

Similarly ... we were able to support the resolution submitted by twelve delegations representing nations in Africa and Asia. We were not unmindful of the cogency of the arguments that this twelve-power proposal in some substantial respects duplicated the provisions of the El Salvador resolution already adopted. On the other hand ... we recognized that the principal purpose of enlarging the Councils was to provide for more adequate representation for the new member countries. My Delegation was, therefore, inclined to support the measures sponsored by the twelve members from Asia and Africa - since this resolution in no way conflicted with the El Salvador proposal, and could have been regarded as a testimonial to the sincerity with which its authors are pursuing the objective of contributing more fully to the operations and activities of the United Nations. Considering that there was a substantial divergency of opinion in the Committee on the merits of the texts of each of the resolutions presented, we thought there was some virtue in accepting both, which, considered together, faithfully reflected the general consensus in the Committee - and I believe in the Assembly - that the membership of the two Councils should be enlarged and that the Assembly should go on endeavouring to find ways and means of enlarging them.

...We have before us an amendment to the draft resolution that brings together in closer proximity the divergent views of the proponents of the proposals referred to. We congratulate the respective sponsoring delegates in that they were able to reconcile their differences in presenting what would appear to be an acceptable compromise. As we have already registered our one reservation with respect to the advisability of establishing a committee to achieve such an important objective, it is unnecessary for us to make any other comment on the amendment itself. The Canadian Delegation is prepared to support any reasonable resolution that will produce a small increase in the two Councils, but we would oppose a large expansion of the Councils, as we feel this would be such an important step that its consideration must await the expected general review and revision of the United Nations Charter.

I ask your indulgence ... to add a word in regard to the third of the three items grouped together on our present agenda - the question of increasing the number of judges in the International Court of Justice. Although it appears in neither of the resolutions before us, there was some advocacy, at the Committee stage, for this proposal. I can only say ... that, if such a proposal had been formally presented, my Delegation would have opposed it. We should have done so for the same reasons put forward by many delegates speaking on this proposal in the Special Political Committee. It is necessary for me now merely to mention them. The first is that the membership of the International Court of Justice under its Charter is based upon wholly different principles from those which determine the membership of the Councils. These two principles - the adequate representation of the different forms of civilization and the principal legal systems of the world, and (secondly) the high personal qualifications of the individual judges - are quite capable of being carried out under existing arrangements. Our second reason for opposing the expansion of the Court is that in our view it is large enough now for its efficient operation. To increase it would, in the opinion of my Delegation, hinder rather than assist it in its performance.

As to the amended resolution now before us, I repeat ... that my Delegation will take pleasure in supporting it.

