

other party, this being followed by other pleadings, written and oral. A number of arbitration conventions involving my country provide for such a procedure under which both parties in the arbitration exchange an initial statement of facts and supporting evidence, followed by a second pleading in the form of an answer to the other party's statement with any additional evidence relied upon. Consequently we believe that a similar provision in the final draft should be made for disputes to be handled in this manner, if the parties so desire.

On the question of the revision or annulment of the award, my delegation considers that the nature of an international arbitration might frequently render it desirable that the award should be final and binding and not be open to revision or annulment even on the part of the International Court of Justice. In other words, there may be disputes where the advantages of finality of the award outweigh advantages to be gained by the possibility of revision or annulment. Consequently, for these reasons, it may be desirable to permit the parties to an arbitration undertaking to agree on an alternative procedure, if they so desire, in respect to revision or annulment of the award.

In conclusion... the Canadian Delegation takes the position that the draft articles on arbitral procedure which we are now considering require further study by the widest group of states before they are made the subject of a convention which might be applied on a bilateral or multilateral basis. As yet most governments have not had sufficient time to study the latest revision of these articles by the International Law Commission. Moreover, the observations by different delegations in this debate make it clear to us that it would be most undesirable and premature to open this convention for signature and ratification at the present time. We think that governments should at least be given the opportunity to make further comments in view of the considerable revision that has been made since they last commented, and particularly in the light of the observations made by member governments during the course of this debate. The new articles now have wide implication in the whole sphere of international arbitration and contain innovations which, desirable as many of them appear to be, require further consideration by governments.

It is for these reasons, ... that my delegation was pleased to join the other co-sponsors in the new revised resolution which will give member states the opportunity to study the latest revisions of the draft articles in the light of the record of the present debate because we consider that these observations will be most useful to governments and enable them to formulate more definitive and concrete views which, for lack of time or sufficient information, they may not have been able to do up to the present. The revised resolution will ask governments to submit comments before January 1, 1955. We consider this date to be more realistic than July 1, 1954 and will give governments adequate time to formulate constructive comments which they might feel they could not have done, if comments had to be in July 1, 1954. The revised resolution will also ask the