heartedly in favour of holding the next General Assembly in Europe—the continent which, more than any other part of the world, needs to know the true nature of the work accomplished by the United Nations.

167. As to the financial considerations raised here, they can be quite properly settled under the terms of the resolution now before us.

168. Without entering into a prolonged discussion, I wanted to place the views of the Haitian delegation before you. I have just stated the grounds for our support of the draft resolution, and for our desire that the next session of the General Assembly should be held in Paris.

169. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): The delegation of Israel voted last December against holding the sixth session of the General Assembly in Europe. The reasons which prompt us now to maintain our position have been enumerated and substantiated in this debate by the representatives of the Netherlands, Sweden and others who followed them.

170. May I, in this respect, add only one other small consideration. In addition to the financial burdens and administrative difficulties which would confront the United Nations in holding the next session in Europe, delegations would have to accommodate themselves to new and untested facilities which might impede their efficient functioning.

171. In voting against the draft resolution now before us, my delegation wishes to assure the representative of France that we greatly appreciate the gracious

response given by the French Government to the wishes of the majority of the Members of the United Nations. France has been the scene of and host to many momentous and successful conferences. The only peace treaties concluded after the last war were negotiated and signed in Paris. This should serve as an inspiration to all those who have not abandoned hope that negotiations, conducted now and in the future in a spirit of mutual understanding, can and will pave the road to lasting peace. The Israeli delegation is confident that French hospitality will have ample opportunity to contribute to the success of international conferences, even if in 1951 France does not have occasion to welcome the sixth session of the General Assembly in Paris.

172. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): When the question of selecting the site for the sixth session of the General Assembly came up last December, my delegation abstained from voting. We did so because we felt that as host government, and as the country having the honour of furnishing the site for the United Nations Headquarters, abstention on our part seemed to be the proper course to take.

173. We do not wish to appear to avoid the responsibilities resting on the host government, nor do we want to seem to take advantage of the obvious economies, efficiencies and general convenience which would flow to us, as well as to a number of other countries, by reason of having the sixth session take place in New York. I stress those three considerations of economy, efficiency and convenience.

174. It seemed to us only appropriate to consider the question of economy not merely as a loyal Member of the Organization but as one of the large contributors to its budget. We agree with the comments that have been made by some of the preceding speakers that, in a sense, the general policy question was put at rest by the decision which was taken by the General Assembly on 14 December, and it is not now my purpose to reopen this matter nor to question the policies underlying it, particularly because of the factors which led us to abstain, which I have just outlined.

175. With regard to the questions which are now before the Assembly, I consider that the record is completely clear with regard to several very practical considerations which have been presented. The matter of financial implications of the proposal contained in the draft resolution is one which I am sure will cause concern to all of us and, for a variety of reasons, will be of particular concern to my government, as well as to some of the other governments represented here.

176. We are also very much concerned, as I imagine all Members are, with the administrative problems which have been mentioned in very clear terms by some of the preceding speakers. It would be interesting to know what, in fact, would be the effect upon the work of the United Nations organs and specialized agencies of this new element which has come into the situation: the rather late date which the Government of France suggests or advises us is the earliest date upon which it can conveniently make the necessary arrangements. While I am sure that this is not the time or the place to engage in general political polemics, it does seem to me that there may be varying interests

in the work of these specialized agencies. Some of us participate in their work whole-heartedly; others have seen fit not to participate, and therefore perhaps they might be excused if they do not take into account the necessities for efficiency and orderly operations which those constructive agencies perform.

177. Therefore it is relevant and indeed rather important for the Assembly to be advised by the Secretary-General, if he would be kind enough to do so what, in his opinion, would be the effect upon the work of the other agencies and organs of the United Nations of the date of opening of the Assembly proposed to us by the note which we have received from the Government of France.

178. Finally, there also arises the question of general convenience and efficiency of operations upon which the views of the Secretary-General, as the responsible executive of the Organization, would also be most welcome to my government and I imagine to other governments represented here. Therefore, before my delegation is in a position to act upon this matter, it would be most obliged if the representative of France would find it possible to indicate to the Assembly whether it is within the plan of the Government of France, as it has surveyed the problem, to provide the necessary facilities in such form and manner as would leave the United Nations without the necessity of incurring any extra expense beyond the amount which appears in the approved budget for 1951, perhaps with some small addition that might be decided upon by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions—by a small amount I assume is meant an amount which in fact we would all agree was a small amount. We would therefore appreciate it if the Secretary-General would be kind enough to give us an appraisal of the administrative implications, both with regard to the efficiency of operations and the impact upon the work of other organs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

179. Mr. LACOSTE (France) (*translated from French*): I should indeed be ungrateful if I did not thank the various delegations which have spoken about Paris and its hospitality in such a flattering manner before they announced that they would vote against the President's proposal that the General Assembly should take a definite decision to hold its next session in Paris. Many of the speakers who have addressed the Assembly on this subject have spoken of the capital of France in such terms that the members of the French delegation present here could not help feeling a little homesick. I must also express my gratitude to some of these delegations for the charming embarrassment they showed in developing their arguments.

180. In the matter of substance, I have but two remarks to make. First, my government will not, of course, feel annoyed or hurt in any way if the result of the vote on the President's draft resolution should be adverse. Likewise, if the decision should be favourable, it is prepared to assume the additional obligations—if the truth were told, rather heavy additional obligations—entailed by its acceding, against its financial interest at least, to the friendly pressure exerted upon it by the majority of the Assembly during previous debates on the matter. I would just remark,

however, that it would undoubtedly have been better if the arguments which have been advanced here today against the proposal—some of which are, indeed, very pertinent—had been made earlier. In that way we should have gained time, which seems to be one of the basic concerns of most representatives speaking against the draft resolution today.

181. Last, but not least, I wish to thank those who, in speaking in favour of the draft resolution, also praised Paris and in so doing invoked reasons the lofty character of which touched me. I am sure that the representative of Bolivia will realize that I am referring to him and that he will be recognized by everyone.

182. There is one last remark I should like to make. I am faced by a somewhat delicate situation: to decide how I shall cast my vote. I was tempted to abstain but I must say that some of the arguments put forward to discourage the Assembly from voting to choose Paris—I shall leave it to the Assembly to guess which—have led me to consider seriously whether I should not vote in favour of the proposal.

183. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We are very happy about the conclusions Mr. Lacoste has reached. I now call upon the Secretary-General.

184. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I am reluctant to answer now all the questions which have been raised because if I am to negotiate agreements with the French Government I do not wish to commit myself to too great an extent at this time. A card player likes to have some hidden cards in his hand.

185. I might just say that the difference between 1948 and 1951 is the following, and I mention this to explain the necessity of adopting paragraph 3 of the draft resolution proposed by the President. In 1948 countries were almost competing with each other to welcome the General Assembly, and we were so popular at that time that we had invitations from three governments in Europe—from the Governments of France, the Netherlands and Belgium. It was much easier then to negotiate the necessary agreements and we had in fact reached an understanding with all three governments on the basic principles relating to holding the Assembly in any one of those countries. Thus, before we began to negotiate, detailed agreements were already in existence with regard to each one of the countries which might be selected by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, stipulating that the government concerned should provide us with a General Assembly hall, office space, buildings, maintenance service and so on. Everything was ready. When Paris was chosen by the Advisory Committee, on my advice and in accordance with my proposal, we just had to work out the details with the French Government.

186. This time there is no basic agreement. We have a letter by which we are welcomed to Paris. Something remains to be negotiated—agreements concerning the practical life of the General Assembly for twelve or thirteen weeks.

187. Therefore, I think it is necessary that paragraph 3 of the President's draft resolution should be adopted by the General Assembly, as such a resolution would

state the wishes of the majority and would express the limits within which I have the right to negotiate with the French Government in connexion with all practical agreements.

188. I should like to answer one question which has been put to me by several speakers: whether the Working Capital Fund is involved. If the draft resolution is adopted, including its last paragraph—the proviso that some amounts can be transferred to the section of the budget covering the holding of the General Assembly session—the Working Capital Fund will not be involved. I think, therefore, that it would be a guarantee to have the last paragraph of the draft resolution adopted by the General Assembly.

189. I agree with what has been said by the representative of the United Kingdom and by the President—and there were also some remarks to that effect in the statement of the representative of France—that the amounts mentioned in the last sentence of the draft resolution are to be small amounts. The budget for 1951 is very tight. Perhaps we may effect saving if the situation changes in some of the organs of the United Nations and, if small amounts will satisfy the French Government's request, I shall recommend to the Advisory Committee that it agrees to place those amounts in that section of the budget which covers the session of the General Assembly.

190. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I wish to raise a point of order. I believe I am right in saying that all financial allocations require a two-thirds majority. In the opinion of my delegation, the final paragraph of the draft resolution deals with a financial allocation and therefore must obtain a two-thirds majority. In view of this fact and in view of the fact that the last paragraph impinges on the preceding paragraphs of the resolution, we believe that the last paragraph should be voted on first.

191. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In my opinion, the adoption of paragraph 3 does not necessarily require a two-thirds majority. It is true that some figures are mentioned in it, but the budget has already been adopted by a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly. It would not be correct to say that the decision would involve budgetary expenditures and that the paragraph must accordingly be adopted by a two-thirds majority.

192. The original decision of the General Assembly—I refer to resolution 497 (V) dated 14 December 1950—was adopted by a simple majority, but when the budget was submitted to the Assembly—a budget which made provision for the holding of the sixth regular session in Europe—it was adopted by a two-thirds majority.

193. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan): The last part of the draft resolution reads: "...plus such additional amounts as may be authorized by transfer from other sections of the 1951 budget by the Secretary-General with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions". Of course at this stage, beyond a vague assurance that these sums will be small, we do not know what the importance of these sums will be. Secondly, we do not know, whatever their importance, whether they can be found within the budget, and thirdly, we have no

means of assessing at the moment what the effect of such a transfer from one section to another will be on the section from which the money is withdrawn. I think that this can easily be understood to mean that it will have an effect on the budget estimates, although it may not affect the total sum under those budget estimates. If that is correct, I suggest that rule 152 of the rules of procedure applies. Rule 152 reads in part:

"No resolution in respect of which expenditures are anticipated by the Secretary-General shall be voted by the General Assembly until the Administrative and Budgetary Committee has had an opportunity of stating the effect of the proposal upon the budget estimates of the United Nations."

194. Consequently, I request the President to rule that the General Assembly cannot vote upon this draft resolution in its present form.

195. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I propose to express my opinion after the representative of Australia has spoken. However, I wish to state that, in my opinion, the sum provided in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution has already been approved by the General Assembly.

196. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia): You may recall that I referred to those few words at the end of the draft resolution when I addressed the General Assembly earlier in the meeting. As I said then, it is quite customary for amounts to be transferred from one section of the budget to another, and those words may mean no more than a repetition of the normal procedures of the General Assembly. I did say, however, that their express inclusion indicated to me the possibility that the Secretary-General might anticipate that the amount of \$2,350,400 would in fact prove to be inadequate. I am not quite sure whether I correctly understood the Secretary-General when he spoke to us a moment ago, but perhaps he could clarify this because it would have a bearing on my impression as to whether this particular sentence requires a two-thirds majority or not.

197. When the question was being considered at an earlier stage by the Fifth Committee and subsequently by the General Assembly, there was a report from the Secretary-General [A/C.5/433] which indicated that he anticipated that the cost of holding the session of the General Assembly in Europe would be a certain amount, on the assumption that certain facilities, which were there enumerated, were provided by a host government. What I am not entirely clear about is this: is the Secretary-General proposing that if, in respect of those items which he had estimated would be carried on the United Nations budget, the expenditure is under \$2,350,400, plus any savings on the budget from other sections, we should be authorized to apply those savings to lightening—if I may say so without disrespect—the burden on the French Government? If that were the case, I think it would require a two-thirds majority, because it is a departure from what has already been agreed to. If, however, those additional words are just to remind the General Assembly that after all it is not uncommon for sections to be exceeded and that, if the amount of \$2,350,400 were exceeded it is always open to the Secretary-General, with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee, to transfer it to another section, he would

merely be repeating what is accepted practice and I do not think it would require a two-thirds majority. However, I should be grateful if the Secretary-General would clarify exactly what is involved.

198. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): On the same point of order, I believe that the representative of Australia raises a problem which is directly related to the question I put in my statement and to which I regret that I feel no answer has yet been given. If economies were made, the effect on the budget in the normal course of operations would be that those economies would quite simply be unexpended funds, and therefore the purpose of the expenditure does seem to be relevant to the point of order which has been raised.

199. In my comments a few moments ago, I very respectfully suggested that it would be most desirable to have the record perfectly clear on two points: first, whether the Government of France, in its planning and its concept of the problem, considers that the sixth session can be held in Paris without exceeding the total amount set apart in the present 1951 budget for the purpose of holding the sixth session; and, secondly, before the vote is taken, among other things to enable my delegation to abstain rather than vote against the pending draft resolution, it might be advisable to have an appraisal from the Secretary-General of the effect which the opening of the session at the late date suggested would have upon the work of other United Nations organs and the specialized agencies. In no sense did I put those two questions as rhetorical questions. They seem to my delegation to be relevant and quite important to a proper and orderly consideration of this matter.

200. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I shall answer the last question first. If the General Assembly convenes on 6 November, and goes on until the end of January or the middle of February, some difficulties will arise with the schedules of the specialized agencies. I have always encouraged the specialized agencies to hold their general conferences in the spring, so that the international meetings might be spread out over the year. That results in a saving in the long run. I cannot go into the details of that now. However, my answer to that question is that there would be practical difficulties which would, in the long run, mean the same thing as further expenditure by the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

201. With regard to the question raised both by the representative of Australia and the representative of the United States, it is too complex a question for me to answer at this time. We are all facing too many unknown factors. I cannot say more on that subject than what I have already stated. I think that paragraph 3 is necessary.

202. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan): We can proceed on only one of two assumptions. Either paragraph 3 is necessary or it is not. According to the comments made by the President, one would conclude that it is merely a reiteration of a decision which has already been properly taken on a previous date. In that case, I would beg leave to suggest that it is unnecessary. However, a moment ago, the Secretary-General assured us that this paragraph is in fact necessary, which

means that it has budgetary implications, and that it does provide for sums beyond those which the Assembly has voted for this particular purpose.

203. I suggest, therefore, for the President's consideration, that he should rule in the spirit of the second sentence of rule 152 of the rules of procedure under which the Assembly is not empowered to vote upon the matter unless it has been examined and reported upon by the Fifth Committee. In the last resort, if this paragraph is taken out, the complexion of the resolution would be different. But, so long as it stays there, I beg leave to doubt whether, under the present circumstances, this Assembly has the power to vote on it. If the Assembly should decide, against the President's advice or in support of his advice, that it can, certainly there is no doubt that a two-thirds majority would be required.

204. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I believe that the rules of procedure provide a solution for such difficulties. The Assembly is divided on the question of whether a two-thirds majority is necessary or not for the adoption of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution before us. In order not to put the Assembly in an embarrassing position, I prefer not to make a ruling. I shall consult the Assembly as to whether it thinks the vote on paragraph 3 requires a two-thirds majority or not. Under the rules of procedure, this decision will be taken by a simple majority.

205. I call upon the USSR representative on a point of order.

206. Mr. J. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): It seems to me that the United States representative is making what I would call an unfair request by asking the French representative to say, on his Government's behalf, whether the General Assembly will be able to manage on its present budget. It is very difficult for any government to answer such a question, which is essentially a matter for the United Nations General Assembly itself.

207. I feel, therefore, that there is no need or justification for asking the French Government any such question. We ourselves can consider and decide here whether or not any additional funds will be required. Taking the whole situation into account, it is probable that they will be required. Should that be so, there is the accepted procedure whereby those responsible for financial arrangements must apply to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

208. The USSR delegation therefore sees no particular need for paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, but if this paragraph is indispensable we could support it on the understanding that it is to be interpreted as meaning that we are not thereby authorizing the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to revise the General Assembly's decision but that its function must be restricted to finding, together with those responsible for the budget, ways and means of covering the additional expenditure; in any case, the Advisory Committee must not be given *carte blanche* in the matter. That Committee might suddenly decide that it cannot sanction additional funds

or monies even to the extent of a single dollar, and that, therefore, the Assembly cannot meet in Paris.

209. I feel that we must here agree that the General Assembly does not by this resolution confer such powers on the Advisory Committee. That Committee, together with the officials of the Secretariat in charge of the budget, must find ways and means of covering any additional expenditure that may be incurred. At the moment none of us has a clear idea as to what the supplementary expenditure will be; it may well be that there will be none. Should any be necessary, however, it is essential that the Advisory Committee should assist in finding the necessary funds to cover those expenses, within the limits of the total budget and without exceeding the funds appropriated for 1951.

210. That is how the matter stands. On no account, however, should this decision be construed as authorizing the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to revise the General Assembly's resolution, in the event that anyone should think of interpreting it in that sense.

211. It must, therefore, be made perfectly clear that the General Assembly is instructing the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, together with those dealing with budgetary matters, to see to the proper disbursement of the available funds and to find ways and means of meeting any additional expenditure should the need arise, but does not authorize the Advisory Committee to revise the General Assembly's decision.

212. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): In speaking on the same point of order regarding financial allocations, I beg leave to disagree with the President in his statement that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution could not be interpreted as a new budgetary allocation. I draw attention to the President's own words in his draft resolution, where he says ". . . plus such additional amounts as may be authorized by transfer from other sections of the 1951 budget by the Secretary-General. . . ." The draft resolution refers to "other sections". When the last General Assembly approved the budget, it did so in connexion with, let us say, sections A, B or C. The Assembly did not foresee a new insertion of section "X" for an additional Paris meeting. Therefore, the transfer of a certain amount of money from one section to another, or from one purpose to another purpose, is a new financial question. This is my first observation.

213. With regard to the second point I wish to raise, I direct your attention to Article 18 of the Charter which, in part, states as follows:

"Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting. These questions shall include . . . budgetary questions."

The Charter does not even mention budgetary allocations; it refers to budgetary questions.

214. My third point relates to the rules of procedure, certain parts of which have already been referred to by the representative of Pakistan.

215. In the light of all these considerations, it is impossible to escape the conclusion that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution is, first, a budgetary and finan-

cial allocation and, secondly, a new allocation, although it is made within the framework of the 1951 budget. The Secretary-General himself has said that we are facing too many unknown factors. He is quite right. We do not know what these factors will turn out to be. The Secretary-General is going to Paris or will send someone there to negotiate various agreements which might have all kinds of financial implications. How can this Assembly put its stamp of approval on something the implications of which it does not even know? How can this Assembly, which professes to direct the peace of the world, take such a decision at a time when thousands of people are dying on the battlefield? We must think twice before doing so.

216. Let us leave all other considerations aside. I do not know what the delegations may have in mind when speaking of going to Paris. Surely there are good reasons for the Assembly to think of its responsibilities.

217. The representatives of the United States asked whether the time-table would upset the functioning of other United Nations organs. The reply was that naturally it would. However, no complete answer was given. The Economic and Social Council meets in February; that meeting will have to be cancelled, as well as the meeting of the Trusteeship Council in January and of the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund, which also meets about that time, to say nothing of the specialized agencies.

218. How many representatives here present can tell us the number of Korean refugees who are dying now in Korea? What is the number of Arab refugees or of Greek refugees? Is the world really so much at peace that we can so easily trade a few million dollars light-heartedly? And for what purpose? Can someone tell us just what advantage is to be gained from going to Paris and trading away a few million dollars? This Organization has great responsibilities on its shoulders. Not even the Government of France wants the United Nations to meet in Paris at that time. It is quite right. The French Government is not anxious to put up a few million dollars of its own money for the doubtful blessing of having an international organization sitting in the Palais de Chaillot during a very critical period of its political life. I ask those who support the idea of going to Paris if that would be an advantage to the United Nations. By the time of the proposed date, the French elections will just have been held. The French Government will be settling down to a period of cabinet-forming and party politics. Would it be an advantage to France to have us there? Would that be an advantage to the United Nations? Where is the advantage?

219. It is not my intention to speak for a long time, I am rising now only to speak on a point of order. I did not speak before because I did not want to influence the majority. The fact is inescapable that starting the session on 6 November would upset the entire meeting schedule of the United Nations. It must be calculated that between the end of such a session and the beginning of the following General Assembly there will be only a six months' interval, while the period between the end of last December and the next General Assembly will be about a year. You cannot leave the problems of the world to be considered at such irregular intervals.

220. I now come back to my point of order. I must disagree with the President; the last paragraph of the draft resolution is a new allocation. According to the rules of procedure and the Charter, it requires a two-thirds majority.

221. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We are now discussing the question whether paragraph 3 requires a two-thirds majority for adoption or not. We have already had a long debate; let us not stray from the subject.

222. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan): The President has been good enough to express his views on whether or not rule 84 of the rules of procedure applies. May I remind him that I have also drawn his attention to rule 152, on which he has not expressed his views. I should like to refresh the memory of the General Assembly by reading the last sentence:

“No resolution in respect of which expenditures are anticipated by the Secretary-General shall be voted by the General Assembly until the Administrative and Budgetary Committee has had an opportunity of stating the effect of the proposal upon the budget estimates of the United Nations.”

223. The question before us is merely this: in respect of the decisions contained in this draft resolution, does the Secretary-General anticipate further expenditures? He has told us twice that he does. If so, this is one of those draft resolutions on which the Assembly, in the way it is at present set up, is not empowered to vote unless the matter has been before the Fifth Committee and the report of that Committee, on the effect of the proposal, is before the Assembly. I should be very grateful to the President if he would rule on this matter in the spirit of rule 152 of the rules of procedure.

224. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In my opinion, rule 152 does not apply. It reads as follows:

“No resolution involving expenditure shall be recommended by a committee for approval by the General Assembly unless it is accompanied by an estimate of expenditures prepared by the Secretary-General.”

225. But this is not a committee, this is the Assembly itself. Furthermore, rule 152 was applied when the Assembly wanted to take a decision on the question of holding the sixth session in Europe. At that time the Fifth Committee studied the financial implications and submitted a report to the Assembly [A/1714]. The Assembly then approved the budget as a whole by a two-thirds majority. Consequently, I repeat, rule 152 does not apply in this case. It is true that the Charter and the rules of procedure stipulate that a draft resolution which has budgetary implications must be approved by two-thirds majority. When the General Assembly has doubts whether this rule is applicable to a draft resolution or not, however, and is divided on the point, it must take a specific decision. I should therefore like to have the Assembly's opinion in order to get out of this impasse. It would be difficult for me to make a ruling myself or to listen to the same arguments over and over again. I shall therefore not make a ruling but shall ask for the Assembly's opinion. Are we agreed on this point?

226. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan): My difficulty lies in the fact that the President read the first sentence of rule 152. I refer to the second sentence of that rule. The first sentence undoubtedly does not apply but the second sentence does. The expenditures anticipated in this draft resolution have never been voted upon by the General Assembly for the purpose for which they are to be allocated now.

227. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): If I should call on all those who want to speak on this point, we should never finish. The Assembly must take a decision. If I am obliged to do so, I shall make a ruling but it will be challenged and possibly overruled. I would like to avoid this procedure as I want the Assembly to decide for itself whether a two-thirds majority is needed for the adoption of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. Will the representatives agree to refrain from speaking? The representative of Iraq has asked to speak. He is the sixth on my list.

*The President continued in English.*

If the members do not agree with my last ruling, I shall have to allow the other representatives to address the Assembly as well.

228. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) (*translated from French*): I ask for the closure of the debate.

229. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Points of order have to be dealt with in an orderly manner. Although the Bolivian representative wants to facilitate my task, I am sorry to say that his point of order is out of order, since we are already discussing a point of order which has to be settled.

230. Mr. BRENAN (Australia): I am very sorry to prolong the discussion but in fact I wish to make a suggestion which might possibly shorten it. It occurs to me that a small amendment might overcome all the difficulties we are facing. If, as I said earlier, the last part of paragraph 3 in the draft resolution merely reiterates what is standard practice, it would seem to me not to require a two-thirds majority. I was therefore wondering if we might delete the words “plus such additional amount . . .” down to the end of the paragraph, and insert at an earlier stage something along the following lines:

“Provided that the total estimated cost of holding the sixth session in Paris, including such meetings as may be arranged after 1 January 1952, shall not, subject to the normal rules of finance of the General Assembly, exceed the amount of \$2,350,400 provided in the 1951 budget.”

231. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I do not know the opinion of other representatives, but I judge from the reaction of those who supported the draft resolution that this amendment would be rejected.

232. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) (*translated from French*): I have listened carefully to the remarks of the representatives of Pakistan and Iraq, but I cannot support them for the simple reason that, whatever happens, the 1951 budget cannot be altered. It has been adopted by a two-thirds majority of the Assembly. Since the budget has not been amended and expenditures do not exceed its provisions, no new question has arisen, contrary to the affirmation of the represen-

tative of Iraq. This is not a new question, since the expenditure concerned remains within the 1951 budget. Consequently, I do not think that a two-thirds majority is necessary.

233. Mr. LACOSTE (France) (*translated from French*): I merely wish to reply to Mr. Gross's question. The French Government has not asked for any specific sum to help it in the preparatory arrangements for the Assembly, but relies on the Secretary-General to contribute whatever he can, within the available appropriations, towards the Assembly's session in Europe. If the Secretary-General should find that he does not have quite enough funds at his disposal and should wish to consult the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, that is for him to decide. We have asked for nothing more than the assistance, understanding and co-operation of the United Nations in giving us, within the limits deemed possible by the Secretary-General, such support as will ensure that our financial obligations are not excessive.

234. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I do not believe it is proper procedure—again taking the President's leave since I seem to be disagreeing with him all the time today—to take the sense of this Assembly when there is in the rules of procedure a rule which is quite clear. The representative of Pakistan quoted the second sentence of rule 152. This is quite specific and reads as follows:

“No resolution in respect of which expenditures are anticipated by the Secretary-General shall be voted by the General Assembly until the Administrative and Budgetary Committee has had an opportunity of stating the effect of the proposal upon the budget estimates of the United Nations.”

235. When the rules are very clear there should be no question either of a ruling or of taking the sense of the Assembly. The rule is clear. We cannot take a vote by a simple majority to decide on a question which is already determined by the rules of procedure.

236. The PRESIDENT: Who is to decide whether or not the rule is clear? It may seem clear to you but others may have a different opinion.

237. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan): The President was going to put to the Assembly the question of whether rule 84, which provides for a two-thirds majority, does or does not apply. I have submitted that the second sentence of rule 152 is applicable. The President has disagreed with me. Therefore, to get the record straight, that should be the first question to be put to the Assembly; if that is the President's ruling, I shall take the liberty of challenging that ruling.

238. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): My ruling is firm and final. The Pakistani representative's last resort is to challenge it. The time is now 6.30 p.m. and the matter has been sufficiently discussed. I shall put to the Assembly the question of whether or not the adoption of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution requires a two-thirds majority. Have I made myself clear?

239. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan): I challenge the ruling.

240. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I shall repeat my ruling, which is to put to the Assem-

bly the question of whether a two-thirds majority is required for the adoption of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. It is not a decision on my part, it is rather a decision to put the question to the Assembly. In challenging my ruling, does the Pakistani representative mean that I am not to consult the Assembly on that point?

241. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan): I have not reached the stage of contesting that ruling. I contest the President's ruling that rule 152 does not apply. That is what the President has ruled and I take the liberty of challenging that ruling.

242. The PRESIDENT: That is not my ruling. I beg the representative of Pakistan to follow very carefully what I have to say. And I prefer to say it in French in order to be sure that I do not make mistakes.

(*Translated from French*):

My ruling is that I shall put to the General Assembly the question of whether or not a two-thirds majority is required for the adoption of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. Does the representative of Pakistan still challenge that ruling?

243. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan): First of all, I request the President to give a ruling on whether or not rule 152 applies. I have submitted that rule 152 does apply and that therefore—leaving aside the question of a two-thirds majority—the General Assembly cannot vote at all on the matter. First, then, the President has to decide whether the General Assembly can vote. In my view, rule 152 forbids the General Assembly to vote on this question at all. If the President rules that rule 152 does not so forbid the General Assembly, I shall take the liberty of challenging his ruling. Therefore, to set the record straight, that is the first question on which I shall request a ruling by the President. If it is decided that the General Assembly cannot vote on this question at all, then the question of a two-thirds majority does not arise.

244. As to the question of language, I might add that the President speaks most beautifully in both languages.

245. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The President is not obliged to make a ruling on every question put to him. I have acquired a certain familiarity with the conduct of debates during the six months of the General Assembly. I repeat my ruling as President and shall not accept any points of order. My decision, as President, is to put to the General Assembly the question of whether a two-thirds majority is required for the adoption of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution contained in document A/1790.

246. Are the members of the General Assembly agreeable that I should put the question in this way? There are no objections. The General Assembly agrees that the question should be put thus. I therefore put to the vote the question of whether a two-thirds majority is required for the adoption of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

*The result of the vote was 11 in favour, 23 against and 14 abstentions. It was decided by a two-thirds majority that paragraph 3 could be adopted by a simple majority.*

247. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/1790.

248. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): Point of order.

249. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Is it connected with the question of voting?

250. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): No, but I attempted to raise this point of order before. The problem as I see it, and which stands on the record at the present time, is that the Secretary-General in reply to my question stated that he anticipated that the holding of the sixth session in Paris, beginning on 6 November, might involve additional expenditures by reason of the effect upon the work of other organs of the United Nations of the opening of the session on that date. I understood his answer to be in that sense. Therefore it seems to me that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution is not really at issue, at least it is not at issue in the context of the question I put to the Secretary-General. This is precisely the point upon which I previously requested clarification. The new problem which has been presented by the response of the French Government, gracious and welcome as it is to many of us, does involve the impact upon the plan of the fact that the sixth session is to start on 6 November.

251. If I am incorrect in my interpretation of the Secretary-General's reply that commencing the sixth session on 6 November may have an effect upon the budget of the United Nations in other respects, I should like to have that misapprehension corrected. If, on the other hand, I am correct in my interpretation of the Secretary-General's statement, I should like to point out, with the greatest respect, that in my opinion rule 152 applies.

252. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/1790, which reads as follows:

*"The General Assembly,*

*"Having been informed that the French Government, desirous of responding to the wish that has been expressed to it on several occasions, has decided to welcome the General Assembly to Paris for the duration of its sixth session,*

*"1. Decides, in pursuance of its resolution 497 (V) of 14 December 1950, to hold its sixth regular session in Paris;*

*"2. Decides that, notwithstanding the provisions of rule 1 of its rules of procedure, the sixth session shall commence not later than 6 November 1951;*

*"3. Authorizes the Secretary-General to conclude with the French Government the necessary agreements for holding the sixth session of the General Assembly in Paris, provided that the total estimated cost of holding the sixth session in Paris (including such meetings as may be arranged after 1 January 1952) shall not exceed the amount of \$2,350,400 provided in the 1951 budget, plus such additional amounts as may be authorized by transfer from other sections of the 1951 budget by the Secretary-General with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions."*

253. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) (*translated from French*): I request a roll-call vote.

254. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan): I request that a separate vote should be taken on paragraph 3.

255. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): If the representative of Bolivia agrees, the roll-call vote will be taken only on the draft resolution as a whole.

256. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) (*translated from French*): That is quite agreeable to me.

*The preamble and paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution were adopted by 26 votes to 14, with 13 abstentions.*

257. Mr. LACOSTE (France) (*translated from French*): I would suggest that the voting on paragraph 3 should be in two parts: first, up to and including the words: "... provided in the 1951 budget ..." and then the remainder of the paragraph.

258. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In accordance with the French representative's request I put to the vote the first part of paragraph 3, up to and including the words: "... provided in the 1951 budget ...".

*The first part of paragraph 3 was adopted by 28 votes to 15, with 10 abstentions.*

259. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I now put to the vote the last part of paragraph 3, beginning with the words: "... plus such additional amounts ...".

*The last part of paragraph 3 was adopted by 22 votes to 17, with 12 abstentions.*

260. Mr. SARPEN (Turkey): My delegation regrets that it is not in a position to support this draft resolution due to the inclusion of paragraph 3. I shall therefore vote against the draft resolution, but for that reason only.

261. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole. A vote by roll-call has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Colombia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour: Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, France, Haiti, Iran, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile.*

*Against: India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Australia, Canada, China.*

*Abstaining: Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Mexico, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Yemen, Afghanistan, Brazil.*

*The draft resolution was adopted by 24 votes to 17, with 12 abstentions.*

*The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.*