

Page 3.

states of the United Nations have been asked on several occasions in the past to submit to the Secretary-General whatever comments they might wish to make on the question of defining aggression. Few (indeed I believe only some 25 in all) have actually done so.

Canada was not persuaded by the arguments advanced in the General Committee that this item should be discussed entirely either in the First Committee or in Plenary. It is our firm opinion that this is not the sort of subject which can be furthered by being debated in a predominantly political context. Those who have read the reports of the Fourth Session of the Committee established under the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1181(XII) which were published in A/AC.91/Series, as SR's 23 to 28 inclusive, will certainly have to agree with the Representative of Ecuador on that Committee, who during the 25th meeting on April 11 of this year pointed out that this whole subject has been "made an arena for cold war polemics". I very much regret that the same thing has occurred during the course of this present debate. My delegation is of the opinion that if any success in reaching general agreement on a definition is to be achieved this will probably not be possible except as a result of the most careful non-political deliberations of an essentially legal nature.

Before I conclude, Mr. President, I would like to refer to the specific proposal made by the USSR as part of Document A/6833 of September 22 for the establishment of yet another special committee - a special committee whose task it would be to draw up a draft definition of aggression to be submitted to the 23rd Session of the United Nations General Assembly. Our views on this aspect of matter are rather like those expressed by, I believe, the Distinguished Permanent Representative of Bulgaria, when he was speaking in the First Committee on the Maltese Item on November 15, and there argued against "a hasty and unjustifiable proliferation of Committees". Canada believes that to establish at this juncture another committee charged specifically with defining aggression is not desirable. It is our view - a view expressed by the Canadian Representative on April 7, 1965, during the Third Session of the Committee established under the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1181(XII) that there exists a very close relationship between the search for an agreed legal definition of aggression and the work of the Special Committee on Friendly Relations, particularly as that work relates to a continuing consideration by the Special Committee of two Charter principles of the threat or use of force and non-intervention. It is our opinion that there are certain fundamental legal considerations common to all three concepts: those of aggression; threat or use of force; and non-intervention. We, therefore, consider that no separate attempt to define aggression as it were in vacuo ought to be made. We believe instead that if a further attempt is to be made to reach agreement on a definition of aggression that definition ought preferably to come subsequent to conclusion of

... 4