

Mr. Charles Stein, the Canadian Representative in the Sixth Committee, expressed Canada's position in these words:

We believe that the question of possibility cannot but be considered in relation to the usefulness of a definition. We are still doubtful whether any definition could really be helpful to the competent agencies of the U.N. . . . indeed some definitions might well constitute an obstacle to them . . . We feel, in fact, that any definition would fail to achieve its proper purpose unless it safeguarded the present broad discretion of the Security Council and the General Assembly to assess and decide upon all the factual elements of the case.

As to the scope of the definition, the Canadian Representative was opposed to branding automatically certain acts as aggression. In conclusion, Mr. Stein added that Canada "is not opposed to a definition which would appear likely to be agreed upon by the General Assembly and the Security Council, including the permanent members of the Council, which would not be at variance with the existing scheme of the Charter and which would meet the other texts (I have) outlined".

After nearly five weeks of discussion, the Sixth Committee on November 9, by a vote of 33 in favour and 3 against with 14 abstentions, including Canada, approved a resolution to set up a second special committee, which is directed to meet in 1956 and to submit to the eleventh session of the General Assembly "a detailed report followed by a draft definition of aggression having regard to the ideas expressed at the ninth session of the General Assembly and to the draft resolutions and amendments submitted". An earlier proposal to set up a working group was rejected by 19 votes in favour and 22 against.

Admission of New Members

The agenda item on Admission of New Members at the ninth session was discussed in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. Although a number of proposals were considered and two resolutions eventually were adopted by the Committee, little progress in breaking the deadlock on new members was achieved.

Responsibility for recommending admissions of new members rests with the Security Council. The continuing failure of the Council to approve any of the twenty-one outstanding applications has resulted in the General Assembly becoming increasingly concerned with the problem. At its eighth session, the General Assembly established a three-member Committee of Good Offices to consult with members of the Security Council and report to the General Assembly. The Committee, consisting of representatives of Peru, Egypt and the Netherlands, was forced to report to the ninth session that it had been unable to obtain from members of the Security Council any indications of changes of attitude on their part on outstanding applications.

In addition to considering the report of the Committee of Good Offices when it began its deliberations on the new members question, the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had before it a draft resolution sponsored by Australia suggesting that the Security Council should give renewed consideration to the applications of Laos and Cambodia in view of the favourable references to recognition of their sovereignty and independence made in the final declaration of the Geneva Conference.