

interpretation of the voting procedure in the Security Council to put alongside the one already in existence.

It is a definition and interpretation in which, if present indications are correct, the vast majority of members will concur. This interpretation has also the concurrence of four of the members who participated in the previous interpretation. Even though the interpretation which is embodied in this document is never formally put into effect by any single or precise action, it is nevertheless bound to have results in the same way that any general interpretative process has a result on a constitutional structure. It seems to me, therefore, that the results of this process which was begun by the Committee are bound to be of very considerable significance. It is true that what we have done is to initiate a very gradual process but it seems to me that it is only by a gradual process, by trial and error, by interpretation such as the one which we have now completed that the voting procedure in the Security Council can be altered in present circumstances. It may be that before long we can as it were, shift gears, and consider the more direct approach of constitutional amendment. In the meantime, it seems to the Canadian delegation that this constitutes a very useful and practical step towards the gradual solution of this problem and the Canadian delegation is very happy to associate itself with this report.

(2) Canadian Statement, Ad Hoc Political Committee, November 17, 1948: Interim Committee.

As a member of a delegation which took a fairly active part in the debate last year on the establishment of the Interim Committee, I would like to say a very few words on the work of the Committee during the year and on the question as to whether or not it should be continued.

I have listened attentively to the representatives who have spoken both in favor of and against the continuation of the Interim Committee. On the one hand, we have had some very clear reasons advanced why the Interim Committee should be continued for at least another experimental year, and there is no need for me to repeat these arguments here. On the other hand we have had some arguments — as they appeared to me, confused and at times contradictory arguments — why the Interim Committee should not be continued.

Last year, the opponents of the Interim Committee argued that it would be a dangerous agency to create, that it would rush in and interfere all over the place and cause trouble. This year, some of them argue that it is not doing anything to justify its existence. They are hard to please, I suppose because they don't want to be pleased.

A careful examination of the Interim Committee's Report shows that the Committee has proceeded cautiously and has not yet exercised several of the functions, some rather important functions, assigned to it by the Assembly. But I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a bad thing. The Interim Committee has, in fact, proceeded slowly and has been very careful indeed not to impinge on the activities of the Security Council. It has therefore not justified the violent and exaggerated criticism of its opponents who last year kept on repeating *ad nauseum* — and they seem to be doing it again this year — in spite of the evidence, that the Interim Committee was designed to circumvent the Security Council. I confess that I detected a slight note of sadness in the statement of the representative