

## STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 55/45

### ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

Statement by the Chairman of the Canadian Delegation to the United Nations, and Minister of National Health and Welfare, Mr. Paul Martin, made in the Ad Hoc Committee, December 1, 1955.

My country is honoured and proud to be associated with 27 other nations in advocating a constructive and positive move designed to strengthen the United Nations. I need only list these countries to suggest how broad, how widely representative is the movement supporting our proposal. We have with us as sponsors, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Yemen and Yugoslavia. And as I introduce the Draft Resolution which we have sponsored together with these 27 other countries, I have a feeling which I am sure will be shared by many other members of this Committee, that this may indeed be for this organization an historic occasion. For the opportunity is now given to us to solve the basic constitutional question relating to the admission of new members.

Our record over the last few years in dealing with this matter has been one of failure and undoubtedly this has reflected on the prestige of the organization. The effectiveness of the United Nations as an instrument of international co-operation and as a world forum is directly involved in the solution of the new members problem. It is now our strong belief that we can break the deadlock; we will then have accomplished in the course of this session a significant move in the field of international relations. The opportunity is ours if we will act reasonably now.

The conditions for admission of new members are clearly set out in the Charter both as to substance and as to procedure. But, as we survey the past proceedings and the controversies over this issue, it becomes clear that the problem facing the organization in this matter is not strictly of a legal, constitutional or procedural but of a political nature, and that, in this as in many other fields, the only possibility of breaking the deadlock is through the acceptance of a compromise.

At first, as it will be recalled, we argued over the interpretation of Article 4 of the Charter. At the very first session, for instance, there were long discussions whether the question of diplomatic relations with a candidate for admission should be considered in dealing with its application. Later, at the second session, we sought an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice whether the admission of an applicant could be conditional upon the admission of other applicants. At the same time, efforts were made to persuade the permanent members of the Council not to exercise their right of veto and procedural amendments were adopted in the hope that this might facilitate the solution of the problem.

Legal and procedural solutions having failed, more drastic constitutional steps were then envisaged. It was suggested, for example, that the principle of universality should be formally adopted. In 1949, at the fourth session, consideration was given to the possibility of effecting the admission of new members by a decision of the Assembly when the Security Council had not made a recommendation either because the application had not obtained the required majority of votes or because a permanent member had exercised its veto. Only a few members had then been admitted and the number of applicants was steadily increasing.

By 1950, only nine countries had been admitted out of twenty-three applicants. There was a deadlock over the so-called "package-deal" solution but in many countries support for the principle of universality was growing.

In the course of the following years, proposals of one kind or another continued to be rejected and, in time, emphasis came to be placed on negotiation. We have had to recognize that action was paralyzed by the veto and that other avenues of progress would have to be explored. Studies were undertaken, for instance, in the Special Committee on the Admission of New Members which met from March to June 1953. This was followed later in the year by the appointment of a three-member Committee of Good Offices empowered to consult with members of the Security Council and to report back to the General Assembly. It gives me great pleasure to recognize that this Committee and, in particular, its distinguished Chairman, Mr. Belaunde of Peru, has played no small part in bringing about a more realistic appreciation of the kind of approach which has to be adopted if a way out of the impasse is to be found.

And I may say by way of digression that I welcome his statement, this interpretation of support of the Resolution which is now on our table. And I may say that at least one other member of the Good Offices Committee has indicated to me, as have so many members of this Committee who are not sponsors, their intention to support the Resolution.

More and more, support of as broad a membership as possible in our organization has increased. The powers represented at the Bandung Conference have recorded in no uncertain terms their own position regarding universality of membership. At San Francisco, speaker after speaker

pointed out that to play its full part in improving the international situation, our organization had to be more nearly universal and a solution to the problem of new members had to be found urgently. There is no doubt that all those who believe in our organization, and who are willing to work for the achievement of its objectives, are convinced that its stature and effectiveness are impaired as long as the membership issue has not been solved.

I do not propose at this time to attempt to apportion the blame. We ourselves have not always looked at this question in the same way. I am more concerned with the immediate prospect which is presented by the proposal embodied in our draft resolution, a proposal which in our view reconciles the constitutional requirements of the Charter and the practical exigencies of the political situation.

We have now presented, we hope, a workable solution to the membership problem. We believe that a large majority of the members of this Assembly will share our view that, in the interests of the organization and to achieve the objectives we had in mind when it was set up, we should accept a practical solution within the framework of the provisions of the Charter which will result in a substantial addition to our membership. If we can persuade the members of the Security Council that the course we suggest is wise, if we can impress upon all concerned through strong endorsement of the proposal which is now before us, that we are determined that no further delays should be entertained, for the first time we shall have achieved in our organization the representation of all the broad areas of the world.

The proposal which Canada is now putting forward in association with other members has not been advanced lightly. It is not a proposal which we have always favoured but one which we have come to support slowly and deliberately after prolonged study of its implications and consequences and after careful probing of our conscience. We have sought to find other ways out of the dilemma presented by the problem of new members but we have, in the course of time, rejected them all as impractical or as involving consequences less in the interests of the United Nations. For this reason, at San Francisco last June, my colleague, Mr. Pearson, called for action on the waiting list of applicants, convinced that the time had come when we should accept all the applications for membership which are now before the United Nations.

We have, however, delayed taking any initiative in this matter because from the outset, we have been mindful of the fact that in the admission of new members the Charter lays a joint responsibility of the Security Council and of the Assembly. It was our hope that the Security Council would have found it possible to deal with this problem long before now but we have come to the conclusion that we should not allow another session to pass without taking action which seems to us necessary in the Assembly. And unless I am mistaken, many other members of the Assembly share the view of my delegation both as to the urgency of dealing with the issue and the desirability of recording our respective positions in this field.

It is desirable that the views of one of the two organs of the United Nations which are concerned with the admission of new members should be clarified fully at this juncture so that the members of the other body concerned may appreciate our position in reaching their own conclusions.

We are not asking the agreement of the other members of this organization to a proposal which is without difficulties. There are reasons why we should have preferred not to take this course but in this imperfect world it is often unwise to refuse to take any action unless that action is open to no possible objection or criticism from any standpoint. It seems to us that the course we recommend is best, on balance. To delay longer would be to perpetuate injustices. We doubt the wisdom of such an alternative.

After long consideration it has seemed to us that the worse course would be to allow a considerable number of countries to languish in frustration outside the United Nations. Most of the applicants are countries with much to contribute to or gain from our organization. They are in many cases countries with ancient traditions and great cultures. Some are countries with governments newly instituted which are anxious to establish their international relations within the order framework of the United Nations as the organ of the community of nations.

In particular, and I mention this as an example, I have in mind the case of Italy, a country which culturally has been one of the main creative forces within our Western civilization and one which, for instance, in the field of law, for thousands of years literally has made a constant and inspiring contribution. It is hardly conceivable that our organization should continue any longer to operate without being able to list among its members a country like Italy which is one of the recognized founders of the very family of nations of which this organization seeks to be the expression.

Some applicants are controlled by regimes or are following policies which we do not like. Some dwell in such isolation and obscurity that we know little about them. This is far from a satisfactory situation but the question remains whether admission of these members will on the whole make it better or worse. We think that the edge is more likely to be taken off intolerance and misapprehension with the United Nations than in barren isolation.

We do not agree with the tendency to look upon admission to membership in the United Nations, or for that matter, upon recognition of states as the conferring of a favour and to forget that it is also in some respects the performance of an international duty and the imposing of a discipline. Admission to membership means the bringing of countries under the obligations of our organization and these are obligations which go far beyond those which are normally incumbent on members of the international community under the law of nations. We may disapprove of the regime or of the policy of some of the applicants but are they not likely to become more acceptable members of the world community as part of this

organization, when they are committed to its purposes and subjected to its rules. There is an obligation upon members of this organization to behave in accordance with definite principles and to observe insofar as possible the decisions of its various bodies. While no member could pretend that his record has been impeccable -- and I am certainly not suggesting that ours is and certainly the record of some have left much to be desired -- the noble principles of the Charter remain for all of us, to a greater or less extent, standards by which to measure ourselves. They are not yet fully attained but they inspire our conduct and we can say that being accountable to this great organization has had a beneficial effect on our behaviour. The same is bound to happen to these countries which are now outside, when they subscribe to principles and join an organization which we strongly support.

We are all, of course, deeply concerned to preserve and to respect the principles of the Charter. We are convinced that the action we propose here does no violence to these principles. The Charter is not a law with a precise interpretation for every article. It is a document which has to be interpreted with understanding and with moderation. Being the product of many different civilizations and schools of thought, it would be presumptuous for any of us to insist upon interpretations which would be inevitable only in terms of our own education and concepts. This is no plea for taking a light or expedient view of the Charter but a request that we should recognize that there may be legitimate differences in its interpretation.

Let us face frankly the principal concern of those who fear, for instance, that the admission of some of these states would be contrary to the terms of Article 4 (1). Can we say that these states are "peace-loving", an essential requirement for membership? How can we interpret exactly the meaning of this term "peace-loving"? It does certainly not mean "pacifist", because virtually all member states, including my own, maintain armed forces and believe that we must be prepared to fight if necessary to defend our principles and our way of life. Perhaps it is easier to understand this term if we contrast it with its antonym, which would presumably be "war-loving". We have known war-loving states in the past. The United Nations was itself founded in the association of countries fighting together against states controlled at that time by men who loved and glorified war for its own sake. There remain perhaps some individuals in the world who share this degenerate attitude to war, but I doubt if there is any state in the world today which now does so as a national policy. This is the age of the hydrogen bomb. To me it is inconceivable that states, whatever they may consider their national interests to be, should not now live in horror of war. It remains true that there are states - and I do not exclude some of the present applicants for membership - whose policies, if not altered but pursued in the extreme, could provoke war, but I am prepared to believe that they are not seeking war as an objective or instrument of national policy and that they would in fact go to considerable lengths to avoid it. This it seems to me rather than compliance with certain subjective structural or policy tests, should be the criterion to be applied in relation to Article 4(1).

Some objections have been made to the admission of certain applicants on the grounds that they might not fully qualify as states and that they might not be able to carry out their obligations as members of the Organization. We are entering here a field where there is bound to be controversy. Unless there is willingness to compromise to take a moderate view, again the prospects of progress are likely to be jeopardized indefinitely. For our part, we consider that new candidates should not be required to meet stricter standards than those which have been applied in the past in dealing with this problem.

I submit that we must interpret the Charter in a spirit which is compatible with the Organization as it exists and as it has developed since its foundation. The United Nations is not and it never has been the preserve of countries all of whom are inclined to give similar interpretations to Article 4(1) or any other. We could of course have formed a United Nations of this kind with membership exclusive to those who see alike on most things. When we rejected such a conception of the United Nations we accepted by implication a broad interpretation of the terms of the Charter.

In the view of my Delegation there has never been any doubt as to the infinitely greater value of a United Nations which embraces all the major traditions and contemporary philosophies of government than of one confined to those who are unlikely to quarrel with each other over anything serious. Having accepted this view as one more likely to bring about peace and harmony in the world, we are obliged, I think, to accept its implications. One of those implications is that we ought not to use the Charter to bar from membership countries whose policies and points of view resemble closely those of other states which are Charter members.

It is by the principle of ensuring the broad representative character of the United Nations that we have justified the position taken in our draft resolution. It may be thought that this is a principle which is contrary to the strict letter of the Charter. If one accepts, however, the argument that I have put forward above, I do not think that there is a contradiction involved. My argument is that the principles of the Charter must be interpreted in the light of the intended world-wide nature of our membership. If the United Nations were confined entirely to peoples of one tradition, then we might be justified in a more limited interpretation of Article 4. Given the fact, however, that it includes members of many different traditions, that it is in a sense, therefore, virtually universal, we must understand its provisions in those terms.

Members of the committee will have noted that the draft resolution refers to the pending application for membership of all those countries about which no problem of unification arises. It will be understood that the resolution refers to unification for purposes of membership in the U.N. only, and that it is not intended to exclude from membership, now or later, applicants which have problems of this nature in other contexts.

It will be obvious also, as we indicated in our statement in the general debate, before Spain submitted her application, that in submitting our resolution we had in mind that the Security Council should consider the other 17, and now as a result of the Spanish application, the 18 other outstanding applicants. In our view, the admission of 18 new members remains the target. For our part, we are prepared to receive favourably all the recommendations which will be made by the Security Council.

Our support of the draft resolution is based on a philosophy of the United Nations as we see it, a United Nations which is as near universal as possible. We are aware of the fact that the expansion of the United Nations will introduce more voices, perhaps in some cases discordant voices, into a community where there is already much discord. We realize that by bringing in these members we may be swelling the opposition occasionally to measures which we shall undoubtedly be supporting. Unquestionably it would be easier to sit back and prolong the present situation indefinitely out of fear of unknown consequences but in our view to do so would be a sterile attempt to preserve a restricted arrangement which is bound to be swept away sooner or later. We cannot ignore the nature of the world as it exists. If the United Nations is to survive and if it is to play the great role intended for it, then it must reflect the real world, not a partial world of our contriving. We see no reason to face an expanded and almost universal United Nations with timidity, to think only of the disadvantages and to forget the enormous opportunities. Those few men who during the days of World War II determined to set into being the United Nations were not influenced by timidity. They recognized the advantages as well as the disadvantages but they projected their ideas forward and gave us the direction which made possible for the second time a potent, collective security organization designed to maintain the peace of the world.

The problem as we all know is urgent. Our Draft Resolution suggests a compromise arrangement which we believe to be compatible with the provisions of the Charter. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, we are faced with the unique opportunity of completing the task we undertook at San Francisco in 1945. If we approach the task in the spirit of understanding and moderation and necessary compromise which inspired our course ten years ago, I am sure that we shall succeed again.

So, I wish to make an appeal, which I do, I hope, responsibly and understandingly, to the members of the Security Council; those members of the Council with whom I have been in close contact during the last arduous weeks deserve credit for what I consider an understanding attitude in a matter which is of such importance to the United Nations and to the world. When they next deal with this matter, I am sure that they will bear in mind the widespread desire within this organization and outside, to see the United Nations develop into the representative organ which its founders envisaged and I wish to urge all members of the United Nations not to allow divergencies of interpretation and disputes over detail or extraneous issues to stunt the expansion of our organization and to prevent it from achieving at last its intended and natural world-wide character.

At the outset, I said that this could be a historical occasion. No one will deny that it is an important event. For some time now my colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L.B. Pearson, has shared with so many others a deep desire to extend the membership of the United Nations in which he and the Government of which he is so distinguished a member, have such great faith and I am sure that I can go beyond the government and speak for the parliament of my country. It would be a matter of the greatest regret, and not without deep significance, if the efforts to break the deadlock on the membership issue did not succeed. The United Nations is not free of imperfections. Its record is not one of absolute achievement. Its record, however, is good and its future parallels the concerns and the interests of all nations. It is because of these things that in proposing this resolution on behalf of all the sponsoring nations, the Canadian Delegation is firm in the view that our efforts on behalf of new members will not fail, that, as a result, our efforts in the first year of the second decade of this organization will be marked by an event second only to the foundation of the United Nations.

---

S/C