

In the view of my Delegation there has never been any doubt as to the infinitely greater value of a United Nations which embraces all the major traditions and contemporary philosophies of government than of one confined to those who are unlikely to quarrel with each other over anything serious. Having accepted this view as one more likely to bring about peace and harmony in the world, we are obliged, I think, to accept its implications. One of those implications is that we ought not to use the Charter to bar from membership countries whose policies and points of view resemble closely those of other states which are Charter members.

It is by the principle of ensuring the broad representative character of the United Nations that we have justified the position taken in our draft resolution. It may be thought that this is a principle which is contrary to the strict letter of the Charter. If one accepts, however, the argument that I have put forward above, I do not think that there is a contradiction involved. My argument is that the principles of the Charter must be interpreted in the light of the intended world-wide nature of our membership. If the United Nations were confined entirely to peoples of one tradition, then we might be justified in a more limited interpretation of Article 4. Given the fact, however, that it includes members of many different traditions, that it is in a sense, therefore, virtually universal, we must understand its provisions in those terms.

Members of the committee will have noted that the draft resolution refers to the pending application for membership of all those countries about which no problem of unification arises. It will be understood that the

resolution refers to unification for purposes of membership in the U.N. only, and that it is not intended to exclude from membership, now or later, applicants which have problems of this nature in other contexts...

It will be obvious also, as we indicated in our statement in the general debate, before Spain submitted her application, that in submitting our resolution we had in mind that the Security Council should consider the other 17, and now as a result of the Spanish application, the 18 other outstanding applicants. In our view, the admission of 18 new members remains the target. For our part, we are prepared to receive favourably all the recommendations which will be made by the Security Council.

Our support of the draft resolution is based on a philosophy of the United Nations as we see it, a United Nations which is as near universal as possible. We are aware of the fact that the expansion of the United Nations will introduce more voices, perhaps in some cases discordant voices, into a community where there is already much discord. We realize that by bringing in these members we may be swelling the opposition occasionally to measures which we shall undoubtedly be supporting. Unquestionably it would be easier to sit back and prolong the present situation indefinitely out of fear of unknown consequences but in our view to do so would be a sterile attempt to preserve a restricted arrangement which is bound to be swept away sooner or later. We cannot ignore the nature of the world as it exists. If the United Nations is to survive and if it is to play the great role intended for it, then it must reflect the real world, not a partial world of our contriving.

FRANCO-TUNISIAN RELATIONS

(Continued from page 321)

national assembly which will prepare a democratic constitution for the new nation. The influential leader of the Néo-Destour, M. Bourguiba, who returned from exile in France following the conclusion of the Franco-Tunisian Conventions, described the future of his country in these terms:

le français restera toujours le lien qui reliera la Tunisie à la civilisation occidentale . . . une Tunisie . . . solidaire du monde arabo-musulman par son âme et sa culture et résolument tournée vers l'occident dont elle fait partie . . .