

Ambassador Plimpton, the distinguished USA representative, in proposing this resolution pointed out that what was being considered was not a general enlargement of the Commission but rather a specific enlargement limited to the one geographical region not presently represented on the Commission, namely, the central and southern region of the African continent.

The impression has been gained from some of the discussion that the two new seats being proposed are intended to represent the whole geographical region of Africa which is, of course, not the case at all. The other portions of Africa were considered to be represented under the overall agreement reached in 1956.

It can be said therefore that the third alternative we are considering involves an element of reallocation in that it adds two seats to the number of seats assigned to Africa and Asia in 1956.

The advantage in this approach is that following the precedent adopted in 1956, it supplements rather than supersedes an arrangement already in existence and it avoids the danger of attempting a new general reallocation which could involve the Committee in lengthy and controversial discussions not to mention the difficulties we have outlined above which may be in store for the International Law Commission itself.

For these reasons, of the three possible courses open to us, the Canadian delegation feels that the more reasonable one is that suggested in the draft resolution which is now before us. Canada therefore proposes to vote for the eight power resolution contained in document A/C 6/L 481.

This is not to argue that the 1956 solution was ideal and that the modification now suggested will make it