

in 1956 was an unsatisfactory one and that a compelling need exists to scrap the 1956 agreement and start again. If there were factors which could be brought forward to show that the 1956 overall agreement was now entirely out of date and therefore required remodelling there would then be considerable point to the argument that a new overall agreement should now be drawn up. However, the only relevant development that has taken place since 1956 is that 21 new states, including 19 African states, have joined the United Nations. This development in no way unhinges the basis of the 1956 overall arrangement, it can and should, in the opinion of the Canadian Delegation, be dealt with on a separate basis.

If the 1956 agreement is considered carefully, it is difficult to see how an overall reallocation in the context of an expansion would be advisable. Representatives of the Afro-Asian group have stated that there is need for a reallocation because, in their view, their group is under represented. Similarly claims are being made that the Eastern European group is under represented. However, who is to judge as to the validity of these claims or as to the validity of similar claims that other groups of states would well be justified to advance were it decided to introduce an overall reallocation of seats even in the context of an expansion.

Reallocation coupled with expansion involves other difficulties. The most likely of these would be that the Commission would have to be increased to such a degree as to make it no longer able to function efficiently as a technical legal group. It could be reduced to a forum in which various political groups would be mechanically putting forward rigid formal positions. In that case, all hope of communication on an individual basis between experts which constituted the original purpose of setting up the Commission would be lost.