"Each Member of the United Nations has, by signing the Charter which contains these declarations, contracted by treaty a solemn obligation to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion. Each national government has, in the name of its people, accepted this obligation knowing the difficulties likely to be encountered in honouring it to the full. The Members of the United Nations have pledged themselves to act together in overcoming these difficulties; they have likewise pledged themselves to act separately. Thus failure by one nation to act provides no excuse for the inaction of others."

Canada has consistently urged the Assembly to weigh carefully the possible long-run implications of certain actions which it had been suggested it should take. In New York in November of last year the Assembly was dealing for the first time with the applications of states for membership in the United Nations. It was therefore essential that nothing which the Assembly did should create a dangerous precedent. For this reason Canada emphasized the importance of an applicant state possessing a sufficient degree of sovereignty to enable it to carry out independently the obligations imposed by the Charter and insisted that the degree of dependence of an applicant state upon another state was a relevant consideration. In developing this thesis Canada expressed doubts about the admissibility of Transjordan to the United Nations.

So far as I can recall, Canada was the only state which emphasized in New York the importance of this criterion. Since then the doctrine has received increasing support. Experience in the Assembly has already demonstrated that the admission of Members so dependent upon another Member of the United Nations that they do not in fact possess a sufficient degree of sovereignty to enable them to carry out independently the obligations imposed by the Charter does not serve the general interest.

Another example of a long-run consideration which has affected Canadian policy on an immediate issue was in the discussion at the last regular Assembly of the proposed incorporation of the mandate of South West Africa in the Union of South Africa. The South African Government had presented as an argument for incorporation the results of consultations which it had had with the non-European population of South West Africa, according to which the non-European population favoured the incorporation of their territory in the Union of South Africa by about six to one. The Canadian delegation felt that it would be extremely dangerous for the Assembly to establish the precedent of accepting as established facts the results of soundings of opinion or plebiscites taken solely under the auspices of interested parties. A precedent of this nature might embarrass the Assembly if it were asked to give its blessing to the annexation of an independent state as the aftermath of a questionable plebiscite. Canada therefore voted in favour of a resolution which stated that the Assembly was unable to accede to the incorporation of South West Africa in the Union of South Africa.

Again, in the debates on Spain the Canadian delegation abstained from voting on the final resolution because it contained a recommendation to the Security Council that it violate one of the most important articles of the Charter. Under this article, Article 39, the Security Council must, before calling on Members of the United Nations to impose sanctions, first determine that there exists a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace or an act of aggression which makes it necessary that sanctions should be imposed. The resolution on Spain was so worded that it called upon the Security Council to consider imposing sanctions against the Franco regime without first deciding the preliminary question of whether the existence of that regime constituted a threat to the peace. To con-