



C O N T E N T S

Page

Election of a member of the International Court of Justice to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Judge Sergei Aleksandrovich Golunsky	295
Procedural decision concerning the agenda of the meeting	296
Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East: report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee	295
Reports of the Sixth Committee and the Fifth Committee:	
Publication of documents concerning the drafting and application of the Charter	
Preparatory work with regard to the possible holding of a general conference of the Members of the United Nations in accordance with Article 109 of the Charter	296
Amendment of the Charter: election of a technical committee to study and report on the amendment of the Charter on the basis of proposals to be submitted by Member States	
Scale of assessment for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Fifth Committee..	301
Financial reports and accounts, and reports of the Board of Auditors: (c) United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, for the financial year ended 30 June 1953; (d) United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, for the financial year ended 30 June 1953: reports of the Fifth Committee	304
Review of audit procedures of the United Nations and the specialized agencies: report of the Fifth Committee	304
Audit reports relating to expenditure by specialized agencies of technical assistance funds allocated from the Special Account: report of the Fifth Committee	304
United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund: (a) annual report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board for the year ended 31 December 1952; (b) acceptance by the specialized agencies of the jurisdiction of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal in matters involving applications alleging non-observance of Pension Fund regulations; (c) amendments to the regulations for the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund: reports of the Fifth Committee	304
Narcotic drugs: (a) assumption by organs of the United Nations of functions and responsibilities assigned to them under the terms of the Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and Use of Opium, 1953, and of the financial burdens resulting therefrom; (b) question of the remuneration of members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Drug Supervisory Body: reports of the Fifth Committee	304

Election of a member of the International Court of Justice to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Judge Sergei Aleksandrovich Golunsky

[Agenda item 59]

1. The PRESIDENT: In connexion with this election, I should like to recall to the General Assembly the decision it adopted during the third session [*resolution 264 (III)*] with regard to the conditions under which a State a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice but not a Member of the United Nations may participate in the elections of the members of the Court. That decision provided as follows:

"That such a State shall be on an equal footing with the Members of the United Nations in respect to those provisions of the Statute which regulate the nominations of candidates for election by the General Assembly;

"That such a State shall participate, in the General Assembly, in electing the members of the Court in the same manner as the Members of the United Nations..."

2. In accordance with that decision, Liechtenstein and Switzerland are entitled to participate in the election which is now to be held, and I take pleasure in welcoming the representatives of Liechtenstein and Switzerland to the Assembly this morning.

3. The Secretary-General has, in pursuance of Article 7 of the Statute of the Court, placed before the members of the Assembly the required information [*A/2521 and Corr. 1 and Add. 1 and 2*] with regard to the persons who are candidates in this election. I should also like to draw the attention of the Assembly to document A/2574, in which the Secretary-General outlines the procedure for the election in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. I believe that, on the basis of the information contained in that document, the Assembly can proceed at once to the election.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Franco y Franco (Dominican Republic) and Mr. Hergel (Denmark) acted as tellers.

Number of ballot papers:	57
Number of abstentions:	3
Number of invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	57
Required majority:	32

Number of votes obtained:

Mr. Kozhevnikov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)	52
Mr. Dihigo (Cuba)	1
Mr. de Laval (Peru)	1

President: Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi PANDIT (India).

4. The PRESIDENT: So far as the General Assembly is concerned, Mr. Kozhevnikov has obtained the required absolute majority of votes.

5. I should like now to read out the following communication which I have received from the President of the Security Council concerning the balloting which has taken place in that Council:

"I have the honour to inform you that the Security Council held its 644th meeting on 27 November 1953 in order to proceed to the election of a member of the International Court of Justice, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Judge Golunsky, and that Mr. Feodor Ivanovich Kozhevnikov has received an absolute majority of votes."

6. Since Mr. Kozhevnikov has received an absolute majority of votes both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, I have the honour to declare that he has been elected a judge of the International Court of Justice, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Golunsky.

Procedural decision concerning the agenda of the meeting

Pursuant to rule 67 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss items 19, 58, 70, 72, 42, 37, 43, 46, 47, 68, 32, 33, 34, 36, 12, 23 and 73 of the agenda of the General Assembly, which appeared on the agenda of the meeting.

Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East: report of the Ad Hoc Political Committee (A/2558)

[Agenda item 19]

Mr. Forsyth (Australia), Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Political Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/2558).

7. The PRESIDENT. The General Assembly will now vote on draft resolutions A and B contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Political Committee.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 51 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Reports of the Sixth Committee (A/2559) and the Fifth Committee (A/2578): Publication of documents concerning the drafting and application of the Charter

[Agenda item 58]

Preparatory work with regard to the possible holding of a general conference of the Members of the United Nations in accordance with Article 109 of the Charter

[Agenda item 70]

Amendment of the Charter: election of a technical committee to study and report on the amendment of the Charter on the basis of proposals to be submitted by Member States

[Agenda item 72]

Mr. Spiropoulos (Greece), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/2559).

8. The PRESIDENT: I should also like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the report of

the Fifth Committee [A/2578], submitted under rule 152 of the rules of procedure. This report is before the Assembly for its information.

9. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): During the discussion on the inclusion in the agenda of the proposals on "preparatory work with regard to the possible holding of a general conference" to review the Charter, the delegation of the Soviet Union pointed out that those proposals were in no way technical or procedural, nor entirely unrelated to the revision of the Charter, as their advocates asserted.

10. In the course of the debate in the Sixth Committee, it was repeatedly demonstrated that the fact that this question had been raised at the present session of the General Assembly could not be dissociated from the campaign which is being waged against the fundamental principles of the Charter, and in particular against the principle of the unanimity of the great Powers, the corner-stone of the United Nations. The debate bore out the case put forward by the Soviet delegation during the discussion on the inclusion of these proposals in the agenda of the present session.

11. It was proved beyond all dispute that another purpose of this campaign was to exacerbate the cold war. The reactionary circles in the United States are trying, by means of this campaign, to divert the attention of public opinion in the United States and a number of other countries from the incontestable fact that the current serious crisis of the United Nations—now degraded to the role of an appendage of the North Atlantic bloc—is due not to the shortcomings of any of the provisions of the Charter, but to the fact that the fundamental provisions of the Charter have been disregarded and violated by a number of countries and particularly by the United States. It has thus become quite clear that the reason why the General Assembly is being asked to adopt a decision relating to "preparatory work with regard to the possible holding of a general conference" for the review of the Charter is that it is desired to use the name of the United Nations to cover up and justify the great campaign against the fundamental principles of the Charter which is being conducted by the United States and certain other countries.

12. The preamble of the draft resolution adopted by the Sixth Committee, in particular, has that end in view. In this connexion, we believe it should be remembered that in the Sixth Committee sixteen delegations voted for the replacement of the preamble by another form of words containing no reference to "preparatory work with regard to the possible holding of a general conference" for the review of the Charter. As you know, the majority of the Sixth Committee rightly deleted from the operative part of the draft resolution an appeal to Member States of the United Nations to submit their views with regard to the possible review of the Charter; the operative part, in the form in which it was adopted by the Committee, now calls merely for the publication of certain documents connected with the San Francisco Conference and of a repertory of the practice of United Nations organs. We consider that the request to the Secretary-General, contained in sub-paragraph (c) of the operative part, to prepare a repertory of the practice of United Nations organs, imposes on him an obligation which it is not within his competence to fulfil; it entails the

type of research which, by definition, cannot be effected without commenting in one way or another on decisions taken by the various organs of the United Nations.

13. For these reasons, the USSR delegation will vote against the preamble and against sub-paragraph (c) of the operative part of the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee. If the preamble is adopted, my delegation will vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

14. The Soviet delegation wishes to emphasize that the tremendous value of the United Nations as an instrument of peace depends first and foremost on unswerving fidelity to the provisions of the Charter and, above all, on adherence to the principle of the unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council. What is needed to extricate the United Nations from the serious crisis in which it finds itself is not a revision of the Charter, but the return of the Organization to the road which was marked out for it by the Charter. The entire work of the United Nations should be concentrated on the fulfilment of its essential task, which is to promote the solution of international problems and to prevent, with the co-operation of all its Members, any possibility of aggression by one State against another and, in particular, to prevent the outbreak of a new world war. In the present international situation, any proposals for the review of the Charter can result only in weakening and undermining the Organization and increasing international tension. For that reason we consider that delegations which are sincerely interested in the maintenance of international peace and security should unite their efforts to prevent the adoption of decisions capable of being exploited to the detriment of the United Nations.

15. Mr. TAMMES (Netherlands): Now that the General Assembly has reached the final stage of its consideration of the three items dealing with our Charter and its possible revision in the future, permit me to say a few words as the representative of a delegation which has had a good deal of responsibility in bringing this matter before the Assembly.

16. In retrospect, the picture of our deliberations in the Sixth Committee—which was perhaps somewhat obscured by an unusual cloud of draft resolutions and amendments—shows an increasing reluctance of delegations to enter too deeply into the substance of the Charter review or to commit governments to certain comments and opinions at so early a stage of preparation.

17. Thus, two proposals failed successively to obtain the blessing of the majority. One was a suggestion to appoint a committee. Though my delegation is indebted to the Egyptian delegation for its most constructive contribution to our deliberations, we also felt that such a procedure would perhaps have been premature.

18. The second was our own proposal to invite governments to submit their preliminary views on the matter. In putting forward this suggestion, my delegation, as is well known, based itself on the provisions of Article 109 of the Charter and of the requirements to consider, in any case, the review question in 1955. Nothing seemed more logical than to invite all concerned to prepare for the occasion and, logically again, such preparation should be of a dual character. On

the one hand, the Secretary-General was to provide the necessary basic material, and, on the other hand, governments were to be encouraged to study the question and to give each other the opportunity of learning each other's opinions by submitting them as preliminary views. This idea was dear to our heart and we still think it is basically sound and appropriate as a method of serious preparation. However, we are certainly not blind to the considerations of those who, in the course of our debates, showed reluctance towards the idea of preliminary views and, when we reached the final ballot, we had no choice but to accept the clearly expressed will of the majority.

19. What was left of the draft resolution was, in the first place, the preamble with its reference to Article 109, to which we attach the greatest importance; secondly, the request for documentation as originally proposed by Argentina and ourselves. I think we should all be grateful to the Argentine delegation for making these very interesting proposals which now constitute the body of our draft resolution.

20. The Netherlands delegation feels that the debate on this question has, as a whole, been extremely interesting and stimulating. There is good reason to assume that we have, in fact, already collected the preliminary views of delegations on the subject. Thus the fact that the Assembly has dealt with the matter this year will no doubt prove to be extremely useful for all further efforts in this field. We feel greatly encouraged by the discussions and we believe that the draft resolution, as it is now before the Assembly, is a very good and useful document. For this same reason, we feel that we should not submit our proposal once more concerning the preliminary views. Though we might perhaps, in the ballot today, be able to obtain a small majority, we believe we should not force on the Assembly an idea which is not favoured by 50 per cent of its members. By giving up the proposal on preliminary views we have gained something that, in matters of this kind, is of paramount importance—near unanimity. In this spirit we commend the draft resolution to the Assembly.

21. Finally, I should like to express the sincere appreciation of my delegation to the delegations of Canada, Cuba, New Zealand and Pakistan and, in particular, to the delegation of Argentina, for having co-sponsored the original draft resolution with the delegation of the Netherlands.

22. Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand): During his address to the General Assembly in October 1952 [380th meeting], the New Zealand Minister for External Affairs drew attention to the provisions of Article 109 of the Charter. Anticipating that the conference referred to in that article would be held in conjunction with, or soon after, the tenth annual session of the Assembly, he pointed to the need for considerable preparation and to the desirability that the matter should be taken in hand at this, the eighth, session. In these circumstances, the New Zealand delegation was very happy to be associated with the delegations of Argentina, Canada, Cuba, the Netherlands and Pakistan in the sponsorship of the six-Power draft resolution which formed the basis of the draft which is now before the Assembly.

23. We feel that the present draft resolution will serve two purposes. First, it will remind our govern-

ments that they should, during the next two years, be giving serious thought to the problems associated with Charter review. Secondly, it sets in train the preparation by the Secretary-General of documentary material which should be of great assistance to governments in deciding whether or not they should support the holding of a review conference.

24. A number of representatives in the Sixth Committee gave us the benefit of a thorough and eloquent examination of the background of Article 109 of the Charter. They showed how, during the negotiations at San Francisco, the question of Charter review acquired great significance and was at times the point of focus of the whole conference. Long deliberation led to the present text of Article 109 of the Charter.

25. No general review conference has yet been held, and it follows that the Secretary-General will have no option but to place the question of whether or not such a conference should be held on the agenda of the tenth session, that is, the session to be held in 1955. At that time, a decision in favour of a review conference can be taken by a majority vote of the Members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council.

26. I should like to re-emphasize what the New Zealand representative said in the Sixth Committee, namely, that the New Zealand delegation had but one motive in co-sponsoring the original draft resolution. We wished to assist the Assembly in arriving at what I might call a straightforward procedure for ensuring that the tenth session of the General Assembly, when it discusses the item of Charter review, does so against the background of adequate preparation by Member States. The New Zealand delegation, therefore, regarded the original draft resolution as being of a purely procedural character and as not prejudging the case for or against revision.

27. There were, however, some delegations that regarded the proposal contained in the draft, that the Members be invited to submit preliminary views regarding the possible revision of the Charter, as calculated to prejudice the case for or against revision. My delegation did not regard the proposal in that light. It is significant that there were some who felt it would assist the proponents of Charter revision, and others who believed the opposite. In any event, the proposal was defeated by a very small majority. My delegation is quite happy with this result. We feel that a text of this kind, which I insist is purely procedural, would lose much of its effectiveness if there were a marked division of opinion as to its text. We trust that in its present form it will obtain a large measure of support in the Assembly.

28. There is another respect in which the draft resolution now before the Assembly differs from the original six-Power draft, of which New Zealand was a co-sponsor. The Committee decided that the Secretary-General should not be asked to embark on the preparation of a systematic and comprehensive legislative history of the Charter. The New Zealand delegation originally felt that a history of that kind would be a great help to governments. However, it became clear during the course of the debate from statements made on behalf of the Secretary-General that its preparation would be costly and would impose a great strain on the Secretariat. More important still, it was pointed out that the comprehensive index which had

also been proposed would be an effective substitute. Taking all these factors into account, the New Zealand delegation is glad to accept the Committee's decision not to press for the preparation of a legislative history.

29. Certain representatives in the Sixth Committee, I understand, suggested that the co-sponsors of the six-Power draft were moved by a desire to revise the Charter and, in particular, to secure the abolition of the unanimity rule. I wish to assure the General Assembly that the New Zealand delegation had no such objective when sponsoring the draft resolution. New Zealand has not yet decided whether or not it will support the holding of a review conference. Still less has it decided that it will support any particular amendments to the Charter should a conference be held.

30. I am confident that the valuable and stimulating debate which took place in the Sixth Committee will provide our governments with very useful material. The debates have at least shown that a decision which this Assembly is to take at its tenth session as to the holding of a review conference will have great significance for the future of the United Nations. Over the next two years we must earnestly reflect whether the Charter, which represented the highest common denominator of agreement at a time when our hopes for the future were so high, is not still the most effective instrument of our common purpose—the maintenance of international peace and security.

31. Mr. PETRZELKA (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from French*): During the debate in the Sixth Committee on the matters now under discussion, my delegation and a number of others pointed out that the proposals for the initiation of so-called preparatory work, with a view to the revision of the Charter, were an integral part of the campaign at present being waged against the Charter, and thereby against the United Nations. The persistence of that campaign and the nature of its objectives were clearly demonstrated during the debates which took place in the Sixth Committee. That is why certain sponsors of proposals for the revision of the Charter thought it desirable to profess their good intentions, or to camouflage the campaign which is undeniably being waged against the Charter, by alleging, for example, that the draft resolution related to a mere question of procedure. But that manoeuvre, like the others, was doomed to failure.

32. The present world situation necessitates strict compliance with, and application of, the Charter, for that instrument alone can successfully ensure a lasting and peaceful co-operation among Member States of the United Nations. The Charter, which was solemnly adopted in 1945 by the peoples of the world, was the practical expression of the most fervent wishes and aspirations of the overwhelming majority of mankind.

33. Among the crucial and fundamental principles essential for the maintenance of peaceful co-operation is the principle of collective responsibility, and also the principle of the unanimity of the great Powers members of the Security Council. The latter principle, of course, is a serious obstacle to the policy of cold war, which leads to the establishment of military and political blocs; and it is there that the real roots of the campaign for the so-called revision of the Charter are to be sought. However, that policy is totally incompatible with the real wishes and the peaceful

aspirations of the peoples of the world. The attempt is therefore made to deceive them by the false allegation that the Charter is not effective, that it cannot ensure the maintenance and strengthening of world peace, and therefore needs revision.

34. Such are the assertions that are being made in order to infect the world with mistrust and scepticism as to the value, strength and effectiveness of the United Nations Charter. And that is why certain delegations are trying to violate Article 109 by initiating so-called preparatory work for the revision of the Charter at once, despite the fact that such preparatory work cannot be undertaken until 1956—and then only if the General Assembly takes a decision to that effect at its tenth session in 1955. In spite of that fact, it is alleged that preparatory work for the revision of the Charter is already urgent and necessary.

35. The Czechoslovak delegation voted against the draft resolution in the Sixth Committee, and will do so again in the General Assembly. The preamble of the draft resolution clearly expresses a desire for the revision of the Charter, and sub-paragraph (c) of the operative part confirms that tendency. The United Nations must return to a policy of respect for the Charter and must carry out its mission of peace. The only road our Organization should take is that of peace and co-operation among peoples. The vital interests of mankind demand scrupulous respect for the Charter, and not a new weakening of its authority. My delegation must therefore categorically reject any moves and any campaign directed towards the revision of the Charter.

36. Mr. BYRNES (United States of America): In view of some of the statements made here this morning, I desire to explain the vote of my delegation.

37. Article 109 of the Charter provides that, two years from now, at the tenth session of the General Assembly, we shall automatically have on our agenda a proposal to convene a general conference to review the United Nations Charter. This year several delegations, with commendable foresight, proposed that the Assembly should take some preparatory steps designed to facilitate the discharge of responsibilities which Member States have under Article 109. The Sixth Committee has recommended that we should ask the Secretariat to prepare certain studies on the history of the Charter and on the practice of United Nations organs in applying our basic constitutional instrument. These recommended steps are all procedural in character. They do not prejudice in any way the question of any possible changes that might be made in the Charter through the amendment process. In fact, the recommended procedures are without prejudice to whatever decision the General Assembly may choose to take in 1955 with regard to the calling of a review conference.

38. An impressively large number of delegations spoke in the Sixth Committee in the debate on the items of our agenda dealing with Charter revision. The great majority of them showed objectivity and openness of mind in reviewing the eight-year history of the United Nations and in looking forward to the future. They showed keen awareness of the Organization's problems and eagerness to bring all resources to bear in aid of solutions. They approached the question of Charter revision as an opportunity to see

whether improvements are possible in the structure of the world organization. They dealt with the items now before us as a means of considering and launching constructive procedural steps which would be of assistance to the General Assembly in 1955 and to a review conference thereafter. It was with regret that we found representatives of the Soviet bloc countries insisting upon making the Charter review question at this Assembly merely another vehicle for their hostile propaganda against the United States. Their unprovoked attacks were ignored in the Committee, but it was disheartening that this small group showed only suspicion and hostility towards the honest efforts of others.

39. In the Committee debate, and in the Assembly this morning, representatives of the Soviet bloc countries spoke of Cominform desires and actions to ease tension. In the next breath the same representatives characterized the items on Charter review as a cold-war propaganda manoeuvre, and directed their criticisms particularly to the United States. It must have been amazing to the sponsors of these items and of the proposals which were considered in the Sixth Committee to hear themselves described as tools of another Power, employed for its imperialistic and aggressive purposes. Actually, what the Committee debate revealed, through honest discussion, was a variety of honestly held different, and even conflicting, opinions. My Government is disappointed by the continuing unfamiliarity of representatives from the communist-dominated countries with such a phenomenon.

40. We heard also from the Soviet-bloc spokesmen that what is needed is not amendment of the Charter but scrupulous fulfilment of the obligations it imposes. What strides we should be making already if the whole membership of the Organization, including the Soviet bloc, were scrupulously following the provisions of the Charter!

41. We were told by the Soviet bloc that the Charter principle of unanimity was being violated. In view of the record of more than half a hundred vetoes cast by the Soviet Union, one can only ask who is out of step. What bloc of countries was it that the General Assembly found guilty of illegal and aggressive intervention in Greece? Which permanent member of the Security Council is it that has impaired the ability of the Council to discharge its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and has forced other Members of the United Nations to look after that responsibility through action of the General Assembly and regional organizations? What bloc of countries has flouted the Security Council resolutions 25 and 27 of June 1950 dealing with the communist aggression in Korea, and the General Assembly resolution [498 (V)] designed to cope with the subsequent mass participation by communist China in that aggression? Everyone knows the answer to these questions and a number of others which inevitably come to our minds—questions such as those concerning the road-block thrown up against disarmament, the overthrow of free government in Czechoslovakia, the violations of peace treaties, the sabotage of United Nations efforts in the economic and social fields and through the specialized agencies, the diabolical lies about germ warfare and the barbaric treatment of prisoners of war. These go to make up part of the record since 1945.

42. We were given hope by Soviet Premier Malenkov's words last spring that a change might be in the making. The peoples of the world are anxious to see some sign of that change. Members of the Assembly know the many areas in which such a change should begin to be made manifest. One small area in which we held hope was the area of technical and procedural approach to the question of review of the United Nations Charter. It is to be hoped that the Soviet leaders will study carefully our debates and reflect upon them thoughtfully.

43. In looking ahead to the question of Charter review, we cannot and do not expect miracles. We do not believe that changes in language alone will transform the behaviour of nations. Peace depends not upon what is written in charters or treaties but upon what is in the minds and hearts of men. We do not know now whether changes in the Charter will be desirable or possible, but we do appeal to all governments to explore continuously and in the most thoughtful way the problems, the needs and the potentialities of our monumental effort at international co-operation through this Organization, the United Nations.

44. Mr. LOBODYCZ (Poland): The very fact of inserting in the agenda of the General Assembly the question of so-called preparatory work for the revision of the Charter is the expression of a tendency on the part of the ruling circles of certain States, and in particular of the United States, to undermine the foundations of our Organization, a tendency which has already been evident for a long time. Simultaneously, under the pretext of undertaking preparations for the debate at the tenth session of the General Assembly or at the general conference which might follow it, the United States ruling circles have been searching for new factors to intensify the cold war propaganda and to poison the international atmosphere, which the tone and contents of today's explanation by Mr. Byrnes fully confirms.

45. The Charter of the United Nations has become the target for the partisans of the policy of dictation in international relations, for the Charter is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all States, small and great. The sovereign and equal rights of great and small States can be protected only if the co-operation of the permanent members of the Security Council, based upon their unanimity, is secured. Primarily, therefore, this campaign to make our Organization revise the Charter is directed against the principle of the unanimity of the great Powers. The campaign for revision of the Charter aims at sharpening the crisis in which our Organization is now plunged.

46. This situation has been brought about not by the so-called weaknesses of the Charter, but by the systematic violation of the obligations it imposes by the United States and a number of other States. I do not intend to list at this time all the violations of the Charter that have been committed by the United States; I shall simply mention the most flagrant violations, which weigh heavily upon our Organization. I shall recall only the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty, the United States intervention in Korea, and the fact that the representatives of the People's Republic of China have not been allowed to participate in the work of our Organization. No recourse to allegations, long since denounced, such as those enum-

erated today by Mr. Byrnes, can overshadow this truth. If our Organization is to emerge from this crisis, it is not revision of the Charter that is needed. It is necessary that those who until now have violated the spirit and the letter of our Charter should observe its provisions strictly. In the present situation, any action designed to revise the Charter would only play into the hands of those who will not allow the United Nations to contribute to the relaxation of international tensions and to perform its role of encouraging co-operation between States, whatever their political, social and economic systems.

47. This opinion was shared, as the discussion proved, by a majority of delegations which, in spite of all prodding, asked for caution and pointed out the dangers which are hidden in any attempt to revise the Charter. The extensive discussions which took place in the Sixth Committee revealed that the moves to prepare for the revision of the Charter are not only premature but also harmful to our Organization. Furthermore, those moves would weaken the prestige of our Organization. This was so evident that the Sixth Committee eliminated from the draft resolution those stipulations which, while ostensibly designed to gather opinions from governments regarding the revision of the Charter, were actually aimed at creating an atmosphere of lack of confidence in the Charter, and at whipping up a campaign against the foundations of our Organization.

48. Nevertheless, the majority of delegations in the Sixth Committee gave way to the pressure of the campaign for revision and approved a request to the Secretary-General to publish documents and indexes to be utilized in the useless and harmful preparatory work for the revision of the Charter. The retention in the draft resolution that was adopted by the Sixth Committee, of the preamble, suggesting the need for revision of the Charter, makes possible the use of this resolution for purposes of propaganda directed against the United Nations Charter. The fact that this preamble has been maintained, owing to the insistence of certain delegations, despite the fact that it obviously conflicts with the rest of the draft resolution, reveals the intent to use the resolution for propaganda purposes which are contrary to the principles of the Charter.

49. The Polish delegation will therefore vote against this draft resolution if its preamble and sub-paragraph (c) of its operative part are maintained.

50. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution proposed by the Sixth Committee [A/2559]. Separate votes have been requested on different parts of the draft.

51. We shall vote first on the preamble.

The preamble was adopted by 53 votes to 5.

52. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the opening clause of the operative paragraph, which reads as follows:

"Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, publish and circulate among the Member States during 1954, or shortly thereafter".

The clause was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

53. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote successively on sub-paragraphs a, b and c of the operative paragraph.

Sub-paragraph (a) was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (b) was adopted by 53 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (c) was adopted by 52 votes to 5.

54. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 54 votes to 5.

Scale of assessment for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Fifth Committee (A/2577 and Corr.1)

[Agenda item 42]

Mr. Ahson (Pakistan), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/2577 and Corr.1).

55. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): During the discussion in the Fifth Committee on the scale of contributions to the United Nations for 1954, the USSR delegation opposed the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee on Contributions, which provide for a further increase in the contributions of the Soviet Union, of the Ukrainian SSR and of the Byelorussian SSR, and cited a series of facts to show that the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions in this matter were inequitable and unobjective.

56. As we all know, in determining the scale of contributions by Member States to the United Nations, certain factors which were laid down by the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations and approved by the General Assembly [*resolution 14 (I), part A*] have to be taken into account. These factors are as follows: the comparative income per head of population; the temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War; and the ability of Members to secure foreign currency—i.e. United States dollars—to meet their contributions to the United Nations budget. As you know, these factors laid down by the General Assembly have not been revised or replaced, and consequently both the Committee on Contributions and the General Assembly, in determining the contribution of each Member of the United Nations, are under the obligation to take them into account.

57. What in reality is the position with regard to the fixing of Members' contributions to the United Nations budget? The fact cannot be overlooked that since 1951 each review of the scale of assessment has brought an increase in the contributions of one group of countries—the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian SSR, the Byelorussian SSR and Poland—and a decrease in the contributions of another group of countries—the United States, the United Kingdom and its dominions and certain others.

58. Thus in 1951 the contributions of the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR were increased by 10 per cent, in 1952 by 40 per cent and in 1953 by 25 per cent; and the report of the Fifth Committee proposes an increase of over 15 per cent in their contributions for 1954. The contributions of these countries will accordingly have been increased over a period of four years by a total of 90 per cent;

in other words they will almost have been doubled. Meanwhile the contribution of the United States has been reduced by 16.2 per cent over the last three years; the United Kingdom contribution by 22.6 per cent; the contribution of the Union of South Africa by more than 30 per cent; that of Australia by 11.2 per cent; that of the Netherlands by 10.7 per cent, and so on.

59. This policy in the determination of contributions to the United Nations budget is not in conformity with the factors which were laid down by the General Assembly, and which have to be taken into account in fixing the scale of assessments.

60. The inequitable and unobjective nature of the recommendations contained in the Fifth Committee's report with regard to the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR is the more obvious when it is remembered that those countries suffered enormous losses during the Second World War; the damage inflicted on their national economies was evaluated at 500,000 million dollars. Clearly such tremendous losses and such destruction cannot have been fully made good so soon after the end of the war; and their effects are still felt. The Soviet Union is obliged to invest considerable sums for the restoration of its national economy, which was destroyed by the German invaders.

61. Let us turn to another factor which has to be taken into account in establishing the scale of contributions to the United Nations: the ability of Members of the United Nations to secure foreign currency, in other words, dollars, to meet their contributions. For the United States, that is no problem, since its contribution is paid in its own national currency. For the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian SSR, and the Byelorussian SSR, and, we may add, for Poland, on the other hand, this is a factor of great importance, particularly in view of the fact that the trade of these countries with the United States has been reduced to almost nil by United States policy. As a result, they find it extremely difficult to pay their contributions to the United Nations in dollars. The Soviet delegation's objections to the increase in the contributions of the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR are therefore fully justified.

62. But apart from the fact that the Fifth Committee's recommendations are contrary to the factors adopted by the General Assembly, it must also be observed that they are contrary to rule 159 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which provides as follows:

"The scale of assessments, when once fixed by the General Assembly, shall not be subject to a general revision for at least three years . . ."

Yet, in the case of the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR, as I have shown, there has been an annual revision of the scale of assessments and an annual rise in contributions. The Soviet delegation cannot but draw the attention of the General Assembly to this anomalous situation, in which rule 159 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly has been disregarded for a number of years—manifestly to suit the interests of the United States and certain other States whose contributions have been reduced from year to year. The non-observance of this rule opens the door wide for arbitrary action in the determination of contributions

to the United Nations budget, as is evidenced by the increase in the contributions of the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR, and the simultaneous reduction in the contribution of the United States.

63. The USSR delegation therefore protests against the draft resolution proposed by the Fifth Committee, providing for a further increase in the contributions of the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR over the amounts laid down for those countries at the seventh session of the General Assembly. Accordingly, the Soviet delegation will vote against the draft resolution proposed by the Fifth Committee on this item.

64. Mr. RICHARDS (United States of America): The United States is glad to support the draft resolution on the scale of assessment for 1954 which has been recommended to the General Assembly by the Fifth Committee. We are glad to do so because that draft resolution represents a significant achievement. It gives effect for the first time to the principle recognized by the General Assembly in 1948, [*resolution 238 A (III)*], namely, that no one Member State should be assessed more than one-third of the expenses of the regular United Nations budget. As is well known, the implementation of that principle has been of special concern to the United States. Hence, the United States is gratified at the Fifth Committee's recommendation to reduce the United States assessment to 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent.

65. We believe that the adoption by the General Assembly of the Fifth Committee's recommendation would be in the best interests of the United Nations. As was stated in the early days of the United Nations by one of its principal architects, Senator Vandenberg:

"A preponderance in contributions would unavoidably involve, directly or indirectly, a somewhat equivalent preponderance in determining how much money should be raised and how it would be expended. We do not want such a preponderance of influence ourselves, and we would not grant it to others."

66. In view of the fact that, in 1948, the General Assembly recognized the validity of the remarks I have just quoted and that it has since proceeded cautiously towards the objective of limiting the maximum contribution to 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent, it is indeed a source of regret that a small, but important, group of countries is still contesting both the principle and its implementation. I should have liked to end my remarks at this point on a note of appreciation that the limitation of 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent on contributions was at last becoming effective. The statement of the previous speaker, however, forces me to make some additional remarks, in the interest of keeping the record straight.

67. The Soviet Union representative's primary basis for maintaining that his country's contribution should not be increased is its relative incapacity to pay. In this connexion, he pleads the necessity for special concessions as a result of war damage, and he charges that the United States makes it impossible for the Soviet Union to obtain the required dollars. In addition, he advances various irrelevant reasons why the United States contribution should not be reduced. I shall not take the General Assembly's time in dealing with those irrelevant and worn-out arguments. The

reduction of the United States contribution is in pursuance of a decision on principle adopted by the majority of the Assembly in 1948. The facts regarding the Soviet Union's capacity to pay, however, must be set straight.

68. No one outside the Soviet bloc is in a position to say authoritatively what the Soviet national income is. The Soviet countries have steadily refused to make reliable statistical data freely available so that independent judgments could be made. But the Soviet countries have frequently boasted—both inside and outside the United Nations—about the rapid economic progress which they have achieved since the end of the war. If they would really have us believe that, it seems highly inconsistent for them to be pleading that the General Assembly should continue to afford them special consideration as regards their contributions to the United Nations—that is, it is inconsistent if they are the loyal supporters of the United Nations which they maintain they are. My primary purpose at this moment, however, is not to deal with the insincerities and inconsistencies of the Soviet Union's argument concerning its economic inability to increase its financial support of the United Nations. My purpose in extending my remarks is to deal with the charge that United States trade policy prevents the Soviet Union Government from obtaining dollars to pay its contribution to the United Nations.

69. This Assembly is well aware of the fact that the deterioration in trade relations between the United States and the Soviet Union is directly attributable to the Soviet Union's aggressive policies. Because that is a known fact, I do not have to dwell upon the evidence at this time. That situation, however, has no bearing on the Soviet Union's ability to contribute to the budget of the United Nations. The Soviet Union is a major producer of gold. That gold can be readily converted into dollars in any free exchange market in the world. If the Soviet Union is not disposed to seek that conversion, I am sure that the United Nations will be glad to accept gold bullion in payment of contributions.

70. I hope those facts will lay to rest once and for all the baseless argument which the Soviet Union produces every year in an effort to prevent the General Assembly from raising its contribution to the United Nations to a level more compatible with that country's actual capacity to pay.

71. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland): The Polish delegation wishes briefly to explain its attitude towards the scale of assessment for 1954 which is proposed in the Fifth Committee's draft resolution.

72. On the basis of the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions, the Fifth Committee's draft resolution proposes that Poland's contribution should be increased by about 10 per cent as compared with the figure for the previous financial year. Thus, for the fourth time, there is an increase in Poland's contribution. The same is true of the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR. The following question arises: what are the reasons behind the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions for a constant increase in the contributions of Poland and certain other countries?

73. In the terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions, adopted by the General Assembly in

February 1946 [*resolution 14 (I), part A*], there are very precise instructions concerning this matter. Those instructions pertain to the necessity of taking into consideration, in establishing the scale of assessment, the economic difficulties in which various countries find themselves as a result of the Second World War, as well as the ability of various countries to secure foreign currency. Moreover, rule 159 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure states, in part:

"The scale of assessments, when once fixed by the General Assembly, shall not be subject to a general revision for at least three years."

The actions of the Committee on Contributions demonstrate that that committee has disregarded the decision adopted in 1946, as well as the rules of procedure.

74. In establishing the scale of assessment, the Committee has divided countries into three categories. In the first category, it has placed the countries whose contributions are constantly increased; in the second, the countries whose contributions are increased every few years; and in the third, the countries whose contributions are constantly reduced. Poland and four other countries—the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR, the Byelorussian SSR and Czechoslovakia—belong to the first category. The Committee on Contributions gives these countries different treatment from that accorded to others and has increased, each year, only their contributions to the United Nations budget. As a result of this practice, during the past four years these five countries have been burdened with 90 per cent of all the increases proposed by the Committee on Contributions. This year also, if the draft resolution upon which we are about to vote is adopted, this group of States which is being treated in this particular manner will also be burdened with 90 per cent of all the increases proposed in the draft resolution.

75. During the discussions in the Fifth Committee the delegation of Poland pointed out that the Committee on Contributions had not taken into consideration the difficulties arising in Poland and the other countries which I have mentioned because of the devastation caused by the Second World War. Reconstruction in those countries calls for tremendous financial, as well as other efforts by the entire population. The Hitlerite occupation ruined thousands of villages and dozens of cities, including Poland's capital, Warsaw, and at this time the Polish people, at the cost of great effort and financial outlay, are restoring these cities and villages from the ruins. Nevertheless, Poland finds itself in the group of ten countries which pay the heaviest contributions.

76. Now I should like to comment briefly on a remark just made by the representative of the United States, who mentioned—unusually, I would say—the achievements of Poland, the USSR and other peoples' democracies. We are very proud of those achievements and we do not hide them; on the contrary, we are glad that there are people who recognize them. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that our countries—Poland, the USSR, the Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR and Czechoslovakia—were those which suffered the heaviest damage in the last world war, and whose cities and villages were destroyed, and it calls for great effort and great sacrifice on the part of our peoples, as well as our governments, to supply the ways and means for reconstruction.

77. It is also necessary to stress that the Committee on Contributions, contrary to the recommendations

made at the first session of the General Assembly, has not taken into account the difficulties of the five countries which I have mentioned caused by the United States policy of trade discrimination. Despite the discussion in the Fifth Committee, the representative of the United States has again ventured to bring in his accusations and attacks against the policies of the governments of the Soviet Union, Poland and the other peoples' democracies. We have already given examples of the policy of trade discrimination, carried out by the United States Government, in various Committees of the Assembly and at various sessions. The Assembly is well aware of the situation; and as far as aggressive policies are concerned, we already know, from the discussions in the First Committee on the disarmament problem and on the draft resolution of the Soviet Union which have just been concluded, which countries are really carrying out aggressive policies and what governments are using vast amounts of their national incomes for the financing and support of an armaments policy directed against peaceful countries all over the world.

78. Returning to the question under discussion, the Polish delegation considers that another increase in Poland's contribution at this time is particularly unjust. Nor can the Polish delegation agree to the systematic reduction of the contributions of other countries, particularly the United States, which not only suffered no damage during the war but, on the contrary, made considerable gain. Actually, the United States is in a privileged position in relation to other Member States. It has no difficulty in obtaining funds with which to pay its contribution. As was pointed out not only by the Polish delegation but also by many others during the discussion in the Fifth Committee, the United States has received, either directly or indirectly, large sums out of the United Nations budget. According to the opinion of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions [*A/2403, para. 189*], approximately \$1,800,000 was repaid to the United States Treasury from taxes levied in 1953 on United States employees of the United Nations. That sum, which is refunded to the personnel by the United Nations, constitutes over 4 per cent of our Organization's budget. Moreover, some 80 per cent of the United Nations budget is spent in the United States. No wonder, then, that the representative of the United States was so pleased about the new scale of assessment and expressed his support of the draft resolution recommending that new scale.

79. The Polish delegation considers that the reduction of the contributions of such Member States as the United States, which is in a privileged position, and the placing upon a few countries of the entire weight of these unwarranted reductions, is a flagrant injustice and contrary to the principle to which I referred at the beginning of my statement. That is why we strongly oppose the policy of discrimination against Poland and other States, and we shall vote against the proposed scale of assessment for the year 1954 recommended in the draft resolution of the Fifth Committee.

80. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Fifth Committee [*A/2577*].

The draft resolution was adopted by 50 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.

Financial reports and accounts, and reports of the Board of Auditors: (c) United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, for the financial year ended 30 June 1953 (d) United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, for the financial year ended 30 June 1953: reports of the Fifth Committee (A/2568 and A/2569)

[Agenda item 37]

Mr. Ahson (Pakistan), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the reports of that Committee (A/2568 and A/2569).

The draft resolution contained in document A/2568 was adopted without objection.

The draft resolution contained in document A/2569 was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Review of audit procedures of the United Nations and the specialized agencies: report of the Fifth Committee (A/2566)

[Agenda item 43]

Mr. Ahson (Pakistan), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/2566).

The draft resolution contained in the report was adopted without objection.

Audit reports relating to expenditure by specialized agencies of technical assistance funds allocated from the Special Account: report of the Fifth Committee (A/2567)

[Agenda item 46]

Mr. Ahson (Pakistan), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/2567).

The draft resolution contained in the report was adopted without objection.

United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund: (a) annual report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board for the year ended 31 December 1952; (b) acceptance by the specialized agencies of the jurisdiction of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal in matters involving applications alleging non-observance of Pension Fund regulations; (c) amendments to the regulations for the United

Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund: reports of the Fifth Committee (A/2564, A/2565 and A/2576)

[Agenda item 47]

Mr. Ahson (Pakistan), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the reports of that Committee (A/2564, A/2565 and A/2576).

The draft resolution contained in document A/2564 was adopted without objection.

The draft resolution contained in document A/2565 was adopted without objection.

81. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

82. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom): I request that a vote be taken on draft resolution II under sub-item (c).

83. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the two draft resolutions contained in document A/2576.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 49 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

Narcotic drugs: (a) assumption by organs of the United Nations of functions and responsibilities assigned to them under the terms of the Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and Use of Opium, 1953, and of the financial burdens resulting therefrom; (b) question of the remuneration of members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Drug Supervisory Body: reports of the Fifth Committee (A/2570 and A/2571)

[Agenda item 68]

Mr. Ahson (Pakistan), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the reports of that Committee (A/2570 and A/2571).

The draft resolution contained in document A/2570 was adopted by 54 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The draft resolution contained in document A/2571 was adopted without objection.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.