

on quite a comprehensive list. As matters stand, however, we may be certain that no matter how impressive a majority may be recorded here in the Assembly, some or all of the applicants we may favour will continue to be vetoed in the Security Council.

"Now we recognize, Mr. Chairman, that there is a real difficulty in determining in some cases as to whether in fact an applicant qualifies under the criteria of Article 4, particularly whether the applicant can be regarded as 'able and willing to carry out' the obligations of the Charter. This difficulty exists even if the most objective judgment is applied in determining each case. Discussions in the Security Council as well as in this Committee at the last session, as well as today, amply demonstrate that such a difficulty exists. But surely this is exactly where the discussion of individual applications in the Assembly is particularly relevant in making a proper determination of whether a state is eligible for membership under Article 4 or not. Where, after full discussion of the relevant facts, an overwhelming majority of the members of this organization have stated as their judgment that an applicant is a peace-loving state and able and willing to carry out the obligations of the Charter, and should therefore be admitted to membership, this would be a fairly solid basis for a proper determination of the case, a basis, I submit, which would justify favourable consideration being given to an application by the Security Council.

"On the other hand, if after a favourable determination with respect to any application by the General Assembly the application is to be vetoed in the Security Council, then, in the opinion of the Canadian Delegation, action on the subject of membership by this Committee or the Assembly serves little or no useful purpose. The Canadian Delegation therefore believes that consideration of each application rejected by the Security Council on the part of the Assembly can be justified only if all the permanent members of the Security Council will agree not to use their veto to prevent the admission of a state, which has been approved by two-thirds of the General Assembly as having qualified under the conditions of Article 4, paragraph 1.

"If the permanent members of the Security Council were to give such an assurance, the Canadian Delegation would be happy to state its position with regard to each applicant mentioned in the resolutions before us and to participate in a vote in order to record a decision of the Assembly recommending the Security Council to reconsider the particular cases in question. In the absence of such an assurance, the Canadian Delegation considers that it would be futile to go through the process once again of expressing opinions on the eligibility of various applicants and unless the discussion brings out more points which we have missed in our consideration of the matter, we would be disposed to abstain from voting."

"With regard to the proposal of the Belgian Delegation for reference of certain points of law to the court, we should be disposed to support that resolution."