

# PREPARATORY COMMISSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTY - FOURTH MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Held at Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster,  
London

at  
2.30 o'clock on Saturday, 27 October, 1945

---

The meeting was presided over by The Hon. Adlai Stevenson,  
the Delegate of the United States.

The remaining countries were represented by the following  
Delegates :

Mr. Paul HASLUCK  
H.E. Senhor C. de FREITAS VALLE  
H.E. Mr. W.F.A. TURGEON  
H.E. Senor Don German GERVARA  
H.E. Dr. V.K. WELLINGTON KOO  
M. Ivan KERNO  
H.E. M. Rene MASSIGLI  
H.E. M. Nasrullah ENTEZAM  
H.E. Dr. Luis Padilla NERVO  
M.A. PELT  
H.E. M.A.A. GRÖMYKO  
Professor C.K. WEBSTER  
H.E. Dr. LJUBO LEONTIC

Professor WEBSTER said that he had noticed in the Press that morning that Mr. Stettinius had been operated on the previous day and was making satisfactory progress. He suggested that the Executive Secretary send a message expressing the Executive Committee's best wishes for his speedy recovery, and their desire to be reinforced as soon as possible by his incomparable energy, experience and goodwill.

This was agreed unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of his Delegation, thanked the Executive Committee most earnestly for this expression of good will toward Mr. Stettinius.

RECOMMENDATION  
CONCERNING THE  
LOCATION OF THE  
HEADQUARTERS OF  
THE UNITED  
NATIONS.

FC/EX/108/Rev.3.  
27 October, 1945

The CHAIRMAN asked Dr. Wellington Koo to report on behalf of the sub-committee which had been appointed at the previous meeting to redraft recommendations on the location of the seat.

Dr. WELLINGTON KOO said that the sub-committee had agreed unanimously on the text of the document FC/EX/108/Rev.3. It retained the major part of the last text considered by the Executive Committee, but some changes had been made. The old paragraph 4 concerning the studies by the Executive Secretary, had been omitted. That paragraph had been merely a directive to the Executive Secretary, and need not be included in the report.

In answer to the Chairman. Dr. Wellington Koo said it was understood, of course, that the Executive Secretary would continue his analysis of proposals for the location of the seat.

M. GROMYKO agreed with the substance of the document, but suggested that it would read better if the last three lines of the third paragraph of the preamble were deleted.

Dr. WELLINGTON KOO thought it advisable that the preamble should contain a complete recital of the steps that had been taken before the final decision. M. Gromyko's suggestion would give a blurred picture.

After discussion, the original text of the recommendation was approved.

M. BROUSTRA recalled the remarks made by M. Massigli at the previous meeting. He wished it recorded that if the recommendations had been put to a vote, his delegation would have abstained.

Professor WEBSTER and Mr. FELT wished it to be noted that their Delegations would have abstained from voting for the same reasons.

Dr. WELLINGTON KOO recalled that the Chinese Delegation had proposed on the 15th October that the Executive Secretary make the studies referred to in the old paragraph 4. In order to keep the record clear he proposed that this action be approved by the Executive Committee as a formal decision.

The CHAIRMAN said it was agreed without objection to request the Executive Secretary to continue to study such proposals for the precise location of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations as might be received, so that a working analysis of these proposals might be available to the Preparatory Commission.

DRAFT REPORT  
OF THE  
EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE  
TO THE  
PREPARATORY  
COMMISSION.  
PC/EX/113  
27 October 1945.

Mr. OWEN said that the Coordination Committee of the Secretariat had been examining the reports of the 10 committees as approved by the Executive Committee, with a view to preparing a final text. The Coordination Committee had not conceived its duty to be to effect any changes in substance. A number of purely editorial changes had been made, relating to style, arrangement of parts, chapters and paragraphs and the form of recommendations. Some redundant language had been eliminated, and an attempt had been made to achieve uniformity of punctuation.

The report contained four sets of provisional rules of procedure for the four principal organs. These had been compared in style and content and where no substantial change seemed to be involved the rules had been arranged in accordance with a common pattern. It had been felt that a

a much more substantial coordination of the rules would be desirable, but this was not the duty of the Coordination Committee. The Committee had confined itself to compiling a comparative chart of the four sets of rules and procedure which would be available for the Preparatory Commission as a Secretariat Document. This comparative chart would not be included in the Report of the Executive Committee.

It was not pretended that a complete job of Coordination had been done, but it was hoped that a clear, well organised working document had been prepared for the Preparatory Commission. There were two subjects on which there was some inconsistency between parts of the report, but no attempt had been made to reconcile them, since they had been the occasion of some controversy in the Executive Committee. The Coordination Committee had contented itself with a brief editorial note. Naturally, members of the Executive Committee would have an opportunity to suggest alterations before the text was finally issued.

The CHAIRMAN felt sure that other Delegations, like his own, would have many amendments to make. He suggested, however, that corrections of language, punctuation and other minor matters be referred to the Executive Secretary at the end of the meeting; and only questions of substance be raised at the present time.

Mr. ESCOTT REID suggested that the text of the interim arrangements made at San Francisco should be added as Part V of the Report.

This was agreed without objection.

The CHAIRMAN submitted the report to the meeting section by section, and these minutes refer only to sections on which there was discussion.

RECOMMENDATION  
4 on Page 12

On the suggestion of Dr. WELLINGTON KOO it was agreed that the words "and possibly" should be inserted between "(4) Statistical Commission" and "(5) Demographic Commission" on page 12.

NOTE 1.  
Footnote on  
Page 14.

Dr. RYBAR said that note 1 on page 14 was incorrect. His Delegation had opposed the decision of the Executive Committee not merely on the method of selecting the presiding officer of the Temporary Trusteeship Committee, but on the whole question of setting up that Committee.

M. GROMYKO agreed with these remarks.

The present footnote must be replaced by another saying that the Soviet Delegation did not approve the setting up of the Temporary Trusteeship Committee, since it considered that such a Committee would be unconstitutional. The Soviet Delegation, accordingly, could not agree with any of the subsidiary recommendations of the Executive Committee relating to the Temporary Trusteeship Committee.

M. KERNO agreed with the remarks of Dr. Rybar and M. Gromyko. His Delegation had made reservations concerning the whole question of the setting up of the Temporary Trusteeship Committee. He did not remember whether it had been decided that his reservation should be expressed in a footnote, or merely recorded in the minutes. In any event the footnote, in its present form, was misleading.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the footnote should be inserted at the foot of page 116, and should read as follows :

"The Delegates of Czechoslovakia, the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia opposed the recommendation to establish a Temporary Trusteeship Committee, since they considered such a Committee not authorised by the Charter. These Delegations also opposed the method of selecting the presiding officers of the Trusteeship Council".

Mr. HASLUCK pointed out that the reference in Note 1, would also have to be corrected. The present reference to Section 5, Rule 2, should be changed to Section 5, Rule 9. However, Rule 9, as printed on page 123, did not contain the point to which these three Delegations objected. Rule 9 would have to be amended by inserting the words "by secret ballot".

The CHAIRMAN agreed.

Mr. JEBB understood that words "by secret ballot" had been omitted inadvertently.

Mr. GROMYKO suggested the following wording for Note 1:

"The Soviet Delegation stated that the establishment of a Temporary Trusteeship Committee is not provided by the Charter, and thus it would be unconstitutional. Since all other recommendations on Trusteeship are connected with this main recommendation the Soviet Delegation did not find it possible to agree with any of these recommendations, including, of course, the recommendation on chairmanship".

In answer to the Chairman, M. Gromyko said that his Delegation's objection was not to the Trusteeship Council, but only to the Temporary Trusteeship Committee.

The CHAIRMAN called M. Gromyko's attention to page 122, where the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council were

set forth. His understanding was that the objection related to the Temporary Trusteeship Committee, and therefore the footnote should relate to the proposal in regard to the Temporary Trusteeship Committee on page 116,

M. GROMYKO suggested the following addition to the form of footnote he had previously proposed:

"That on all recommendations which are not directly connected with the question of the establishment of a Temporary Trusteeship Committee, the Soviet Delegation reserves the right to express its opinion at the Preparatory Commission".

This practically related only to the recommendation on the procedure rules for the permanent Trusteeship Council.

The CHAIRMAN said that his recollection was that the three Delegates opposed anything related to the Temporary Trusteeship Committee, and that fact was recorded in the minutes. Perhaps the note should be omitted.

M. GROMYKO could not agree that the note be omitted. In order to avoid a lengthy discussion, he suggested that his Delegation should settle the wording of the footnote and later submit it to the Executive Secretary.

It was agreed that the Soviet Delegation should prepare a wording of the footnote which was also satisfactory to the Delegates of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, and submit it to the Executive Secretary for insertion on pages 14 and 115,

After some discussion it was agreed that the present meeting was not reconsidering recommendations, but merely reviewing the language in which they had been expressed. The report would not be approved as a whole.

PART II  
CHAPTER VIII  
Page 30.

M. GROMYKO pointed out that in the title on Page 30 it was not stated by what Committee the observations had been made. He thought it should be made clear that the Committee in question was Committee 8.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the words "of the Technical Committee" be inserted after the word "Observations".

PROF. WEBSTER considered that such an amendment would depart from the decision which had been taken by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee had decided, without approval or disapproval, to forward to the Preparatory Commission a document entitled "Observations"; and those observations became a document of the Executive Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said that Mr. Jebb had pointed out that if the words "Technical Committee" would be inserted the same wording would have to be used throughout the Report.

M. MASSIGLI said a very large majority of the Executive Committee had favored the approval of the Report of Committee 8, and the decision to forward it merely as "Observations" had been made to accommodate the minority views. There must be no alteration of the decision to transmit the Report as an Executive Committee document, having the same character as other Executive Committee documents.

MR. ESCOTT REID said that M. Gromyko's point might be met if it were made clear that, throughout the Report, the Executive Committee was a ~~body~~



referred to by its full title. In that case the word "Committee" would always mean one of the ten Committees of the Executive Committee. If this were done he felt there could be no objection to the present form of the title, which would mean "Observations of Committee 8."

M. KERNO suggested that the title should make clear the fact that the decision of the Executive Committee had been neither to approve nor disapprove the report of Committee 8.

PROF. WEBSTER said that he would agree to the deletion of the words "of the Committee" in the title.

The CHAIRMAN was also willing to agree to this deletion.

M. GROMYKO enquired whether the present text of the report of the Executive Committee referred in any place to the decision of the Executive Committee neither to approve nor to disapprove the report of Committee 8.

MR. JEBB replied that the decision appeared in the minutes.

M. GROMYKO suggested that the form of words previously agreed on as expressing the decision of the Executive Committee should be put in a footnote.

PROF. WEBSTER said that the Executive Committee had not agreed to insert a footnote. This would disturb the whole balance of the agreement reached, which was correctly embodied in the present text.

MR. JEBB read from the relevant minutes PC/EX/93 dated 13th October, 1945, relating to the Meeting of the Executive Committee which had been held on 11th October, 1945:

"The Motion: Does the Executive Committee desire to transmit to the Preparatory Commission the observations regarding the relationships with the specialised agencies annexed hereto for eventual transmission to the General Assembly for consideration?

It was decided in the affirmative by twelve votes to none with two abstentions (Brazil and Iran) on the understanding that such transmission did not imply either approval or disapproval of the observations referred to, and that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee which considered them would also be transmitted to the Preparatory Commission in order to make clear the views of the various delegations."

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the title read:

"Recommendation to transmit without approval or disapproval observations on the relationship with specialised agencies."

He thought such a title would reflect the meaning of the words "On the understanding" used in the Minutes. There had been no indication in the Minutes whether the understanding was to be put into effect by a footnote or otherwise.

PROF. WEBSTER said that in a spirit of conciliation he would accept that title, but his recollection was clear that it was said the understanding

would be expressed by the transmission of the Minutes.

M. GROMYKO said the question was still left open as to what body had made the observations.

The CHAIRMAN said that everything that was agreed by the Executive Committee became the work of the Executive Committee. To specify individual Committees concerned would make the work of co-ordinating interminable.

MR. HASLUCK considered that effect should be given to a further reservation on behalf of the Australian and United Kingdom delegations. It appeared from the Minutes that these two delegations voted in favour of the Motion, on the understanding that their vote was not to be taken as implying approval of the understanding which had just been stated.

PROF. WEBSTER said that Mr. Hasluck was correct, but to avoid unnecessary complications he suggested that the reservation should not be pressed. The whole position could be explained adequately in the Preparatory Commission.

M. MASSIGLI said that the very basis of the proceedings of the Executive Committee was that all Governments reserved their right to state their positions fully in the Preparatory Commission.

MR. HASLUCK agreed not to press his reservation. Footnotes should not be necessary except for very special reasons.

M. GROMYKO accepted the last text proposed by the Chairman:

"Recommendation to transmit without approval or

disapproval observations on the relationship with specialised agencies."

The title of Chapter 8 as amended was approved unanimously.

CHAPTER IX.  
page 31.

It was agreed that the note on Page 31 should make it clear that the passages quoted were extracts from the Appendix to the Report.

SECTION 3  
III NOMINATIONS  
COMMITTEE  
PAGE 44.

MR. JEBB pointed out that the whole of rules 10 to 13 inclusive on page 44 under the heading "Nominations Committee" should be in brackets.

After discussion it was agreed that, in the printed Report, references in footnotes should quote the number of the relevant page.

It was agreed that the footnote to page 44 should state that the proposals for a Nominations Committee did not receive the necessary two-thirds majority and consequently did not form a definite part of the report itself.

MR. ESCOTT REID suggested that Rule 37 should contain the language which had formerly been in rules 30 and 31 of Document PC/EX/109. In the present text of Rule 37 certain phrases had been omitted. Rule 37 should begin:-

"The General Committee shall, at the beginning of each Session, consider the proposed Agenda together with the Supplementary List and shall make a report to the General Assembly. It shall consider applications for the inclusion of additional items in the Agenda and shall report thereon to the General Assembly. It shall assist the President in drawing up the Agenda for each

meeting."

In the rule, as previously stated, the word "plenary" had appeared before "Meeting."

The amendment suggested by Mr. Escott Reid and the re-insertion of the word "plenary" were agreed.

SUPERVISORY  
COMMITTEE FOR  
ADMINISTRATIVE  
AND BUDGETARY  
QUESTIONS  
Pages 48-49.

MR. ESCOTT REID suggested that either Rule 47 be omitted from the Chapter, or the title of the Chapter be amended to refer to Rule 47. In discussion it was suggested that the title be:

"FINANCE" or "ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS".

M. MASSIGLI suggested that Rule 48 should follow Rule 43.

It was agreed that the Secretariat should draft a more suitable title for Rules 42 to 48 inclusive and should also change the order of the Rules.

SECTION 4.  
Paragraphs  
14 and 15.  
Page 66.

On the suggestion of Mr. Hasluck it was agreed that Paragraphs 14 and 15 should be in brackets.

CHAPTER III.  
Section 1.  
Page 98.

M. GROMYKO said that in Paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (b) the Coordination Committee had inserted a reference to the Temporary Trusteeship Committee. If the Executive Committee could not agree to eliminate this reference, the reservation of the Soviet Delegation should be noted.

MR. JEBB said that the reference to the Temporary Trusteeship Committee had been in the text as received by the Coordination Committee and suggested the insertion of a footnote referring to the previously expressed reservations of the Delegations of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

At the suggestion of M. Gromyko it was agreed that the words "Trusteeship organ" should be substituted in sub-paragraph 3 (b) on Page 98 for the following words: "Temporary Trusteeship Committee, and later Trusteeship Council."

It was agreed a similar change should be effected on Page 12.

PART III  
CHAPTER III  
Section 2.  
Page 100.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that items 10, 11 and 12 had been omitted inadvertently.

PART III  
CHAPTER VII  
Section 3.  
Page 201.

M. GROMYKO said that in the third paragraph of Section 3, Page 201, the following words should be omitted:

"and supported by the Delegation of the U.S.S.R."

This was agreed.

PART III  
CHAPTER VIII  
Page 210.

It was agreed that the heading of Section 1 on page 210 should be changed to conform with the title agreed upon on page 30.

PART III  
CHAPTER X  
Page 235.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Section 1, would comprise the recommendation concerning the location of the Headquarters of the United Nations agreed upon at the present meeting.

Section 3 would contain the recommendation concerning the planning commission.

PART V

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that this would contain the interim arrangements.

MR. PELT asked whether it would be possible to prepare an index to the Report of the Executive Committee.

MR. JEBB said that the preparation of a satisfactory index would take some time, and furthermore he presumed it would have to be done in five languages.

The Secretariat would do its best to prepare an index.

If the Executive Committee were willing that the English and French texts should be distributed before the texts in Chinese, Russian and Spanish, he thought the English and French printed versions would probably be available by about the 10th November. By that date the recommendations in all five languages would probably be available and every effort would be made to have the full texts in Chinese, Russian and Spanish prepared as soon as possible.

Dr. WELLINGTON KOO said that the Chinese Delegation would give the Executive Secretary all possible assistance.

Mr. GROMYKO asked when the full Report would be available in all five languages.

Mr. JEBB said he hoped it would be possible to have the printed versions in all five languages available by November 20th.

Mr. GROMYKO asked when the final official texts in all five languages would be available.

Mr. JEBB said he would have to consult with his colleagues before answering that question.

The meeting adjourned at 5.15 p.m.

-----

The meeting was resumed at 5.30 p.m.

DISCUSSION  
OF DATES  
FOR  
COMMENCEMENT  
OF PREPARATORY  
COMMISSION and  
the FIRST SES-  
SION OF THE  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that a time should be fixed for the beginning of the Preparatory Commission and that a recommendation to the Preparatory Commission should then be formulated on the date for the commencement of the first part of the first session of the General Assembly.

M. de FREITAS VALLE said that he had been disturbed by the suggestion to postpone the beginning of the Preparatory Commission.

A sub-committee had been appointed on the 13th September composed of the Delegates of Canada, Mexico, The Netherlands and the U.S.S.R., with the Iranian Delegate as Chairman, to make recommendations about the dates for the commencement of the Preparatory Commission and the General Assembly. Those dates had been scrutinized with great care and the decision to have a fifteen day interval between the end of the work of the Executive Committee and the beginning of the Preparatory Commission should be retained.

In response to the Executive Committee's request that the Charter be ratified as soon as possible to allow the Preparatory Commission to meet at an early date, many Governments had made a great effort to obtain early ratification. In its desire to comply with the Executive Committee's request, the Government of South Africa had even adopted a procedure which had been attacked as unconstitutional.

The previous decision of the Executive Committee on the time-table had been submitted to the thirty-seven Governments not represented on the Executive Committee, and these countries had been asked if they approved the



decision. In increasing the fifteen day interval it had been explained that the object was the protection of the interests of the thirty-seven countries: but not a single country had made any complaint. Most of the thirty-seven countries were at a great distance from London and would in no circumstances have time to study all the recommendations adequately. In any event all the decisions of the Preparatory Commission could be reviewed in the General Assembly.

If the Preparatory Commission were postponed until the end of November, the General Assembly would not be able to meet until January, but the Executive Committee had already rejected the proposal that the General Assembly should meet in January.

He asked whether there was any example in history of such a speedy ratification of such a complicated and important document. The inference was that the countries of the world wished the United Nations to commence work at the earliest possible date.

He quoted from the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee held on 17th September, 1945, (PC/EX/39). On page 3 of the minutes Mr. Stettinius had said that a major consideration was the physical convenience of the 51 Delegates to the Preparatory Commission. By small additions to their staffs they could immediately continue and take part in the constituent meeting of the General Assembly without the trouble of having to return to their country and then come back in January. Another vital consideration was that the various organs would be able to start work straight away in the New Year."

He himself had supported Mr. Stottinius and pointed out that the Delegates to the Preparatory Commission would be the same as those to the General Assembly, and for Delegates from remote countries, a four weeks interval would mean four weeks idleness in London because the same instructions would stand for both the Preparatory Commission and the General Assembly.

He quoted Paragraph 6 of the Agreement establishing the Preparatory Commission, which provided that the Executive Committee should call the Commission into Session as soon as possible after the Charter came into effect. Under this paragraph even if the Executive Committee had not finished its work the Preparatory Commission should have met and then adjourned.

If the Executive Committee did not give effect to Paragraph 6, all its decisions would be reopened, e.g., the division of the General Assembly into two parts.

In answer to the Chairman, M. de Freitas-Valle said he considered that the General Assembly should meet on the 4th December.

Professor WEBSTER said that the U.K. Government would do everything in its power to give effect to the wishes of the Preparatory Commission, whatever they might be. Already it had taken all possible steps to make possible the commencement of the General Assembly on the 4th December. The steps that had already been taken had been the cause of inconvenience to a great many people. At the same time his Government had always had some doubt whether the date the 4th December was practicable. Even if the

Preparatory Commission were to meet on the 12th November, it could not be certain that it would finish sufficiently early for the General Assembly to meet the 4th December.

In reply to M. de Freitas-Valle he said that the Executive Committee's attitude on the date of the commencement of the Preparatory Commission had substantially changed. There were at least a dozen issues on which no unanimous agreement had been achieved. The Preparatory Commission would have 8 committees, but owing to the small number of many delegations, it would only be possible for two committees to meet at one time. He was sure the Preparatory Commission would last more than three weeks and he would be favourably surprised if it finished in four weeks. It was vital that complete agreement be reached on questions of procedure, otherwise the General Assembly would be a failure. As to the date for the commencement of the Preparatory Commission he said that it was easy for his own Government to decide its policy in the Preparatory Commission because Ministers were kept acquainted with developments from day to day. Distant countries were not in such an advantageous position and he thought an interval of three weeks was not over-liberal. Since agreement had still to be reached on the relationship with specialized agencies, the site, the procedure and constitution of the General Assembly, and the Secretariat, he thought it unwise to assume that the Preparatory Commission could finish in less than four weeks. A strong case could be made for the postponement of the General Assembly until January. That would enable delegates coming only to the

General Assembly to arrive after the holiday season.

He understood that a great number of delegates to the General Assembly would be of Ministerial status and it would be of assistance to them if a definite date for the commencement of the General Assembly were fixed well in advance. Obviously it was most important for his own Government that a date for the commencement of the General Assembly be fixed as soon as possible. A date should be chosen from which no departure was likely. Although the final decision would be taken by the Preparatory Commission, the Executive Committee should recommend some date.

Mr. HASLUCK pointed out that his Delegation had always felt that the General Assembly should be in one part and should meet in April. There should be an adequate interval between the Executive Committee and the Preparatory Commission to allow the Governments of more distant countries to study the documents.

The work of the Executive Committee had been more extensive than anticipated and some important issues had been left open.

Mr. JEBB had suggested that it might be as late as November 10th before the final printed report was available, so that was the date of the effective conclusion of the work of the Executive Committee. His Delegation would be prepared to accept the 14th December for the beginning of the Preparatory Commission.

The Preparatory Commission seemed likely to last four or five weeks, but he could not see that the intervention of Christmas was a matter of any great importance.

In fixing the date for the beginning of the General Assembly it might become necessary to take into account other factors beside purely practical matters. Political considerations might indicate its postponement.

M. KERNO said that the work of the Executive Committee had been more detailed and had taken a longer time than had been anticipated. Many points had been left in abeyance, and a longer interval for study of its work was necessary. The division of the General Assembly into two parts should be retained, more particularly as some of the countries not represented on the Executive Committee had agreed to the division. He suggested that the Preparatory Commission should meet on the 21st or 22nd November, and the General Assembly early in January.

M. PELT appreciated the inconvenience to Delegates already en route and realized that if the date were changed the Executive Committee owed an apology to those delegates. However, a number of new factors had become apparent. The documents were bulkier and more complex than had been expected. The Preparatory Commission would last at least three or four weeks and should be in a position to finish its work before Christmas. The General Assembly should meet early in January.

He suggested that the Preparatory Commission meet during the week commencing Monday, 19th November, and preferably on that date. If this were done it would be possible for the Preparatory Commission to finish its work by the 19th December, and Delegates would be able to return home for Christmas.

M. VERGARA agreed with all the arguments advanced by M. de Freitas-Valle. A resolution had been communicated to all the Governments concerned and should be adhered to.

The 15 day interval should commence from the time when the final report became available, which would be within four or five days of the present meeting. He suggested that the Preparatory Commission meet on the 19th November. The date for the opening of the General Assembly should not be fixed at the present meeting, but should be determined at the opening stages of the Preparatory Commission.

M. MASSIGLI said that the report of the Executive Committee was such a complicated document that the beginning of the Preparatory Commission should be delayed until after the 19th November, although it must meet soon enough to finish its work before Christmas. The Executive Committee must be careful in fixing the date for the first meeting of the **General** Assembly, but in compliance with the wishes of U.K. Government a rough date should be fixed at the **present** meeting. The final date would be determined in the

early stages of the Preparatory Commission.

PROFESSOR WEBSTER said that obviously the final date for the meeting of the General Assembly must be fixed by the Preparatory Commission. The Executive Committee, however, should suggest a date giving a reasonable assurance that the Preparatory Commission could finish its work in time.

He felt sure that all the Governments which would be represented at the Preparatory Commission would share the wish of the Executive Committee that the organs of the United Nations should be set up as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had thought the area of agreement obtained in the Executive Committee was surprisingly high. His Delegation had hoped that the constituent meeting of the General Assembly could finish its work in December. The divided session was a cardinal principle of the work of the Executive Committee.

He felt that the Preparatory Commission must be delayed, and with greatest reluctance he suggested 20th November for its commencement.

The first meeting of the General Assembly should be as close as possible to the end of the Preparatory Commission and he suggested the period from the 1st to the 3rd January.

Mr. TURGEON felt it would be rash to suggest that the General Assembly meet in December. The Preparatory Commission should not commence later than the 15th November because many Delegates would wish to return home for Christmas. Since the

Preparatory Commission might last as long as four weeks he suggested the General Assembly meet between the 10th and 15th January.

The CHAIRMAN said that if the Preparatory Commission were to meet on the 15th November he failed to see why there should be an interval of a whole month. The General Assembly should meet at the beginning of January, preferably on the 2nd which was the anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Declaration.

Dr. WELLINGTON KOO agreed with regret that the meeting of the Preparatory Commission must be postponed, and he suggested it begin on the 19th November.

If the Preparatory Commission had adequate time for study it might finish its work in three weeks which might make it possible for the General Assembly to meet about the 20th December. Since other Delegates did not appear to share this view he would be willing to accept the 2nd of January.

The Executive Committee must propose a date for the meeting of the General Assembly. The decision to have the first session of the General Assembly in two parts should be retained. The interval between the Preparatory Commission and the General Assembly should be short so that public interest could be sustained.

M. GROMYKO suggested the 26th November for the beginning of the Preparatory Commission, for the reasons he had expressed at the previous meeting.



For the commencement of the General Assembly he would accept a date early in January.

M. NERVO considered the first meeting of the General Assembly could not be before January. He could not agree that the intervention of Christmas had any relevance, more particularly since most of the Delegates would not be able to return home in any event. He doubted that a longer period of study would shorten the Preparatory Commission and thought the position might well be the reverse.

The Preparatory Commission should meet as near as possible to the middle of November and the General Assembly should meet early in January.

After considerable discussion the Chairman ruled and it was generally agreed that the Preparatory Commission should commence on the 23rd November.

DISCUSSION  
ON THE DATE  
FOR THE  
COMMENCEMENT  
OF THE FIRST  
PART OF THE  
FIRST SESSION  
OF THE GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY.

M. MASSIGLI suggested the 3rd of January for the first meeting of the General Assembly.

Mr. HASLUCK pointed out that the Delegates to the Preparatory Commission would consist of officials and experts, but many men in high public office would join the Delegation for the General Assembly. Travel during the holiday period was very difficult, and he suggested that the first meeting of the General Assembly be in the week beginning the 7th of January.

Mr. ESCOTT REID said that even if the Preparatory Commission were to finish its work on the 21st December there would only be a 12 day interval to January 2nd.

The same problems of coordination, translation and printing would exist on a greater scale between the Preparatory Commission and the General Assembly, and he thought January 2nd was too early.

M. PELT felt the 2nd or 3rd of January might suit Europeans but the 7th was the earliest practicable date for other countries.

Professor WEBSTER suggested the 8th January.

M. GROMYKO said that the Delegates to the Preparatory Commission, with some additions, would attend the General Assembly. They would have to remain in London and should not be left idle for too long a period. Without feeling strongly on the issue, he suggested the 3rd or 4th of January.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with M. Gromyko, and felt that the two and a half week interval was more than ample.

Dr. RYBAR said that the officials and experts who would be Delegates to the Preparatory Commission would be well acquainted with the material and could brief the high officials who would be arriving for the General Assembly. He suggested a date at the beginning of January.

M. ENTEZAM said that if his memory was correct, among the Governments not represented on the Executive Committee, only four were European. The convenience of the more distant countries should be considered.

It was agreed that the Executive Committee should recommend to the Preparatory Commission that the General Assembly meet between the 2nd and 7th of January.

It was agreed to entrust to Mr. Jebb the drafting of the telegram relating to the availability of reports and translations.

It was agreed that the same telegram would state the decisions made at the present meeting concerning the dates for the Preparatory Commission and the General Assembly.

It was agreed that it was unnecessary to include the formal recommendation on dates in the Report of the Executive Committee to the Preparatory Commission.

The CHAIRMAN expressed on behalf of all the Delegates, his warm thanks to Mr. Jebb, Mr. Owen, and the staff for the faithful, diligent and helpful support they had given for the past two months. He felt that another important milestone in the history of the United Nations had been passed. Unanimity had been reached in by far the greater part of the report of the Executive Committee, including its most important decisions.

The Delegates had continually broadened their area of agreement and were learning to understand one another better.

Dr. WELLINGTON KOO wished to express the sincere appreciation of the Delegates of the skill and ability with which Mr. Stevenson had conducted the proceedings. The final two weeks had been the most strenuous and fruitful period of the work of the Executive Committee, and the happy results obtained were in large measure due to the Chairman.

M. GROMYKO believed that the Executive Committee had worked most successfully. The Soviet Delegation had done its best to assist in preparing recommendations which would help the Preparatory Commission and the General Assembly to solve their problems successfully. The Secretariat, headed by Mr. Jebb, had carried out very good and useful work.

Mr. JEBB expressed great appreciation of the kind remarks of the Chairman and M. Gromyko and said that such success as had been attained by his staff had been partly due to the forbearance of Delegates during the initial and continuing difficulties of the Secretariat. He felt that the success of the Executive Committee's work had been assisted by a growing "team spirit" in the Secretariat, and he trusted that this "team spirit" would continue to grow and be characteristic of the International Secretariat of the future.