

Some of the permanent members of the Security Council have indicated that they will not, notwithstanding their views in respect of any particular application, prevent the General Assembly from considering an application by the exercise of the veto. If all the permanent members of the Security Council could give us a similar assurance, this would be a great step ahead and we could perhaps see a ray of hope.

Believing as we do that the deadlock which has developed over the admission of new members is essentially a political problem and requires a political solution, we might have hoped that during the past year which has seen a number of changes for the better, the Soviet Government might have seen fit to make some change in its proposal concerning the admission of new members. However, the resolution which they have presented to the Assembly this year is identical with their proposal not only of last year, but of previous years.

No matter how broad and liberal an interpretation of Article 4 of the Charter we would like to adopt and see others adopt, we cannot ignore the qualifications of individual countries whether or not the applications are presented individually. The Soviet Delegation know very well that although our founding fathers at San Francisco assumed the eventual universality of our Organization within the framework of the Charter, it is well nigh impossible for us to accept Outer Mongolia as a member state, while excluding other states fully qualified for membership.

In other words, from our point of view, the Soviet proposal has both sins of omission and commission. Much as we would like, therefore, to see the largest possible number of qualified outstanding applicants admitted to the United Nations, we shall once again be compelled to cast our vote against the Soviet resolution.

The resolution proposed by the distinguished Representative of Peru is, we believe, worthy of support. As I have said above, surely by some means, a solution of this problem can be found and we believe it would be appropriate for a Special Committee to undertake this task, to use its best endeavours, and report back to the Assembly.

With regard to the amendment submitted by the distinguished Representative of Argentina, while we agree that the sooner a solution can be found the better, we do not consider that having regard to the known difficulties and complexities of the problem it would be right to attempt to set a time limit of four weeks within which the Committee must report.

The Canadian Delegation will therefore support a proposal for the establishment of a Committee of good offices, will vote against the amendment to this resolution and will vote against the Soviet resolution for simultaneous admission of the states enumerated in that resolution.

Canadian Delegation does not consider that this and should I must state from the outset, however, we believe that the Charter and dealing with it in the Assembly, we remain convinced that the matter should not be settled in this way. The provisions of the Charter are, we believe clear and the decisions of the International Court of Justice must be respected. Before we can solve the problem here, therefore, we must have before us a recommendation of the Security Council.

External Affairs  
Supplementary Paper  
Reso.  
Adopt  
A/2/