

Advisability of Establishing a Permanent Committee of the General Assembly

The Assembly resolution of November, 1947, by which the Interim Committee was established, provided that the Committee should report to the third regular session on the advisability of establishing a Permanent Committee. The Interim Committee's report on this subject was accordingly presented by its Rapporteur, Mr Entezam of Iran.

Mr Entezam said that in order to form an opinion on this question members should consider firstly whether the Interim Committee had infringed the powers of other organs, as certain delegations had feared it would, and secondly whether it had satisfactorily fulfilled its mandate in the past year. In his view the fear that the Interim Committee would usurp functions of the Security Council had proved unjustified, and, on the other hand, useful work had been done—for instance, on the questions of the veto and of methods of international co-operation. The existence of the Committee had enabled a special session of the Assembly on the Korean question to be dispensed with, and thus more money had been saved than the Committee itself had cost.

The Interim Committee had decided unanimously to ask the Assembly to prolong its mandate, but there had been a difference of opinion as to whether the Committee should be continued for one year, a number of years, or permanently. Accordingly the draft resolution submitted by the Interim Committee did not make any recommendation on this point.

The delegate of the *United States* thought that the Committee might play an important role in assisting the Assembly to complete its work in the allotted time by giving preliminary consideration particularly to political problems. For various reasons, however, it had been unable to do so in the past year, and he thought that until the lines upon which the Assembly was evolving became a little clearer, it would be wiser not to set up a Permanent Committee, but to extend the existence of the Interim Committee for a year at a time.

The *United Kingdom* delegate considered that, although it might also perform useful functions in relation to specific political questions, the Committee's most valuable field of activity was the study of long-term questions such as the veto, international co-operation, and perhaps genocide. The experience of the past year had shown that it was quite possible for the Interim Committee and the Security Council to co-exist without overlapping. His delegation, for reasons outlined in the report, was not in favour of giving the Committee power to deal with economic and social or administrative and budgetary questions.

The delegate of *Poland* (Mr Lange) recalled the reasons why his Government, along with those of other members of the Slav group, had not taken part in the work of the Interim Committee. From the legal point of view, the establishment of a standing committee was