

CANADIAN DELEGATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY SEVENTEENTH SESSION

RELEASE ON DELIVERY

PRESS RELEASE NO. November 28, 1962. PRESS OFFICE 750 Third Avenue, YUkon 6-5740.

16

STATEMENT BY MR. N.N. GENSER, CANADIAN DELEGATE ON THE SIXTH COMMITTEE, NOVEMBER 28, 1962.

Mr. Chalrman,

I should like to apologize for taking the time of the Committee to speak twice on this item, but a number of points have been raised since my earlier statement concerning the resolution of which my Delegation has the honour to be a co-sponsor, and I should like to comment very briefly on these points.

May I begin by expressing the pleasure of the co-sponsors of Draft Resolution L.507 at the response which it has received in this Committee. If I have understood correctly the statements which have been made, the majority have expressed their concurrence with It and not one delegation has criticized it substantivery. Moreover, it has been our feeling that the level of debate in this Committee, both with respect to our resolution and the others which have been tabled, has been conducted on a very high plane and that, if I may refer for a moment to the hope expressed in my opening statement, we have indeed been able to "avoid contentious political issues as much as possible, while not ignoring political realities" and have approached this topic "as lawyers seeking workable solutions to problems." Such criticisms as have been made of Resolution L.507 ave, the co-sponsors feel, been offered in a constructive spirit, nd it is in this same spirit that I should like to attempt to clarify certain points which have been raised concerning it.

I have in mind principally the comment made by several speakers that Resolution L.507 is "too narrow".

and the control of th

the state of the s

and the second of the second o

The implication seems to be that it is essentially a procedural resolution, proposing only two items for study, and that something more should be expected of the Sixth Committee on this item. It is the view of the co-sponsors of Draft Resolution L.507, however, that it is much more than a procedural resolution, and I should like, if I may, to explain why.

Many delegations have spoken with approval of the preambular paragraphs of the resolution, and I do not consider it necessary to recapitulate the thinking behind the principles and purposes embodied in the preamble. I should, however, like to draw particular attention to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. This paragraph makes a clear affirmation that "The rule of law is essential for the achievement of the purposes of the United Nations, particularly the development of friendly relations and co-operation among states based on respect for the principles set forth in the Charter of Equal Rights and of the sovereign equality of all member states". Such an affirmation as the first and most important operative paragraph in the resolution can hardly be termed "too narrow". It is, I would suggest, of itself of sufficient important almost to justify the passage of the resolution. Such an affirmation by the General Assembly is not me ely timely and appropriate, it is, in the view of the co-sponsors, of paramount importance. Drawing attention, as it does, to the need for the nations of the world to turn to the rule of law as the path of peace, it represents something which we, as lawyers representing our respective governments in this legal committee, might well take home with some price.

Certainly this long overdue affirmation is one which none of us can in conscience oppose. Rather, it should merit cur full support, since it could conceivably represent the beginning of a new approach to international affairs, It is, I would suggest, our duty as lawyers to attempt to provide the initial impetus for such a development. If I may advert to the statement of the distinguished representative of Turkey, law was not given its proper pre-eminent place in the thinking behind the Charter of the United Nations, and it is incumbent upon the Legal Committee of the United Nations to attempt to rectify this situation. As one distinguished representative said, "Power without law is madness". Many delegations including those of Austria, Algeria, Chile, Great Britain, Greece, Iran, Ireland, Mali, Sweden and the United States have spoken in support of the concept of the rule of law amongst nations. Let us emphasize this concept in any resolution which we pass.

Turning to the second operative paragraph of Resolution

L.507, this paragraph makes a clear-cut affirmation that, "The

Charter is the fundamental statement of principles of international

law governing friendly relations and co-operation among states,

notably the obligation to respect the territorial integrity and

political independence of states and of the obligation to settle

disputes by peaceful means". Can this affirmation be described as

narrow? This is not a minor point to be made en passant, or found

buried in preambles which may or may not be consistent with such a

concept. Not one delegation has disagreed with the premise that the

Charter is the fundamental statement of principles of international

law governing friendly relations and co-operation among states.

On the contrary, nearly every delegation has stressed this point

in their statements on this item,

and the many statements making the very point stressed in operative paragraph 2 attest to its importance and its validity. This cardinal point is one which, in the view of the co-sponsors of L.507, should be affirmed clearly by the General Assembly.

The suggestion that a resolution containing affirmations as important as those contained in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of Draft Resolution L.507 is too narrow is not, with due respect, acceptable to the co-sponsors of L.507.

I should like to turn now to operative paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6 (?) of the resolution. These paragraphs might fairly be termed as essentially procedural. Even here, however, the co-sponsors of Resolution L.507 do not consider that the concrete action being proposed can fairly be described as "too narrow". Firstly, as has been made clear by the co-sponsors, the two topics proposed for study are not intended as the only two to be so studied. The way is clearly left open for discussion and study of further topics, and indeed further topics are welcomed. Moreover, we should not lose sight of the fact that the topics proposed as the first to be studied have been selected with some considerable care with a view to their importance to the newer nations of the world and their relevance to the item on the agenda. Each of the topics proposed is in itself a very broad one, and each lends itself to a serious and comprehensive study by this Committee. Taken together, these two

...

principles might indeed be described, as some have suggested, as the two most important principles underlying friendly relations and co-operation among states in accordance with the Charter. It is not, of course, necessary to go so far in deciding that they are worthy of serious study by the United Nations on a priority basis.

I hope my foregoing comments have to some extent dispelled the notion that Resclution L.507 is "a narrow one". There is, however, another matter which has been raised by some delegation on which there may be some misunderstanding, namely the nature of the topic of the obligation to settle disputes by peaceful means. It has been suggested, and rightly, that some of the co-sponsors see in this topic the possibility of broadening the acceptance of the International Court of Justice. This is, of course, one aspect of the general question of the peaceful settlement of disputes which could hardly be ruled out from any serious discussion of the general topic. I should like, if I may, however, to ruote again from the statement I made on the opening day of our debate on this item, in order to emphasize a point I then made:

"I should point out at this stage, however, that it is not the intention of the co-sponsors that the studies and discussion of the peaceful settlement of disputes be confined to the machinery of the international Court of Justice. On the contrary, it is our hope that we will be able to expand upon and further develop the procedures outlined in Article 33 of the Charter of negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort

****6

institution of the second of t

nin z

100

to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of the choice of member states of the United Nations.

It is our further hope and intention that the discussions of this question, which in our view has considerable substantive content, will not be confined to its procedural aspects."

It is clear from the statements made on this item that while many delegations share the views of my Government that the International Court should be permitted to play an increasingly important role in the peaceful settlement of disputes, other delegations prefer to stress other means of peaceful settlement of disputes. This would seem to be fully in accord with Article 33 of the Charter, which explicitly provides that the means of peaceful settlement are open to the choice of the member states of the United Nations. It could hardly be otherwise, when, as has been pointed out by many distinguished delegates, the United Nations is founded upon the principle of sovereign equality of nations. Some member states may prefer negotiation, some may prefer inquiry followed by negotiation, some may prefer mediation, some conciliation, others arbitration, still others judicial settlement, and others resort to regional agencies or arrangements. What is proposed by the co-sponsors of L.507, is that an examination be made of the whole complex of procedures open to member states to settle their disputes peacefully, with a view to enhancing and further developing these procedures, and, perhaps, of developing new ones, such as the fact-finding function often carried out by the United Nations, and as proposed by the distinguished representative of the Netherlands.

I wish to make it quite clear, however, so that there should be no doubt in anyone's mind on this issue, where the preference of my Government lies. I am not now speaking in my capacity as co-sponsor of Resolution L.507, and it may be that other co-sponsors and other supporters or potential supporters

1.1

BARRELL CALL The second of the second A STATE OF THE STA The state of the s A Section of the sect 1 10 m = 1 1 2 m = 20 12 m . . 7 5 9 8 1338 The first of the second or the care the second of the $a_{N} a_{N} a_{N} = a_{N} a_$ 也是《**墨**树的》(1917年),以及野乡的人,因为自己的自己的,他们就是这个人的人。

and the state of t

of L.507, may have different views. A brief analysis of the list of these countries which have accepted the Court's jurisdiction, and those which have not, suffices to show the diversity of views on this cuestion. Speaking, however, as the representative of my Government rather than in my capacity as co-sponsor of Resolution L.507, I should like to make clear that my Government attaches very great importance to the need to further develop and expand the process of judicial settlement of disputes between nations.

There is one further matter on which there may have been a certain amount of confusion, namely, the general cuestion of a compromise resolution. It will be recalled that in my opening statement I said, speaking on behalf of the co-sponsors of draft resolution L.507, that "we have not considered that our approach is the only one which can be followed on this topic. Our hope is indeed that the co-sponsors of resolutions embodying other approaches will be able to agree with us that ours is not antagonistic to theirs, nor theirs incompatible with ours". I should like to make clear that this remains the view of my Delegation and of the co-sponsors of L.507.

At a later point in my statement, however, I said also, "I do not propose to comment in detail on other resolutions..... before their sponsors have had an opportunity to present them. I should say frankly, however, that it is our view that the more fruitful approach, in the light of the history of past attempts to produce general statements of principles governing relations between countries, would be for the Sixth Committee to commence upon an empirically-based study of specific areas of the law in need of development and codification. It is, of course, for this reason that we have embodied the latter approach in draft resolution L.507".

In the light of the more than three weeks debate on this item, we remain of that view. Indeed, the trend of debate has confirmed us in this view. Nevertheless, the co-sponsors of draft resolution L.507 recognize the weight and validity of the many expressions of views suggesting that efforts be made for some

*** ** . . .

en de la companya de la co

.C.

form of compromise to be reached. I should, perhaps, make clear that the co-sponsors of L.507 do not consider that draft resolution L.509 represents such a compromise, although it was introduced as such, and has been referred to by several delegations in that fashion, Like resolution L.505, it embodies the declaration approach rather than the study of specifics as proposed in L.507.

The essential point in issue, as we see it, appears to be the ruestion of whether a resolution embodies the general rather than the specific approach would re-affirm relevant Charter principles or would attempt to do something rather more than or different from that. The members of this Committee are, I think, entitled to know that the co-sponsors of resolution L.507 have been in touch with the co-sponsors of resolution L.509 and have offered certain suggestions. It may be that during the debate on the resolution, some progress can be made towards a compromise. Certainly, the co-sponsors of draft resolution L.507 remain open to suggestions of possible bases of general agreement on this cuestion. We see no objection, for instance, to two resolutions being passed by this Committee, should this prove necessary.

I trust that the foregoing explanations will clear up certain misconceptions which may have arisen concerning the nature and extent of the proposals embodied in resolution L.507, and the intent of its co-sponsors. May I conclude by saying that it is our earnest hope that resolution L.507 will receive the support of all delegations, whatever else may be decided on outside the terms of reference of that resolution.

. Hora and the state of the sta •