

The admission of The Gambia, the Maldive Islands and Singapore to the United Nations in 1965 formed part of the established pattern of emerging nations crowning independence by membership in the United Nations. In contrast, the withdrawal of Indonesia from the United Nations in January was an unhappy and unfortunate event. It represented an act which had not even been provided for in the Charter, although it had been agreed at San Francisco that if "a member . . . feels constrained to withdraw . . . it is not the purpose of the Organization to compel (it) to continue its co-operation with the Organization".¹ In commenting to the press on Indonesia's action, the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that it "is bound to be injurious to Indonesia and is not helpful to the United Nations, particularly at the present time, when it is faced with serious difficulties. . . . I am sure that the vast majority of member countries will be most disappointed in the course that has been taken by President Sukarno".

The question of Chinese representation² remained to the forefront, with the balance of viewpoint shifting further in favour of the People's Republic of China. At the twentieth session, a resolution calling for the removal of representatives of Nationalist China and the seating of representatives of the People's Republic of China resulted in a tied vote of 47 in favour to 47 against, with 20 abstentions. In 1963 the vote on the same resolution was 41 to 57, with 12 abstentions. The prior vote designating the question as "important", and thus requiring a two-thirds majority for approval, was 56 in favour to 49 against, with 11 abstentions (as compared to 61 in favour, 34 against, with 7 abstentions when a similar procedural resolution was adopted in 1961). The same day, Mr. Martin issued a statement in Ottawa saying that:

Canada would have welcomed the opportunity to see Communist China take a seat in the world organization had Peking made this possible. If that has not yet happened, it is because Peking itself has set a price on participation which is unacceptable.

As progress along the road to disarmament has to be measured over a long period of time, it is not always possible to point to significant accomplishments in any given year. While no agreements were reached in 1965, disarmament negotiations were encouraging in that they were exhaustive and were carried on despite the disruptive effect of a number of international crises, particularly the intensification of the war in Vietnam. Debates in the Disarmament Commission,³ which was convened for the first time in five years,

¹Documents of the UN Conference on International Organization, San Francisco, 1945, Vol. VII, Page 327.

²See Page 13.

³See Page 47.