Statement by Dr. John Stewart, M.P.,
Acting Chairman of the Canadian Delegation,
in the Plenary Session of the General Assembly,
December 5, 1963.

...Canada has a deep and continuing interest in the work which has
and is being done to further the cause of human rights throughout
. This interest has been heightened by our membership on the
rights Commission; and we attach very great importance to its work.
reason, I should like to explain why Canada voted against the
on which has just been adopted by this Assembly.

The United Nations, in dealing with the many problems which require
tion, must operate within the limits of the resources of people, time
y at its disposal. In order to do this, this organization must
an effective priorities and abide by them. Failure to do this will only
the effectiveness and productivity of our efforts. The General Assembly
to give priority in 1964 to the World Conference on Trade and Develop-
This conference will greatly increase the tasks of the already overburdened
t in preparing the massive documentation required. Moreover, the
on of staff for conferences has become a crucial problem. Consequently,
etary-General considered that the number of meetings in 1964 should be
a minimum.

The Conference on Trade and Development will require the conference
s available in Geneva for an extended period of time. Additional
ve been presented by the proposed alterations at headquarters here.
will reduce considerably the facilities available for meetings and place
ased load on those in Geneva. For these reasons the Secretary-General
whether the Functional Commissions might not cancel their meetings in 1964.
l and Social Council took into account the views of the Secretary-
d adopted a calendar of conferences for 1964, which did not include a
of the Human Rights Commission.

Canada has consistently supported the Secretary-General in his attempt
ce the number of meetings in 1964, and we have endorsed the calendar of
nces which the Economic and Social Council adopted. We do not consider
e situation which caused the Secretary-General to make his appeal has
. In fact, when the Third Committee was considering this issue, the
ary-General, in Document A/C.3/L.1144, reiterated his hope that the
ber of conferences approved by the Economic and Social Council would be
ained.

We understand the desire of some delegations to have a draft convention
ial discrimination ready for consideration by the nineteenth session of this
y. In order to have this convention prepared, the Economic and Social
has now been asked to reverse its decision regarding a 1964 meeting of the
ights Commission. In our view, this decision was taken without paying
ent regard to the broader considerations which led the Secretary-General to
s proposal and the Economic and Social Council to approve it. We believe
the inevitable consequences will be to affect adversely the operations of the
d Nations in other areas, which are equally important to the needs and
ations of all of us, but particularly of the less-developed countries. It is
ese reasons...that we have voted against this resolution.