

of Articles 5, 6 and 19; that, under the Rules of Procedure, the powers of the Credentials Committee were limited to examining whether credentials submitted to it were authentic, i.e. signed by the head of state or foreign minister of a member state; and, accordingly, that suspending a member by rejecting the credentials of its representatives constituted a violation of the Charter and of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly.

The opponents of the universality principle included, almost without exception, the African, Asian, Eastern European and Caribbean states. They argued that, while universality was an important principle, it should not override other principles embodied in the Charter; that in Article 6 the Charter provided a mechanism for the expulsion of a member that had persistently violated the principles contained in the Charter; and that the continued presence of a member state that persistently defied the organization and showed contempt for its principles eroded the credibility of the United Nations. Some contended that the prerogative of the Security Council should be examined closely and perhaps redefined if its permanent members misused their powers by preventing the adoption of concrete measures on matters of concern to a great majority of the members of the organization.

Since the opponents of universality commanded the required majority, they could obtain a *de facto* suspension of a member state from the Assembly session. Their voting power does not change the fact, however, that, in the long run, the United Nations cannot survive if it begins to evaluate the right of states to participate on the basis of their policies and practices or on the degree of representativeness of their governments. The particular concern of many countries here was for Israel, the other member that might become the target of similar attack in the foreseeable future. (In fact, attempts at the General Assembly in 1975 to reject the credentials of the Israeli delegation, and to suspend the Spanish delegation, were easily defeated.) A decision by the General Assembly to suspend or otherwise limit the participation of Israel in the organization would have disastrous effects on public support for the United Nations in Canada,