

## CANADA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

### PALESTINE

Before the end of the first Palestine truce on July 9, the Security Council attempted to bring about an extension of the armistice. The Jews agreed to the proposal in principle; the Arabs, however, were not prepared to accept a prolongation of the truce under existing terms. Consequently fighting again broke out in Palestine.

A United States resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire within three days of its adoption, and providing that failure by either side to comply would constitute a breach of the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter and require consideration by the Security Council with a view to using diplomatic, economic or even military sanctions, was adopted on July 15 by a vote of seven to one with three abstentions. The resolution further provided that the original truce terms would remain in force until a final political solution was reached.

Canada gave full support to the resolution, the strongest in the Council's history. General A.G.L. McNaughton, Canada's representative on the Council, said the Council had no alternative but to employ "imperatives" under the circumstances. Canada fully recognized the gravity of this step but considered that hostilities had to be ended in order that efforts toward a lasting settlement could be resumed. A Canadian proposal to allow the Mediator to postpone the cease-fire's three-day limit if necessary was defeated. On previous proposals for the use of force if necessary, Canada had taken the stand that all efforts at negotiation should be exhausted before force was resorted to.

A Syrian resolution requesting the International Court of Justice for an advisory legal opinion as to the

international status of Palestine after the end of the British mandate on May 15 was rejected by a vote of six to one (Ukraine) with four abstentions (Canada, France, U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.). Canada opposed the resolution on the grounds that to open the general question of the legal basis upon which the United Nations was acting seemed "neither necessary nor desirable" and would "inevitably hinder and postpone the negotiations for peaceful settlement". The Canadian delegate suggested, however, that during the negotiations "specific" legal questions might arise on which the Court might rule.

### INTERIM COMMITTEE

The Interim Committee met during July to discuss three sub-committee reports: on voting procedure in the Security Council, on the study of methods for the promotion of international co-operation in the political field, and on the advisability of establishing a permanent committee. (As set up by the General Assembly last year, the Interim Committee was to function for a trial period of one year.)

In preparing its report on voting procedure, the sub-committee (of which Canada was a member) considered an exhaustive list of the possible decisions which the Security Council might have to take on the basis of each article of the Charter. It then indicated which decisions might be regarded as procedural (decided by a straight majority vote), and which, even though substantive (and therefore subject to the veto under present rules) should be decided by a vote of any seven members of the Council. Speaking in support of the report, the Canadian representative said that Canada's position should not be taken to indicate any modification of its desire "for a

more radical solution" to the problem of voting procedure or of its discontent over the way the veto had been misused. The present recommendations were regarded by Canada merely as a first step in a gradual approach to the whole problem of voting procedure. Until the underlying problem of lack of unanimity among the Big Five was solved, voting difficulties could not be settled merely by constitutional reform. Canada consequently did not support an Argentine resolution to ask the General Assembly to consider calling a general conference (as provided under Article 109 of the Charter) to review the Charter. The proposal, however, was adopted by a vote of 19 to 7 with ten abstentions.

The second report considered by the Interim Committee dealt with the promotion of international co-operation in the political field and, more specifically, with the peaceful settlement of disputes. Among the recommendations brought forward by the sub-committee and unanimously approved by the Interim Committee were the restoration to full effect of the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of Disputes of 1928, the creation of a panel of conciliators and changes in Security Council and General Assembly rules of procedure relating to the performance of conciliation functions by a rapporteur or a conciliator. The Canadian delegate commended the sub-committee for its report and said that it represented a "very promising beginning" in the study of international political co-operation.

When the question of recommending that the Interim Committee be made permanent was discussed, the Canadian representative voted with the majority and said the Committee had done useful work and urged that the experiment be carried