

In ordinary circumstances, it would be expected that the question of adequate representation on the Councils would be dealt with as part and parcel of a general review of the Charter. This is an undertaking of the utmost importance. Canada would have preferred that expansion of the Councils should take place in that context. In a general review, all implications of one change would, and could, receive thorough consideration and the consequences drawn in other sections and articles before the change was effected. Obviously, the membership of the Councils is but one facet of the Charter review made desirable by the profound changes which have taken place in the world, and the additional heavy responsibilities which the organization has assumed since San Francisco. Any change will have important effects on the other facets, and it would be preferable if the carefully-balanced construction which the framers of the Charter sought to erect was to be looked at in its entirety and not piecemeal.

As my Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson, said in his speech in plenary on September 19, on the assumption that we must make, that we, and I quote, "want the United Nations to be an effective international instrument for practical and positive action in carrying out United Nations decisions, a comprehensive reappraisal should be made of certain basic questions of function and organization which have been pushed into the background of our thinking because of recurring tension in international relations leading to the fear that the questions themselves may contain the seeds of possible further friction". And later, he said: "To be fully effective, United Nations machinery and organization should adequately reflect the present membership, without giving undue weight to any single factor, whether it be military or industrial strength, population or financial contribution, politics or race or geography."

However, it seems clear from the report submitted by the Committee on arrangements for a conference for the purpose of reviewing the Charter - Document A/5487 of September 4, 1963 - that a majority of member states believe that international circumstances at the present time are not propitious for the holding of a general conference to review the Charter under Article 109 of the Charter. This would seem to indicate that we cannot expect a general review of the Charter in the immediate future and that we must therefore deal with the matter before us on an ad hoc basis by enlarging the Councils through an amendment to the Charter under Article 108. As I indicated earlier, ...this is the only equitable solution. Nevertheless, it is earnestly to be desired that Charter review will not be unduly delayed. The changes now contemplated in adjusting the composition of the Councils would, in this perspective, be regarded as ad hoc and interim arrangements, which the whole membership of the United Nations may wish to review in the not too distant future, when the Charter is reviewed as a whole.

Whatever the arrangements contemplated, I should like to make it clear that my Delegation could not accept that the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1946 should be regarded as having been overtaken by events and be scrapped without the concurrence of the parties to that Agreement. The Gentlemen's Agreement is still valid, and cannot be modified without the concurrence of the parties to it. As a member of the Commonwealth, Canada is not prepared to give this concurrence, and surrender its claim to representation on the Security Council. Could the Eastern European group, whose seat was considered as counterbalancing the Commonwealth seat under the Gentlemen's Agreement? And would the Latin American group, the Western European group, or even the Middle Eastern group?

New seats must be provided to accommodate the new members and to give them the representation, the equitable representation, to which they are entitled. The urgency of doing this has already been demonstrated by the "liberties", if I may use that expression, which have been taken in recent times with the agreed allocation of seats. If I understood the Soviet representative correctly in his statement on Tuesday, it was to these "liberties" that he objected. He did not contemplate the disappearance of the East European seat. In fact, he wanted a full one, all the time, for a group whose numbers are in a mathematical ratio not fully sufficient to warrant it. And, in the General Committee, again, he was providing for a Vice-President every year, for a Chairmanship every year, and for a rotation of the Presidency purely on a group basis, irrespective of whether a group was of eight or 16 or even 32.