

the situation in China in an almost identical manner.

67. In those circumstances, the source of developments in China could not be sought outside China, for that would be to ignore the evidence.

68. The Polish delegation considered that there were neither formal nor factual reasons to justify consideration of the question raised by the representative of China. It therefore reiterated its appeal to the General Assembly to reject the General Committee's recommendation.

69. Mr. AUSTIN (United States of America) remarked that it would not be proper to discuss the merits of the proposed item at a time when the only question before the Assembly was whether that item should be included in the agenda. He, for one, had no intention of doing so. It was well known that the United States had always taken the position that any Member of the United Nations was entitled to bring before the General Assembly any matter falling within the scope of the Charter. That principle was expressed in the Charter.

70. It had been asserted that, before an item involving charges against a State was placed on the General Assembly's agenda, those charges must be substantiated. Such a practice, if adopted, would entail a complete reversal of the procedure of the General Assembly and of the obvious purposes of the Charter. The General Committee would then become involved in prolonged discussions on the substance of a question before it had been decided whether the question should be placed on the agenda.

71. It seemed astonishing that such a suggestion should come from the USSR delegation and its supporters, who had always claimed and exercised the right of placing any matter whatsoever on the agenda. Only a few days previously (226th meeting), the delegation of the Soviet Union had submitted proposals containing the gravest possible charges against the United States and the United Kingdom without offering a shred of evidence. Those proposals had been placed on the agenda (229th meeting); it was

curious, therefore, to hear the representative of Poland say that there was no room in the United Nations for slanderous or provocative proposals. Mr. Austin recalled that in the General Committee¹ his delegation had taken the position that even the USSR proposals should be included in the agenda, emphasizing, of course, that that attitude did not prejudice the United States views on the substance of the matter.

72. The item proposed by the delegation of China was obviously one of important international concern falling within the scope of the Charter. For that reason the United States had voted in favour of recommending that the item should be placed on the agenda, and would again vote for its inclusion.

73. Mr. SARPET (Turkey) reserved the freedom of his delegation to vote on the main issue as it considered proper in the light of subsequent developments in the debate. Only when the facts of the case had been presented and the various views expressed would the Turkish delegation find itself in a position to vote in conformity with its convictions. Mr. Sarper would therefore vote in favour of the inclusion of the item in the Assembly's agenda.

74. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the recommendation of the General Committee to include the item in the agenda.

The recommendation was adopted by 45 votes to 6, with 5 abstentions.

75. The PRESIDENT announced that the item proposed by the Chinese delegation had therefore been included in the agenda and that it would be allocated to the First Committee for consideration.

76. Mr. AZIZ (Afghanistan) explained that his delegation had abstained from voting on the inclusion of the item because it had not had time to receive instructions from its Government on the matter.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.

¹ See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly*, General Committee, 66th meeting.

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIRST PLENARY MEETING

Held at Flushing Meadow, New York, on Thursday, 20 October 1949, at 10.45 a.m.

President: General Carlos P. RÓMULO (Philippines).

Election of three non-permanent members of the Security Council

1. The PRESIDENT stated that as the terms of office on the Security Council of Argentina, Canada and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic would expire at the end of 1949, three new non-permanent members were to be elected.

2. He reminded the Assembly of the terms of Article 23 of the Charter, in accordance with which due regard should be paid in the election both to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization, and to equitable geographical distribution. The Article further

provided that retiring members were not eligible for re-election.

3. In accordance with rule 84 of the rules of procedure, the election would be held by secret ballot and there would be no nominations.

4. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, thanked the President for reminding the Assembly of the rule contained in Article 23 of the Charter. The President was quite right to recall that under rule 84 of the rules of procedure no nominations were allowed in elections to the Security Council. Mr. Vyshinsky had no intention whatever of making any such nomination. He had asked to speak on a point of order simply to request the Assembly to take into account not only

Article 23 of the Charter, to the contents of which the President had drawn the Assembly's attention, but also the tacit gentleman's agreement which had been consistently applied during the previous elections in 1946, 1947 and 1948.

5. He wished to stress the fact that slander was being used to misrepresent the attitude taken by the USSR. That had been done in particular by the head of the Yugoslav delegation. The Press release published by the Yugoslav delegation depicted the position taken up by the Soviet Union in the most inaccurate, untrue, tendentious and slanderous fashion.

6. The USSR insisted upon one point only, that gentlemen should honour a gentleman's agreement.

7. The PRESIDENT ruled that the USSR representative's remarks were out of order.

8. He called upon the General Assembly to proceed to the vote.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kauffmann (Denmark) and Rahim Bey (Egypt) acted as tellers.

Number of votes cast, 58;

Invalid votes, 0;

Valid votes, 58;

Two-thirds majority, 39.

Number of votes obtained:

Ecuador, 57;

India, 56;

Yugoslavia, 37;

Czechoslovakia, 20;

Afghanistan, 1;

Philippines, 1.

Ecuador and India, having obtained the required two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, were elected non-permanent members of the Security Council.

9. The PRESIDENT stated that, in accordance with rule 86 of the rules of procedure, an additional ballot would be held to decide which member was to fill the third vacant place. The vote would be restricted to the two candidates which had obtained the highest number of votes, namely, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia.

A second vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of votes cast, 59;

Abstentions, 1;

Invalid votes, 0;

Valid votes, 58;

Two-thirds majority, 39.

Number of votes obtained:

Yugoslavia, 39;

Czechoslovakia, 19.

Yugoslavia, having obtained the required two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, was elected a non-permanent member of the Security Council.

10. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the results of the elections to the Security Council, such as they had just been announced to the General Assembly, clearly showed that those elections had been held in a way which was contrary to the Charter of the

United Nations and especially to Article 23, which laid down that non-permanent members should be elected in accordance with the principle of an equitable geographical distribution. There had also been a violation of the firmly established tradition that candidates for non-permanent membership were always nominated by the States belonging to the geographical areas concerned. Those two principles had hitherto been scrupulously observed.

11. Those principles had been grossly violated, however. The delegations of the five countries of Eastern Europe had unanimously proposed Czechoslovakia as a candidate and not one of them had supported Yugoslavia's application. Yet notwithstanding the practices observed at all previous elections to the Security Council, a large number of members had supported Yugoslavia instead of Czechoslovakia.

12. Yugoslavia's entry into the Security Council was not based on a free election held in conformity with the principles of the Charter and established tradition; it was the result of a lobby conspiracy between Yugoslavia, the United States and the delegations of a number of other countries, which had apparently decided to exploit the political situation which had arisen as a result of the relations between Yugoslavia on the one hand, and the USSR and the peoples' democracies of Eastern Europe on the other. It was the result of a bargain struck behind the scenes by Yugoslavia, the United States and various delegations which thus hoped to consolidate their position in the Security Council so as better to transform that Council into an obedient tool of the Anglo-American bloc.

13. The delegation of the Soviet Union wished to state most emphatically that Yugoslavia did not represent the countries of Eastern Europe, and that no one could or would recognize it as having that capacity. The USSR delegation regarded Yugoslavia's introduction to the Security Council as yet another violation of the Charter which jeopardized the very foundations of collaboration in the United Nations.

14. The PRESIDENT stated that he had allowed the USSR representative to speak under rule 80, according to which members might be allowed to explain their votes. He had called him to order as soon as he had become aware that his statement was not an explanation of his vote, and he found it regrettable that the representative of the Soviet Union had not seen fit to heed that call. He would therefore ask the interpreters to cease interpreting in future as soon as they heard the President call any speaker to order.

Election of six members of the Economic and Social Council

15. The PRESIDENT stated that as the terms of office on the Economic and Social Council of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Lebanon, New Zealand, Turkey, the United States of America and Venezuela would expire at the end of 1949, six new members were to be elected.

16. He reminded the Assembly that, under the terms of Article 61 of the Charter, retiring members of the Economic and Social Council were eligible for re-election, and that all Members of the United Nations were therefore eligible with

the exception of the twelve members of the Council whose terms did not expire at the end of the year.

17. The election would be held by secret ballot, and there would be no nominations.

18. MR. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking on a point of order, stated that the Ukrainian SSR withdrew its candidature in favour of Czechoslovakia.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kauffmann (Denmark) and Rahim Bey (Egypt) acted as tellers.

19. During the counting of the ballots, Mr. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) asked for the floor and stated that he wished to draw the President's attention to an irregularity which had taken place. During the meeting, various delegations had been distributing propaganda material in favour of various candidates; yet a statement by his delegation to the effect that it was withdrawing in favour of Czechoslovakia had been stopped by the Secretariat.

20. He asked the President to intervene in the matter, as such action infringed the fundamental rights of delegations.

21. The PRESIDENT explained that the procedure to which the representative of the Ukrainian SSR had referred was irregular and had been stopped as far as possible by the Secretariat.

22. With regard to the previous statement made by that representative, he would point out that the withdrawal of one country's candidature in favour of another was equivalent to a nomination, and for that reason he ruled out of order the statement by the Ukrainian SSR that it was withdrawing in favour of Czechoslovakia.

The results of the voting were as follows:

*Number of votes cast, 59;
Invalid votes, 0;
Valid votes, 59;
Two-thirds majority, 40.*

Number of votes obtained:

*Mexico, 57;
Iran, 55;
United States of America, 54;
Pakistan, 52;
Canada, 49;
Czechoslovakia, 49;
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, 5;
Greece, 2;
Lebanon, 2;
New Zealand, 2;
Turkey, 2;
Afghanistan, 1;
Bolivia, 1;
Costa Rica, 1;
El Salvador, 1;
Ethiopia, 1;
Guatemala, 1;
Haiti, 1;
Israel, 1;
Liberia, 1;
Philippines, 1;
Sweden, 1;
Syria, 1;
Venezuela, 1;
Yemen, 1.*

Mexico, Iran, the United States of America, Pakistan, Canada and Czechoslovakia, having obtained the required two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, were elected members of the Economic and Social Council.

Election of three members of the Trusteeship Council

23. The PRESIDENT stated that two vacancies would occur on the Trusteeship Council at the end of 1949, when the regular terms of office of Iraq and Mexico expired.

24. The General Assembly would further recall that on 13 September 1949 Costa Rica had resigned from the council (A/980).

25. In accordance with rule 129 of the rules of procedure, therefore, it was necessary to elect one member of the Council for the unexpired term of Costa Rica, namely, from the current date until 31 December 1950. In that by-election, which would take place before the other two vacancies were filled, all Members of the United Nations were eligible for election, with the exception, of course, of the existing members of the Council.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kauffmann (Denmark) and Rahim Bey (Egypt) acted as tellers.

*Number of votes cast, 59;
Abstentions, 1;
Invalid votes, 2;
Valid votes, 56;
Two-thirds majority, 38.*

Number of votes obtained:

*Dominican Republic, 45;
Greece, 5;
Haiti, 2;
Argentina, 1;
Bolivia, 1;
Iraq, 1;
Lebanon, 1.*

The Dominican Republic, having obtained the required two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, was elected a member of the Trusteeship Council to fill the unexpired term of Costa Rica.

26. The PRESIDENT stated that in the next election, which was to fill the vacancies created by the retirement of Iraq and Mexico at the end of 1949, all Members of the United Nations were eligible, including retiring members of the Council.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

*Number of votes cast, 59;
Abstentions, 0;
Invalid votes, 0;
Valid votes, 59;
Two-thirds majority, 40.*

Number of votes obtained:

*Argentina, 50;
Iraq, 45;
Greece, 18;
Cuba, 1;
Guatemala, 1;
Lebanon, 1;
Uruguay, 1;
Yemen, 1.*

Argentina and Iraq, having obtained the required two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, were elected members of the Trusteeship Council.

Financial report and accounts of the United Nations for the financial year ended 31 December 1948, and report of the Board of Auditors

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/1017)

27. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the report of the Fifth Committee and the accompanying draft resolution (A/1017).

28. She added that a tribute had been paid in the Fifth Committee to the Board of Auditors, which had been represented by its Chairman, Mr. Sellar, for the great care with which the Board had carried out its task and for its interesting report on the financial situation of the United Nations.

The resolution was adopted without objection.

United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund: financial report and accounts for the financial year ended 31 December 1948, and report of the Board of Auditors

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/1019)

29. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the report of the Fifth Committee and the accompanying draft resolution (A/1019).

The resolution was adopted without objection.

United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund: annual report of the United Nations Staff Pension Committee

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/1018)

30. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the report of the Fifth Committee and the accompanying draft resolution (A/1018).

31. She recalled that Mr. Lebeau, Chairman of the Staff Pension Committee, had supplied the Fifth Committee with additional information regarding participation by the specialized agencies in the pension scheme and regarding the transferability of pension rights acquired by former officials of national governments. Appreciation had been expressed in the Fifth Committee for the devotion and competence with which the Staff Pension Committee had carried out its task.

The resolution was adopted without objection.

Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1949

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/1016)

32. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the report of the Fifth Committee (A/1016).

33. She wished to point out that the report did not contain a request for the appropriation of new credits and that no increase of the 1949

budget was involved. As stated in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the report, all that was involved was a transfer of funds. The Fifth Committee, by a vote of 38 to 5, with one abstention, had decided to concur with the Secretary-General's recommendation that the use of the sum of 27,000 dollars from existing surpluses from appropriations made under section 6 of the 1949 budget should be authorized for the Commission of Enquiry on the Coca Leaf, in order to enable that Commission to carry out its tasks in accordance with resolution 246 (IX) (H) of the Economic and Social Council. The Fifth Committee had therefore decided to recommend to the General Assembly that it should approve that recommendation.

34. The PRESIDENT stated that he did not believe that any formal action was required by the General Assembly in the matter. The Fifth Committee was simply reporting to the General Assembly on the action to be taken to permit the Commission of Enquiry to carry out the task assigned to it by the Economic and Social Council.

35. If there was no objection, he would assume that the General Assembly concurred in the opinion of the Fifth Committee.

The report was approved without objection.

Organization of a United Nations postal administration

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/1015)

36. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the report of the Fifth Committee and the accompanying draft resolution (A/1015).

37. Under paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, the Secretary-General was requested, in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 232 (III), to continue the preparation of necessary arrangements for the establishment of a United Nations postal administration.

38. It had been pointed out to the Committee that the Secretary-General would submit, at a later stage of the current session of the General Assembly, a supplementary estimate of approximately 10,000 dollars for 1950 to cover necessary preliminary expenses such as salaries for the experts who would assist him in his further study of the matter on which he was requested to submit a new report to the following session of the General Assembly. The draft resolution had been worked out by a drafting sub-committee of the Fifth Committee and, with the explanations referred to in paragraph 3 of the report, had been approved by the Fifth Committee by 34 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

The resolution was adopted without objection.

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/1025)

39. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the report of the Fifth Committee and the accompanying resolution (A/1025).

40. During its study of the matter, the Fifth Committee had had before it the report of the Committee on Contributions. Several points raised in that report had been thoroughly discussed, and the Chairman of the Committee on Contributions had made a statement dealing with remarks made and questions put to that Committee. Paragraphs 2 to 7 of the Fifth Committee's report briefly indicated the main subjects covered by the discussion and the reservations made.

41. The Chairman of the Committee on Contributions had told the Fifth Committee that, in accordance with the practice of the Committee on Contributions, the record of the discussions

in the Fifth Committee, as well as of those in the General Assembly, would be one of the factors which the Committee would bear in mind at its next session in studying the scale of assessments to be recommended to the General Assembly at its fifth session.

42. The report of the Committee on Contributions and the recommendations contained therein had been unanimously approved by the Fifth Committee, subject to the reservations referred to above.

The resolution was adopted without objection.

The meeting rose at 12.58 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND PLENARY MEETING

Held at Flushing Meadow, New York, on Thursday, 20 October 1949, at 3 p.m.

President: General Carlos P. RÓMULO (Philippines).

Draft convention on freedom of information: report of the Third Committee (A/1010)

1. Mr. VERBA (Czechoslovakia), Rapporteur of the Third Committee, submitted that Committee's report together with a draft resolution (A/1010).

2. Mr. DE FREITAS (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom supported the draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee. The proposal that further action on the draft convention on freedom of information should be postponed until the fifth session of the General Assembly appeared to it to be both logical and practical. The covenant on human rights would be the basic document in its field; as such it would undoubtedly contain provisions on freedom of information. Those provisions might adequately secure the enjoyment of the right to freedom of information. If that were so, a separate convention would be unnecessary. On the other hand, the provisions might require amplification; until the covenant was completed and its provisions could be seen, it would be impossible to decide whether a further convention was needed and, if so, what it should contain.

3. There was another reason for the United Kingdom's support of the draft resolution. Although there was general and wholehearted support for the ideal of freedom of information, there was not, unfortunately, the same unanimity with regard to the means by which enjoyment of that right could be guaranteed internationally. Those differences of opinion had become apparent during the discussion of the draft convention in the Third Committee¹. They were very wide, and the prospects of agreement appeared to be slight. Possibly the provisions regarding freedom of information in the covenant on human rights, even if they required amplification in a further convention, would obviate the necessity of reopening some of the questions which had been found so difficult to answer. Perhaps when it was seen what was needed to supplement the covenant there would be less difficulty in reaching agreement on a convention.

¹ See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly, Third Committee, 232nd, 233rd and 234th meetings.*

4. The opponents of the draft resolution in the Third Committee had argued that the Committee had a duty to proceed with the detailed discussion of the draft convention, and that by postponing further consideration to the fifth session it would be shirking that duty. The United Kingdom did not concur in that view. The question had been exhaustively argued inside the Committee and had received serious consideration in informal discussions outside the Committee, and the decision embodied in the draft resolution had been reached for logical and practical reasons.

5. Another argument adduced by those who opposed the draft resolution had been that the work of the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information was being discarded and brought to nothing. That argument, which was not supported by the United Kingdom delegation, might have had some force if the Committee had recommended that the General Assembly should postpone further consideration of the draft convention indefinitely, but no such recommendation appeared in the draft resolution. Under its terms, the General Assembly had full liberty to discuss the draft convention at the fifth session in the light of developments in the Commission on Human Rights. Whatever the final decision of the Assembly regarding the draft convention might be, the work done would not have been fruitless, if only because the record of the discussions, both in the Conference on Freedom of Information held at Geneva and in the General Assembly, would be of great assistance to the members of the Commission on Human Rights when drafting provisions regarding freedom of information.

6. Mr. de Freitas recalled that by resolution 277 (A) (III), the General Assembly had decided that the Convention on the International Transmission of News and the Right of Correction should not be opened for signature until definite action had been taken on the convention on freedom of information. At the current session, the United Kingdom delegation had voted in the Third Committee in favour of a proposal that the Convention should be opened for signature forthwith. The proposal had been defeated, but since the decision with regard to the draft convention on freedom of information was post-