



**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 64: Clearance of the Suez Canal: report of the Secretary-General . . . . .	599
Agenda item 37: The future of Togoland under French administration: report of the Trusteeship Council ( <i>concluded</i> ) Election of the United Nations Commissioner for the Elections in the Trust Territory of Togoland under French Administration ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	603
Decision concerning the procedure of the meeting . . . . .	604
Agenda item 39: Question of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia: reports of the Governments of Ethiopia and of Italy Report of the Fourth Committee . . . . .	604
Agenda item 29: Programmes of technical assistance: (a) Report of the Economic and Social Council; (b) Confirmation of allocation of funds under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance Reports of the Second Committee . . . . .	605
Agenda item 28: Economic development of under-developed countries: Question of the establishment of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development: final and supplementary reports of the Ad Hoc Committee, and recommendations of the Economic and Social Council Report of the Second Committee . . . . .	605
Agenda item 12: Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter X) Report of the Fifth Committee . . . . . Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters I, VIII and IX) . . . . .	611
	611

**President: Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).**

**AGENDA ITEM 64**

**Clearance of the Suez Canal: report of the Secretary-General**

1. The PRESIDENT: In connexion with the report of the Secretary-General on the clearance of the Suez Canal [A/3719], a draft resolution has been submitted by Brazil, Iran, the Philippines and Thailand [A/L.238].

2. Mr. KENAWI (Egypt): The clearing of the Suez Canal from the obstructions which blocked the flow of international navigation through it, as a result of last year's tripartite attack against Egypt, has been a splendid example of alertness, efficiency and constructiveness. The story of this episode of the history of the Canal—when time and occasion allow it to be fully told and when depicted then in all the vividness of its glorious colours—will enfold before the world an exhilarat-

ing saga of planning and of determination with, most conspicuous among its heroes, the unrelenting team which, on behalf of the United Nations, assisted the Government of Egypt in that arduous and nearly impossible enterprise.

3. The gratitude of Egypt to them, to the Secretariat of the United Nations, and to all others who have extended a helping hand is both endless and eternal. This gratitude will, furthermore, be eloquently symbolized by the very fact of what the Suez Canal has become again, and by what it will be, we trust—increasingly and adequately, a link of co-operation, goodwill and mutual benefit between the nations of the world.

4. Mr. ESKELUND (Denmark): Besides the report of the Secretary-General of 1 November [A/3719], we have before us a draft resolution [A/L.238] submitted by the countries of four previous Presidents of this Organization—Brazil, Iran, the Philippines and Thailand—on the financing of the clearance of the Suez Canal.

5. The draft resolution concerns the \$8.4 million which, according to the report of the Secretary-General, is "the limit of expenditures and obligations incurred by the United Nations". It is further stated in the report that this sum of \$8.4 million is "subject to reduction by such resources as might become otherwise available". I think that there is good reason to underline the lines which I have just quoted.

6. According to the draft resolution, the cost will be covered by a surcharge of 3 per cent on Canal tolls. Under these arrangements, the advances will presumably be reimbursed over a period of about three years.

7. May I be allowed to express to the Secretary-General, the staff and others—I shall only mention Lieutenant-General Wheeler—who assisted in this very great and complicated task, our high appreciation of the efficiency with which the clearing of the Canal was carried out, at a very reasonable cost. The very first draft estimates of the time the clearing would take and the cost which might be incurred led us to expect something much costlier and much more time-taking than what was actually achieved. Within a period of slightly more than three months—that is, even some weeks earlier than predicted in the final estimates for clearance of the main shipping canal only—all of the clearance, including the openings of ports and harbours, had been completed and at a cost considerably lower, as much as one third lower, than were the final estimates of the cost.

8. Following a note from the Secretary-General [A/3492, annex III] dated 23 December 1956, a number of Governments made available contributions by way of an advance of funds towards the cost of the clearance. My Government provided an amount of \$500,000, and the total of the contributions advanced amounted to \$11.2

million. The draft resolution before us is intended to make possible the reimbursement to the Governments concerned of the advances made.

9. The Danish Government would have greatly preferred that the clearance of the Canal had been assessed purely and neatly as that which it was, and which the General Assembly declared it to be: a task to be undertaken by, and on behalf of, the United Nations as such. In our opinion, the costs ought to be borne by the United Nations itself, in accordance with the scale of assessment accepted by the United Nations General Assembly to cover all the normal costs of our Organization. Thus, and thus only, could be recognized the fact that this great operation was undertaken on the responsibility of the world community and for the benefit of all nations. Actually, there is not one country in the world which did not suffer, directly or indirectly, from the many months of the closing of the Canal and which does not benefit from its reopening. Nobody can dispute that the only natural course, in view of these undeniable facts, would be that our Organization's scale of assessments be used to provide from all of us the money necessary to cover the debt incurred by the United Nations on behalf of all of us.

10. It is a great disappointment to the Danish Government that this has not proved possible; indeed, that no other way could be found than to cast the burden on to the shoulders of the direct users of the Canal, that is, the international shipping firms and the charterers. This solution of the problem seems to us deplorably lacking in equity and international solidarity. Indeed, the 3 per cent on the Canal tolls may, in many cases—although perhaps not in all—prove to be a burden to be absorbed by those self-same shipping companies and charterers which pay them on passage through the Canal.

11. This fact, combined with the indisputable prospect that the consumers in some countries will be more heavily affected than in others, make this proposal altogether too lopsided to be considered fair. Very careful consideration, however, has led my Government to realize that as matters stand and in view of all circumstances known to us, no alternative to the solution which the Secretary-General has felt compelled to propose is in fact available.

12. My delegation will therefore, however unenthusiastically, vote in favour of the draft resolution before us. We will do so on the assumption and with the confidence that all countries concerned will, in the case both of their own and of chartered shipping, co-operate fully and loyally in implementing the 3 per cent levy arrangement and in discharging the obligations it confers.

13. Mr. COOPER (Liberia): In reading the report of the Secretary-General on the clearance of the Suez Canal [A/3719], one cannot but be impressed with the speed and economy with which this work was accomplished and with the small loss of human life and material. We must offer our appreciation and congratulations to the Secretary-General and to General Wheeler and his staff for the practical and speedy execution of the General Assembly's mandate on arrangements for the clearing of the Canal.

14. Having issued such a mandate, the General Assembly is in duty bound to make arrangements to

meet the cost entailed in the enterprise; it is no longer the concern of any particular nation or nations.

15. We note in the Secretary-General's report that he had considered various possible alternatives for meeting the cost of the clearance of the Canal, and the most logical and practical method was his recommendation of the levy of 3 per cent on Canal tolls. It is our opinion that these recommendations are the most realistic, as we feel that those who use and benefit from the Canal should also contribute to its maintenance.

16. My Government, therefore, is in complete agreement with these recommendations and will vote in favour of the draft resolution [A/L.238] sponsored by the delegations of Brazil, Iran, the Philippines and Thailand, which embodies these recommendations. We hope that this draft resolution will receive, if not a unanimous vote, at least an overwhelming majority of the vote of this Assembly.

17. We also hope that if the Secretary-General obtains the necessary powers from the Assembly through the adoption of this draft resolution, he will encounter no serious obstructions and difficulties in implementing this draft resolution, and that the speed and success which has characterized all his actions in connexion with this phase of the Middle East situation may be repeated in making arrangements to cover the cost of clearing the Canal. We all wish him success in this new enterprise.

18. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): The United States delegation wishes to join in congratulating the Secretary-General on the magnificent accomplishment of clearing the Suez Canal and opening up that waterway once again to international traffic. We wish also to extend our congratulations to those individuals who played outstanding roles in connexion with this clearance operation.

19. When we of the Assembly considered this problem at the eleventh session and authorized the Secretary-General to enter into arrangements for clearing the Canal [resolution 1121 (XI)], we all thought that the clearance process would take a very long time and involve a huge expenditure. Nevertheless, the Assembly authorized the Secretary-General to go ahead, and we are all now grateful that clearance work was completed so expeditiously and at a so much lower cost than any of us had imagined. This is but another example of the way in which this Organization can perform important and constructive tasks under the leadership of the Secretary-General.

20. We must now take action to finance the clearance costs to discharge an obligation. We know that the Secretary-General and many Governments have explored all possible alternatives in this connexion. It has now become clear that the Secretary-General has laid before us the most equitable and feasible method of financing, namely to raise the necessary funds by establishing a small surcharge on Canal tolls. The surcharge method, in our view, is equitable because it places the burden of financing upon those who have been the primary beneficiaries of the clearance of the Canal. The method is feasible since the proposed surcharge is so small that it will have virtually no economic impact and because, as we understand it, the Governments which are primarily interested in traffic through the Canal have indicated their support for the

proposal. With such support there can be little doubt that the proposal can be successfully carried through.

21. Accordingly, the United States will vote in favour of the draft resolution which is before us [A/L.238]. We feel sure that all Members will co-operate in implementing the proposal, and thus we will bring to a successful conclusion a most constructive chapter in the history of the United Nations.

22. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The General Assembly has before it the Secretary-General's report on the clearance of the Suez Canal [A/3719]. The report describes the considerable amount of work that had to be done to clear the Canal and to re-establish the normal flow of traffic which was interrupted as a result of the armed aggression of the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt. At the same time, the report contains a proposal for reimbursement of the costs of clearing the Canal by imposing a levy of 3 per cent on Canal tolls. The draft resolution [A/L.238] submitted by the delegations of Brazil, Iran, the Philippines and Thailand endorses this proposal of the Secretary-General.

23. The Soviet Union's position with regard to measures taken by the United Nations to clear the Suez Canal has already been set forth during the discussion of this question at the eleventh session of the General Assembly. At present, the Soviet delegation deems it necessary to recall only the main features of this position.

24. The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the normal and uninterrupted operation of the Suez Canal. The so-called Suez question, artificially created by the colonial Powers, was in fact settled as a result of the publication of the Egyptian Government's Declaration of 24 April 1957 [A/3576] and its subsequent acknowledgement of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

25. The Soviet delegation notes with satisfaction that, with the elimination of the consequences of the aggression by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt, the Suez Canal, under the jurisdiction of Egypt, its lawful owner, is now again open to the free passage of shipping, is operating uninterruptedly and is thus serving the interests of international trade and shipping and the interests of the many nations which use this important seaway.

26. The Secretary-General's report lists in detail the obstructions in the Suez Canal zone which had to be removed in order to re-establish normal traffic in the Canal. However, the report not only by-passes the question of the causes which led to the obstruction and the closing of the Canal, but lays quite unjustifiable stress on the so-called contribution of the United Kingdom and France to its clearance. The report thus virtually represents those responsible for the closing of the Canal as sincere advocates of free and unimpeded passage through it. It is scarcely possible to agree with this view.

27. Similarly, the Secretary-General's proposals for reimbursing the costs of clearing the Suez Canal are unacceptable. The Secretary-General proposes that these costs should be reimbursed by imposing a levy of 3 per cent on Canal tolls, or, in other words, by raising the charges for the passage of vessels of all

the countries using the Canal, without making any distinction between those responsible for putting the Suez Canal out of operation and those who suffered injury as a result of that action.

28. The Secretary-General's proposal, it must be admitted, is contrary to one of the most important principles of contemporary international law, according to which States which have committed aggression must bear not only the political, but also the material responsibility for such aggression. There are no legal, moral or other grounds for absolving aggressor States from responsibility for the damage resulting from the invasion of the Suez Canal zone by their armed forces. Similarly, there are no grounds for laying that responsibility upon other States, which not only fought against aggression, but themselves suffered from the interruption in the operation of the Suez Canal.

29. The Soviet delegation therefore continues to believe that all the expenses incurred as a result of aggression by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt, including expenses in connexion with the clearance of the Suez Canal, should be fully borne by the States which committed the aggression. That method of reimbursing the cost of clearing the Canal would accord with the fundamental principles of international law and with the provisions of the Charter. To depart from these principles would be tantamount to rewarding the aggressors for their invasion of the Suez Canal zone, which caused serious damage to many nations and to international trade and shipping.

30. In view of these considerations, the Soviet delegation feels obliged to state that it will be unable to support the Secretary-General's proposal on the matter and will abstain from voting on the draft resolution [A/L.238].

31. Mr. WALKER (Australia): I am sure we were all interested to hear the views of the Soviet representative on the desirability of those who have carried out aggression bearing the costs of repairing the damage which the aggression may have caused, which has an application to various parts of the world.

32. We join in congratulating the Secretary-General, General Wheeler and all those whose co-operation has brought about the clearance of the Canal rapidly and at less cost than was originally anticipated. This was made possible by the action of eleven countries which made advances to the United Nations for this purpose. Australia was proud to be one of the countries that provided an advance to the United Nations: in our case, the sum of \$1 million.

33. The draft resolution before us bears, therefore, on the arrangements to be made to repay these advances that were made to the United Nations. We should have preferred that the method selected for repayment would have been one that recognized the obligation of the United Nations, rather than a method which takes the form of a levy on the actual trade and shipping that passes through the Canal. However, that seems to be, in all the circumstances, the method most likely to commend itself and to ensure the repayment of the advances, we understand, over a period of about three years, and we are, therefore, supporting that proposal.

34. This does mean, however, that those who pay for the restoration of the Canal are in fact the countries and the economic interests whose trade and commerce pass through the Canal. This emphasizes once again

proposal. With such support there can be little doubt that the proposal can be successfully carried through.

21. Accordingly, the United States will vote in favour of the draft resolution which is before us [A/L.238]. We feel sure that all Members will co-operate in implementing the proposal, and thus we will bring to a successful conclusion a most constructive chapter in the history of the United Nations.

22. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The General Assembly has before it the Secretary-General's report on the clearance of the Suez Canal [A/3719]. The report describes the considerable amount of work that had to be done to clear the Canal and to re-establish the normal flow of traffic which was interrupted as a result of the armed aggression of the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt. At the same time, the report contains a proposal for reimbursement of the costs of clearing the Canal by imposing a levy of 3 per cent on Canal tolls. The draft resolution [A/L.238] submitted by the delegations of Brazil, Iran, the Philippines and Thailand endorses this proposal of the Secretary-General.

23. The Soviet Union's position with regard to measures taken by the United Nations to clear the Suez Canal has already been set forth during the discussion of this question at the eleventh session of the General Assembly. At present, the Soviet delegation deems it necessary to recall only the main features of this position.

24. The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the normal and uninterrupted operation of the Suez Canal. The so-called Suez question, artificially created by the colonial Powers, was in fact settled as a result of the publication of the Egyptian Government's Declaration of 24 April 1957 [A/3576] and its subsequent acknowledgement of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

25. The Soviet delegation notes with satisfaction that, with the elimination of the consequences of the aggression by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt, the Suez Canal, under the jurisdiction of Egypt, its lawful owner, is now again open to the free passage of shipping, is operating uninterruptedly and is thus serving the interests of international trade and shipping and the interests of the many nations which use this important seaway.

26. The Secretary-General's report lists in detail the obstructions in the Suez Canal zone which had to be removed in order to re-establish normal traffic in the Canal. However, the report not only by-passes the question of the causes which led to the obstruction and the closing of the Canal, but lays quite unjustifiable stress on the so-called contribution of the United Kingdom and France to its clearance. The report thus virtually represents those responsible for the closing of the Canal as sincere advocates of free and unimpeded passage through it. It is scarcely possible to agree with this view.

27. Similarly, the Secretary-General's proposals for reimbursing the costs of clearing the Suez Canal are unacceptable. The Secretary-General proposes that these costs should be reimbursed by imposing a levy of 3 per cent on Canal tolls, or, in other words, by raising the charges for the passage of vessels of all

the countries using the Canal, without making any distinction between those responsible for putting the Suez Canal out of operation and those who suffered injury as a result of that action.

28. The Secretary-General's proposal, it must be admitted, is contrary to one of the most important principles of contemporary international law, according to which States which have committed aggression must bear not only the political, but also the material responsibility for such aggression. There are no legal, moral or other grounds for absolving aggressor States from responsibility for the damage resulting from the invasion of the Suez Canal zone by their armed forces. Similarly, there are no grounds for laying that responsibility upon other States, which not only fought against aggression, but themselves suffered from the interruption in the operation of the Suez Canal.

29. The Soviet delegation therefore continues to believe that all the expenses incurred as a result of aggression by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt, including expenses in connexion with the clearance of the Suez Canal, should be fully borne by the States which committed the aggression. That method of reimbursing the cost of clearing the Canal would accord with the fundamental principles of international law and with the provisions of the Charter. To depart from these principles would be tantamount to rewarding the aggressors for their invasion of the Suez Canal zone, which caused serious damage to many nations and to international trade and shipping.

30. In view of these considerations, the Soviet delegation feels obliged to state that it will be unable to support the Secretary-General's proposal on the matter and will abstain from voting on the draft resolution [A/L.238].

31. Mr. WALKER (Australia): I am sure we were all interested to hear the views of the Soviet representative on the desirability of those who have carried out aggression bearing the costs of repairing the damage which the aggression may have caused, which has an application to various parts of the world.

32. We join in congratulating the Secretary-General, General Wheeler and all those whose co-operation has brought about the clearance of the Canal rapidly and at less cost than was originally anticipated. This was made possible by the action of eleven countries which made advances to the United Nations for this purpose. Australia was proud to be one of the countries that provided an advance to the United Nations: in our case, the sum of \$1 million.

33. The draft resolution before us bears, therefore, on the arrangements to be made to repay these advances that were made to the United Nations. We should have preferred that the method selected for repayment would have been one that recognized the obligation of the United Nations, rather than a method which takes the form of a levy on the actual trade and shipping that passes through the Canal. However, that seems to be, in all the circumstances, the method most likely to commend itself and to ensure the repayment of the advances, we understand, over a period of about three years, and we are, therefore, supporting that proposal.

34. This does mean, however, that those who pay for the restoration of the Canal are in fact the countries and the economic interests whose trade and commerce pass through the Canal. This emphasizes once again

the nature of the Suez Canal as an international facility.

35. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia): The General Assembly has before it the report of the Secretary-General on the clearance of the Suez Canal and a draft resolution on this subject submitted by four delegations. This draft resolution is based on the report; it is, in substance, a proposal to the General Assembly to endorse the Secretary-General's recommendation that the expenditures incurred in the clearing of the Suez Canal should be met by the application of a surcharge on Canal traffic. Under this arrangement, a surcharge of 3 per cent on Canal traffic would be paid into a special United Nations account by all shipping using the Canal.

36. The Czechoslovak delegation considers that the United Nations Emergency Force as in the case of this method of financing expenditure places upon the shoulders of all Members a burden which should be borne by the States that caused such expenditure to be incurred. The need for clearing the Suez Canal and restoring it to a condition in which it is usable for maritime navigation is a result of the necessity to remove obstructions in this waterway and repair the damage done as a consequence of the British-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt.

37. The responsibility of the United Kingdom, France and Israel for unleashing this aggression is universally known and was mentioned in a number of resolutions of this Assembly. In the science of generally recognized principles of international law, one of the primary consequences of the responsibility of a State for international offences committed—and aggression is surely one of the gravest international offences—is the duty to pay for all the material and other damage caused by such an offence. Proceeding from this principle, the Czechoslovak delegation has already declared, at the eleventh session of the General Assembly, that those States which unleashed the aggression against Egypt are liable to pay for all damage that has been caused, including the expenses incurred in connexion with the clearance of the Suez Canal and the resumption of the operation of this Canal's facilities which had been either damaged or destroyed.

38. The adoption of the proposed resolution would mean that the burden of financing the clearance of the Canal would be borne by all States using the Canal including those countries which overwhelmingly condemned the British-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt and in addition suffered considerable losses because of the interruption of navigation through the waterway in consequence of this aggression. In addition, funds collected by way of this surcharge on Canal traffic—and it may be assumed from the data set out in the report of the Secretary-General that this would be the considerable amount of \$500,000—would be refunded even to the United Kingdom and France, that is, to the very States which have caused this expenditure to be incurred.

39. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, the adoption of the draft resolution would therefore constitute a serious violation of the juridical principles which must necessarily be maintained and upheld in international relations. For these reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation cannot support the draft resolution now before the Assembly [A/L.238].

40. Mr. GEORGIEV (Bulgaria) (translated from

French): The Bulgarian delegation would like to make a brief statement on the item before us.

41. We commend the work which has been done in clearing the Suez Canal. We are glad to see that this important waterway is being well operated under Egyptian administration.

42. We know that funds had to be found to cover the expenses of the clearing operation and that loans were obtained. We must now find the necessary money to repay those loans.

43. We should not, however, stop there. We should really make those who were responsible for the damage pay these costs. If we were to increase the toll and not ask those to pay damages, who through their act of aggression brought about the destruction in the Canal, we should, as we all know, be guilty of a serious infringement of international law and we should be creating a disquieting, if not dangerous, precedent in this sphere. Moreover, to increase the toll would be tantamount to dividing the cost of clearing the Canal among all nations and all peoples. The nations and peoples, however, should not have to bear the material responsibility for an illegal act, an infringement of international law; the aggressors should bear that responsibility.

44. For that reason the Bulgarian delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

45. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put the draft resolution submitted by Brazil, Iran, the Philippines and Thailand [A/L.238] to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 54 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

46. Mr. ENGEN (Norway): I should like to make a very brief explanation of the vote which my delegation has just cast. We voted for the draft resolution concerning the clearance of the Suez Canal on the understanding that the proposed surcharge shall be implemented and levied in the same manner and in accordance with the same business rules as those governing the collection of the regular tolls and charges. Failure in this respect will of course have a bearing on the implementation of this resolution on the part of the directly interested representatives of shipping and trade in my country. We trust, however, that no complications will develop which would necessitate a reconsideration of the matter on our part.

47. Let me add that the Norwegian Government values highly the efforts made by all concerned in this operation, which made it possible to clear the Canal in a short time and at reasonable cost.

48. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): The reasons why the United Kingdom delegation has felt able to vote in favour of the draft resolution we have just adopted are as follows.

49. First, we believe that this Assembly was right to authorize the Secretary-General to proceed with practical arrangements and agreements to get the Canal cleared as soon as possible. We are happy that, as the Secretary-General states in his report [A/3719], we were able to lighten the task of the United Nations salvage fleet by the clearance which we and the French had already effected in Port Said. We are also glad to have been able to continue some of this work under the United Nations flag. We join in sincerely paying a trib-

ute to the Secretary-General and his staff for their skill and patience in bringing the clearance operation to completion.

50. Secondly, we consider that the Secretary-General, in order to avoid delay so far as lay in his power, was justified in engaging the credit of the United Nations to secure the advances of money necessary.

51. Thirdly, we accept that, among the methods available in terms of practical realism for ensuring that these advances are repaid, as the credit of the United Nations requires that they should be repaid, the least inequitable is that the cost should fall on those who stand to gain by the fact that the Canal is no longer closed. I cannot say, however, that this was an easy decision to take. It means that British shippers and their customers in Asia, in Europe, in Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere, will be called upon to meet some 40 per cent of the cost of remedying the consequences of the blocking of the Canal by the Egyptian Government, for which we were not responsible and which in itself caused considerable financial loss to British shippers at the time. We cannot, of course, regard this as a satisfactory situation, but, as I say, we accept that it is the least unsatisfactory of the possible arrangements.

52. Mr. CARBONNIER (Sweden): The Swedish delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution which the General Assembly has now passed on the same understanding as the one stated by the representative of Norway.

53. Mr. EBAN (Israel): It is clear from the discussion on the resolution just adopted that it deals exclusively with the physical clearance of the Suez Canal from the obstacles which impeded the passage of ships last year. The removal of these physical obstacles is an important contribution by the United Nations, especially by the Secretary-General and General Wheeler, towards the restoration of international commerce.

54. The resolution does not discuss the juridical issues affecting the Suez Canal which have been examined from time to time in the organs of the United Nations. These juridical conflicts remain unresolved. A situation of law does not prevail today in the Suez Canal. The six requirements adopted by the Security Council on 13 October 1956 [S/3675] are not in full operation. These requirements include that there should be free and open transit through the Suez Canal without discrimination, overt or covert—this covers both political and technical aspects. Moreover, on 1 September 1951, at its 558th meeting, the Security Council called upon Egypt to terminate restrictions on all commercial shipping and goods, wherever bound. There is no evidence that these restrictions have been removed.

55. Thus the Suez Canal has been cleared by the United Nations, but the territorial Power has not yet responded by accepting the will of the United Nations in respect of free and non-discriminatory use of the Canal by all ships and cargoes, wherever bound.

56. While this question has been in the background for some time, the United Nations should not underestimate the dangers likely to arise from such continued abuses of international law, the more so when such abuses are based on a doctrine of belligerency and war. In view of the illegality still prevailing in the régime of the Canal, the Israel delegation withheld its support from the

draft resolution which the General Assembly has just adopted.

57. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): My delegation shares the opinion expressed by a few representatives this morning here that the correct way for the United Nations to repay the obligations which it had undertaken vis-à-vis certain Members who had advanced money would have been for the United Nations itself to pay this out of its own funds collected in the normal manner under its budget. We realize, however, that there were grave difficulties in the way of settling the question in this manner, and that is the reason why my delegation has cast its vote in favour of this draft resolution, which contemplates a settlement emphasizing, at any rate, the international character both of the Canal and of the operation which has taken place.

58. I should like to state that under the settlement contemplated in the resolution, it will be the task of the Secretary-General to arrange the practical carrying out of this resolution and he will naturally only be able to succeed in this task if he gets the full co-operation of both the Government of Egypt and all the parties that will have to pay the contributions. I trust that this co-operation will be forthcoming in full measure, and I wish the Secretary-General success in his task.

59. The PRESIDENT: I feel certain that I interpret the feeling of the Assembly when I express a very real appreciation of the expeditious organization and completion of the Canal clearance and when I say that it is important and gratifying indeed that the Suez Canal is once again serving trade and shipping.

60. May I also voice the expectation that with similar expedition the method just now endorsed by the Assembly for the reimbursement to the Governments which contributed to the clearance operation will be put into effect with the co-operation of Member States, so that the advances made to the United Nations may be repaid.

#### AGENDA ITEM 37

##### The future of Togoland under French administration: report of the Trusteeship Council (concluded)

##### ELECTION OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSIONER FOR THE ELECTIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF TOGOLAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION (concluded)\*

61. The PRESIDENT: The election of a United Nations Commissioner for the Elections in the Trust Territory of Togoland under French Administration will be held by secret ballot, and there can be no nominations.

62. Members will recall that at the 727th meeting the voting was postponed at the conclusion of the third inconclusive ballot, and of course the names were known. I think it would be appropriate for me now to express my own appreciation, and I would think, too, the appreciation of the Assembly, of the way in which Mr. Cohen and Mr. Nuñez met our difficulties and jointly decided not to stand for election.

63. In accordance with rule 95, the voting at this meeting will begin with the first of a series of three unrestricted ballots.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Elkohen (Morocco) and Mr. Schurmann (Netherlands) acted as tellers.

\*Resumed from 727th meeting.



A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	80
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	80
Abstentions:	4
Number of members voting:	76
Required majority:	51

Number of votes obtained:

Mr. Dorsinville (Haiti) . . . . .	69
Mr. Rölz Bennett (Guatemala). . . . .	4
Mr. Khoman (Thailand) . . . . .	1
Mr. Cohen (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories). . . . .	1
Mr. Bozović (Yugoslavia). . . . .	1

Having obtained the required two-thirds majority, Mr. Dorsinville (Haiti) was elected United Nations Commissioner for the Elections in the Trust Territory of Togoland under French Administration.

64. Mr. ST. LOT (Haiti) (translated from French): In the absence of Mr. Dorsinville I should like, as Chairman of the Haitian delegation to the twelfth session of the General Assembly, to express my delegation's gratitude for the honour the General Assembly has just done our country in electing Mr. Dorsinville, by so decisive a vote, as United Nations Commissioner to supervise the organization and conduct of the elections to the next Legislative Assembly in Togoland under French administration.

65. We can assure the General Assembly that the Commissioner it has chosen and upon whom it has laid so many responsibilities will do all that he can to justify such trust. We for our part feel that the vote which the General Assembly has just given reflects its appreciation of the general attitude adopted by the Haitian delegation in the United Nations: scrupulous fidelity to the Charter, with objectivity and understanding in seeking ways and means of ensuring more justice and co-operation between States and between men.

Decision concerning the procedure of the meeting

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fourth, Second and Fifth Committees.

## AGENDA ITEM 39

**Question of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia: reports of the Governments of Ethiopia and of Italy**

## REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/3796)

66. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee, I should report to the Assembly that an agreement has been reached by all the parties concerned in this question that in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the Committee the blank space should be filled by the words "His Majesty the King of Norway".

Mrs. Skottsberg-Ahman (Sweden), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee, presented the report of that Committee and then spoke as follows.

67. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-AHMAN (Sweden), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee: I believe it can safely

be said that painstaking efforts were made by members of the Committee to find a generally acceptable solution for the difficult and important problem of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia. Thanks to the co-operation and the spirit of conciliation of all the members of the Committee, and particularly of the delegations of Ethiopia and Italy, these efforts proved successful. During the night meeting of 12 December—which was the deadline suggested by the President of the Assembly—the two groups of sponsors which had already submitted draft resolutions withdrew them, and joined in presenting a compromise proposal which was unanimously approved by the Committee.

68. The PRESIDENT: I put to the vote the draft resolution contained in the report of the Fourth Committee [A/3796], which has been submitted to the Assembly.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

69. Mr. PRADO (Ecuador) (translated from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution we have just adopted, because, as I stated in the Committee when explaining my vote, it was submitted with the full approval of the parties concerned and my delegation could not do other than respect a decision reached freely by the two parties to the dispute.

70. Nevertheless I should like it to be clearly understood that my delegation's vote in no way prejudices the application of any peaceful solution to a territorial dispute and that Ecuador categorically reserves its position with regard to any frontier question, present or future, in which it may be directly concerned.

71. Finally, I also wish it to be understood that my delegation does not consider it sufficient for the sixth preambular paragraph merely to mention the desirability of a final settlement; it should have been made quite clear that the final settlement of a problem of this kind should be based on justice and equity. It is not simply a matter of achieving a final settlement: the main point is that if it is to be satisfactory and lasting, such settlement must be based on law and justice.

72. Ato Yilma DERESSA (Ethiopia): As the title of this item indicates, the question before us is a frontier problem. I have no need to emphasize the obvious truth that all international frontiers are of peculiar and vital importance to the countries which they delimit. In the case of the frontier between Ethiopia and Somaliland, history has made this truth particularly apparent.

73. Again I am stating what must be an obvious truth when I remark that important problems, such as frontier problems, are almost invariably difficult, and require a high order of technical competence to achieve a solution.

74. The discussions under review responded to this situation. They have been juridical and have turned on the specific application of the juridical instrument establishing this frontier half a century ago.

75. These juridical discussions have revealed certain legal points of interpretation as yet unresolved. In its desire to push through to a prompt delimitation of the frontier, Ethiopia, instead of abandoning the discussions or hope of settlement, proposes immediately to pass to a prompt solution of these unresolved juridical points. This accomplished, there should not be the slightest difficulty, within the framework and in

accordance with the provisions of the Convention of 1908, in delimiting the frontier on the ground without further delay. It was for this reason that my delegation supported with its vote the draft resolution before this Assembly, which adopts the legal procedure of arbitration for resolving these technical problems.

76. At a time when the urgency of a settlement is recognized by all, it is important that no time be lost, either by rejecting the progress achieved in the past two years of negotiations, or by seeking to undo agreed settlements. In taking this position, I believe that Ethiopia is giving, once again, eloquent proof of its firm determination to push this matter through to an early solution.

77. With all of these considerations in mind, and with the settlement of difficulties through the procedure contained in the draft resolution before us, it is the confident hope of my Government that we may be able to proceed to a delimitation of the frontier on the ground, and thereby settle this dispute to the satisfaction of both parties.

78. Mr. DE CLEMENTI (Italy) (translated from French): The Italian delegation would like to express the hope that the draft resolution just adopted may lead to a settlement of the question of the demarcation of the frontier between Ethiopia and Somaliland. Called upon to face its responsibilities, the General Assembly was able to reach the decision just taken in this matter, thanks to the conciliatory and really effective action of a number of delegations. I should like to offer them the sincere thanks of my delegation and of the Somali people.

79. One point about which my delegation is particularly happy is the decision of His Majesty the King of Norway kindly to accept the role the resolution entrusts to him in respect of the appointment of the tribunal. The Italian delegation especially asks the Norwegian delegation to be so kind as to convey to His Majesty the gratitude of the Italian Government.

80. The unanimity of the vote on the resolution gives us grounds for hope. We have not yet solved the problem, it is true, but we have settled a further stage of the procedure to be followed in reaching a solution.

81. As to the responsibility which falls upon us, the Italian delegation would like to assure the General Assembly that, as in the past and during the first phase of the procedure upon which the General Assembly, in accordance with its powers, decided earlier, its Government will spare no effort to bring the task entrusted to it to a successful conclusion. We shall do this in order that a just solution may be found in the interests of good understanding between peoples and of international co-operation and peace.

#### AGENDA ITEM 29

##### Programmes of technical assistance:

- (a) Report of the Economic and Social Council;
- (b) Confirmation of allocation of funds under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance

#### REPORTS OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/3759 AND A/3769)

Mr. Hadwen (Canada), Rapporteur of the Second Committee, presented the reports of that Committee [A/3759, A/3769] and then spoke as follows:

82. Mr. HADWEN (Canada), Rapporteur of the Second Committee: The two documents before the Assembly reflect the careful consideration which the Second Committee gave to the United Nations programmes of technical assistance. They also reflect the Committee's keen interest in the practical work of these programmes and its support for their activities.

83. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution I, which concerns the financing of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and is contained in the report of the Second Committee [A/3759].

Draft resolution I was adopted by 75 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

84. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, concerning the United Nations technical assistance programmes, was adopted unanimously in the Second Committee. May I assume that the Assembly adopts the draft resolution unanimously?

Draft resolution II was adopted unanimously.

85. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee in its report on the confirmation of the allocation of funds for the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance in 1958 [A/3769]. This draft resolution has been recommended, without a vote, and unless any Member should wish to explain his vote, I will consider it adopted by the Assembly.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

#### AGENDA ITEM 28

##### Economic development of under-developed countries:

**Question of the establishment of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development: final and supplementary reports of the Ad Hoc Committee, and recommendations of the Economic and Social Council**

#### REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/3782)

86. Mr. HADWEN (Canada), Rapporteur of the Second Committee: It would be a privilege for any Rapporteur to present a report [A/3782] containing issues regarded by his Committee—in this case, the Second Committee—to be of such importance.

87. In its report, there are three principal problems on which the Second Committee took decisions. The first problem concerns demographic questions; the second, international commodity problems; and the third, the question of financing the economic development of under-developed countries. On these three questions, and in particular on the latter one, it may well come to be said of this General Assembly that the resolutions represent some of the most important and constructive actions which it was able to take at its twelfth session.

88. Mr. ROGERS (Canada): My explanation of vote will deal with the vote which my delegation will cast on draft resolution B concerning international commodity problems.

89. At this stage of the work of the General Assembly, my delegation would not have asked for the floor had we not considered that it was particularly necessary for us to explain our vote in connexion with the draft resolution presented by the Second Committee on this subject. I should like to indicate briefly why it is necessary to



emphasize the importance which the Government of Canada attaches to international commodity problems.

90. In the first place, Canada is, in terms of total trade, ranked among the nations of the world directly after the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the Federal Republic of Germany. Of perhaps greater significance, however, is the fact that Canada's major exports are primary commodities and basic products such as wheat and other grains, newsprint and other wood products, and a wide variety of minerals.

91. In the second place, Canada is profoundly interested in international action designed to promote improvement in the conditions of commodity markets and in stabilizing international commodity prices. There are three international commodity agreements now in operation: the International Wheat Agreement, the International Sugar Agreement, and the International Tin Agreement. Canada is a party to all three of these agreements and, I think it is fair to say, has played a part in bringing them into operation and in the promotion of their effectiveness. I believe that there are only four other countries, namely, Australia, Belgium, France and the Netherlands, which are also parties to all three of these agreements. What is more, in its reply to the Secretary-General's circular letter of 5 November 1957, the Government of Canada has expressed a willingness to participate in discussions concerning the possibility of international agreements on certain non-ferrous metals.

92. I have drawn this information to the attention of the Assembly because Canada abstained in the vote in the Second Committee on the draft resolution on international commodity problems, and will abstain again in the vote about to be taken here in the General Assembly. After close and detailed study, we arrived, regretfully, at the opinion that there were several difficulties for us with this draft resolution which would prevent us from voting for it. These, to which I will refer in a moment, were not so serious as to make it necessary for us to oppose the draft resolution.

93. In the first place, the draft resolution refers to international commodity agreements in such a way as to imply that they are the only—or perhaps the best—way of solving international commodity problems. My Government has consistently held the view that the so-called commodity-by-commodity approach is the most satisfactory way of dealing with commodity problems, and in addition, that while some commodities appear to be suitable for the conclusion of international agreements, others do not. In the cases of still other commodities, the Governments most concerned have not found it possible to come to the general agreement which is necessary in order to make an international commodity agreement workable.

94. It appears to the Canadian delegation also that this draft resolution might be interpreted as meaning that the Commission on International Commodity Trade is the major, or possibly the only, body to which commodity problems should be referred. Although the attention of Governments has been expressly drawn by the Economic and Social Council to the fact that commodity problems may be submitted to the Commission, no Government has yet seen fit to do so in any formal sense.

95. It would have seemed better to my delegation if there had been reference in a resolution not only to the

various ways in which international commodity problems can be disposed of, apart from the conclusion of commodity agreements, but also to the fact that the Commission on International Commodity Trade is not the only international body in which commodity problems can usefully be discussed. In this connexion, I would refer particularly to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to which most of the principal trading countries are parties; to the Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements; and to the commodity study groups of the Food and Agriculture Organization, particularly that concerned with the consideration of conditions governing the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities.

96. Incidentally, the Government of Canada agreed to stand for re-election to the Commission on International Commodity Trade in July 1955 and is at present an active member of that body.

97. Finally, my delegation found the wording in the passage relating to improvement of international commodity prices somewhat confusing. I think we would all have been able to support a reference to the necessity for improving conditions regarding international commodity prices, but my delegation finds it difficult to envisage a situation in which the Economic and Social Council might consider the desirability of raising all international commodity prices without regard to the particular problems of particular commodities.

98. I am sorry to have taken so much of the time of the Assembly, particularly at this stage of our discussion. The Canadian delegation considered it desirable to record our wholehearted approval and support for the purposes of the draft resolution and to express our regret that this matter had to be considered towards the end of the work of the Second Committee when it was not possible to agree on wording which, in the opinion of my delegation, would have reflected more accurately the deep concern of the General Assembly and of my delegation in the face of current international commodity problems.

99. Mr. THOMSON (Australia): I wish to make a prior explanation of Australia's vote on draft resolution B on the study of international commodity problems.

100. As a country intimately concerned with international commodity problems, and one which has tried to play its due part in seeking practical solutions of those problems, Australia naturally sympathizes with the intention underlying the draft resolution. That intention was to emphasize the concern felt by many primary exporting countries, particularly underdeveloped countries, over recent unfavourable changes in their terms of trade. Australia felt able to accord its support to the draft resolution in the Second Committee.

101. The draft resolution was, however, a compromise between two earlier draft resolutions. It was tabled at a time when the Committee felt itself obliged to make all possible speed in completing its agenda. The interval between the introduction of the draft resolution and the taking of the vote upon it had, therefore, to be very short. The interval was too short for the Australian delegation to be able to consult its Government fully and to formulate a final view based upon the terms of the draft resolution.

102. Had time permitted adequate consultation with the Australian authorities and fuller discussion in the Second Committee, the Australian delegation would

have suggested to its colleagues that the draft resolution might have been broadened. We would have suggested that it include an invitation to the Economic and Social Council to have regard, in addition to the report of the Commission on International Commodity Trade, to the activities in this field of work of the Food and Agriculture Organization and its Committee on Commodity Problems, to the relevant discussions at the twelfth session of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and to the reports of the Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements.

103. The Australian delegation would also have taken the opportunity to express its view of the need to avoid duplication in the activities of the various inter-governmental organizations concerned with international trade and commodities. We are prepared, however, to support the resolution in its present form, but hope that Australia's views will be taken into account when the Economic and Social Council is preparing the documentation required under operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution B.

104. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan): As an agricultural country the Sudan is very much interested and concerned in the problems and prospects of international commodity trade. That is why my delegation not only supports draft resolution B calling for a study of international commodity problems but also followed the debate with great care as one of the co-sponsors.

105. We admit that this draft resolution is a modest one and that it did not go all the way to meet our wishes and desires. We would have liked a world economic conference where the agricultural countries exporting primary commodities would meet and discuss, face to face and with great frankness, such problems with the industrial countries that import primary commodities and raw materials. We should also have liked more effective co-operation and participation of all Members of the United Nations in the Commission of International Commodity Trade.

106. At this juncture my delegation supports the draft resolution as a compromise. We welcome all efforts at dealing seriously with the promotion and the stabilization of commodity prices. We pay tribute to the good work of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in the Sudan. We look forward to further effective assistance in this wide field.

107. However, we have noticed that the FAO study groups do not include cotton, which is one of the products of prime importance in the Sudan, as it is to many Members of the United Nations. The study we want of this important commodity is not only one of prices and production in international trade, but also a study concerned with the technical aspects of agriculture, irrigation and transportation.

108. We therefore welcome draft resolution B on the study of international commodity problems and hope that it will be considered as only one step towards greater international consultation and co-operation in this very essential field.

109. The PRESIDENT: We are now going to vote on the three draft resolutions contained in the report of the Second Committee [A/3782]. Draft resolution A on demographic questions was adopted unanimously in the Second Committee, and I assume that the Assembly will wish to adopt it unanimously today.

Draft resolution A was adopted unanimously.

110. The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution B concerning the study of international commodity problems. It is in respect of that draft resolution that the Canadian delegation asks for a separate vote on paragraph 3. Thus, I shall put to the vote first the preamble and operative paragraphs 1 and 2.

The preamble and operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution B were adopted by 72 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

111. The PRESIDENT: I now put operative paragraph 3 to the vote.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 65 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions. 1/

112. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote operative paragraph 4.

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 76 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

113. The PRESIDENT: I now put draft resolution B as a whole to the vote.

Draft resolution B as a whole was adopted by 75 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

114. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution C on the financing of economic development was unanimously recommended for adoption, and unless there is any objection I shall consider that the draft resolution is also adopted unanimously in the Assembly.

Draft resolution C was adopted unanimously.

115. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the provisions of operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of section II of draft resolution C which has just been adopted, I suggest the appointment of the following Members to serve on the Preparatory Committee: Canada, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, France, Ghana, India, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Peru, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

116. Mr. ARMENGAUD (France) (translated from French): The French delegation welcomes the agreement reached and embodied in draft resolution C, which we have just adopted.

117. As early as 25 November, in the Second Committee, it had suggested that the only way to achieve success was by progressive efforts and a gradual extension of the resources and activities of the United Nations devoted to the economic development of the under-developed countries. In its view, there should be a sound starting point, which nobody would challenge, and a system of financing to which all countries would be whole-heartedly prepared to contribute.

118. We now have that starting point, thanks to the Special Fund. We wish it good luck and an increase in its resources as speedily as possible. France will give it material and intellectual assistance, as we indicated earlier, the more confidently in that the compromise was reached in a spirit of mutual understanding and desire for an effective system, despite certain misgivings expressed in the Committee during the explanation of vote.

119. The French delegation would like, however, to

1/ See para. 134 below.

draw the Assembly's attention to three points which cause it some concern, one of them a specific matter having to do with the very purpose of the resolution, and the other two of a more general nature.

120. With regard to the first point, a unanimous vote is not enough to ensure the implementation of any resolution. There must be agreement on the meaning of the task which it is designed to implement. There must also be determination to ensure its success and to facilitate its progress, without, however, ignoring its limitations.

121. In that connexion, there are different views on the short-term and, in particular, the long-term objectives of the Special Fund. The day when resources make it possible to extend the activities of the Special Fund or to establish concurrently a development fund designed to promote or to make investments, we shall have to agree on what those investments should be, and we shall accordingly have to define the respective responsibilities of the various international financial agencies in order to avoid duplication, overlapping and confusion, which would result in a faulty utilization of the available resources.

122. It was with that in view that the Pineau plan proposed a logical framework for aid to the under-developed countries providing technical assistance, additional national and international banking institutions engaged in normally self-liquidating operations and, finally, a new fund for financing projects which are non-self-liquidating but essential for any further economic development.

123. The French delegation took a similar stand in 1954. Now once again it requests that we should adopt that course in order that in a few years' time, inefficiency may not lead to disillusionment so intense that the idea of multilateral assistance is superseded by that of bilateral assistance. This would further increase the unfortunate tendency for the world to split into two rival blocks, making universal such divisions as those which twice in thirty years have brought Europe to ruin.

124. Section III of the operative part of resolution 1219 (XII), however, gives us a measure of satisfaction for the time being, owing to the insertion of the word "principally" concerning the activities of the Special Fund. As we understand it, that word means that apart from the loan and investment activities, which are the function of the Special Fund in the present circumstances, any extension of the activities of the Fund or the establishment of the Development Fund can be directed only to the development of the infrastructure, to the exclusion of any financing operations productive of profits.

125. On the second point, which is more general, I should like to make the following comment. We understand a vote in favour of the new Fund to express the willingness of those supporting it to provide it with the means of functioning. From time to time, however, certain statements made during the debate in the Committee appeared to be qualified by reservations. Those reservations, made in the course of speeches supporting the establishment of SUNFED, should not be held to release the speakers from any promise of participation or to qualify such promises by restrictions, even of a monetary nature, which would make their participation more theoretical than real or would

actually make it conditional on an indirect maintenance of an extended bilateralism.

126. The fact that the resolution we have adopted is more modest than the one which the Economic and Social Council hoped for in July 1957 is perhaps partly due to the reservations of some supporters of SUNFED. A similar attitude on the part of the Fund towards the special projects would be difficult to understand.

127. I come now to the third point. Nothing significant can be undertaken and, *a fortiori*, nothing significant can succeed except in a favourable atmosphere. My delegation wishes to state that in its view that favourable atmosphere, which we sensed for a while in the Committee, will remain beyond our grasp, so long as the armaments race continues to take precedence over disarmament and so long as we do not refrain from sterile and dangerous quarrels, of which we have seen many examples and which we sometimes experienced in the Second Committee, on the relative merits of the capitalist and Marxist economic systems.

128. In any event, and this is my conclusion, we have before us a programme of action, a modest programme, to be sure, but one from which we may expect sufficiently tangible results for each one of us to set to work, with a light heart but a clear head. Consequently, subject to the reservations I mentioned concerning the scope of action of the new Fund, the possibilities and conditions of its extension and—I would remind you—its administrative organization, which is set forth in the annex to the resolution and to which we attach great importance, the French Government will use all the means at its disposal to help bring about the establishment and success of the new Fund of which we have just laid the foundation.

129. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom): I shall be very brief in my explanation of vote which the United Kingdom delegation cast on draft resolution C. Not only is the session at a very late stage but, if I may be personal for a moment, I feel a certain embarrassment when I look back and think of how many words I have already spoken on the subject of the financing of the economic development of under-developed countries. In all this spate of words, never once has the United Kingdom delegation or Government in any way failed to recognize the importance of this question, and if we have heavy commitments elsewhere including large annual payments for help to under-developed countries and have not been able to give support for ambitious plans or approve of certain schemes which appeared to us unrealistic or likely to involve us in further heavy commitments, it has, I can assure the Assembly, not been for any lack of sympathy or concern. It has been for reasons which we honestly stated and explained and which I need not repeat here.

130. So now let me say that we are most sincerely gratified at the outcome of all these years of discussion and study. It has always been a cardinal principle of our delegation that, in a matter so important as this, every effort should be made in the Assembly to achieve a general agreement. We have fully understood the anxiety of certain delegations to hasten on with plans even when they seemed to us not to be practicable in any foreseeable future. At last a constructive step has been taken; we have been very happy to support it and in doing so we express our gratitude for the patience and understanding which the principal negotiators have

displayed. Thanks to them, we have got out of the frustration of the past years and started on a modest, but, we hope and believe, constructive and practical programme.

131. Under the terms of the resolution, it will be for the General Assembly, when sufficient resources are available—and these of course will be resources additional to the present plan and must in our view be large enough for effective and continuous action, and I might add that we for our part cannot conceive of resources of sufficient magnitude without internationally supervised disarmament—it will, I say, be for the General Assembly to consider whether a further step is possible.

132. For the present, however, let me say in conclusion that the Government of Her Majesty in the United Kingdom will be very ready to play its full part in the Preparatory Committee established under the present resolution with the task of setting up the Special Fund. We shall also be ready, when circumstances allow, to make a contribution to its resources.

133. The PRESIDENT: Before I call upon the next speaker, there is a point which I wish to mention in connexion with the voting on draft resolution B.

134. There were two misunderstandings over the separate vote on the preamble and operative paragraphs 1 and 2. The representative of Japan wishes his vote to be recorded as in favour of that part of the draft resolution and the representative of the United States as having abstained.

135. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation voted in favour of draft resolution C on the establishment of the Fund. This vote does not mean, however, that the Soviet delegation considers that this resolution provides for the establishment of a real United Nations Fund for financing the economic development of under-developed countries of the type which was advocated in the resolution [662 (XXIV)] adopted at the twenty-fourth session of the Economic and Social Council and for which the representatives of the under-developed countries have been persistently pressing for the past six years.

136. The Soviet delegation considers that resolution 1219 (XII), which we have just adopted, to some extent reflects a wish to replace SUNFED by a somewhat expanded technical assistance fund, to prevent the establishment of SUNFED. The fact that we are not now discussing the establishment of SUNFED and that its establishment is being relegated to an indefinite future was confirmed in the statements of the representatives of many countries in the Committee.

137. The Soviet delegation has already given a detailed exposition of its views on the question of organizing SUNFED in various United Nations organs. In supporting the establishment of a real SUNFED, the Soviet delegation has always considered, *inter alia*, that the Fund should be based on the principle that all countries desiring to participate should be free to do so without restriction. SUNFED should not be subordinated to any existing credit institutions. Contributions to the Fund must be voluntary and payable both in national currency and in kind. These contributions would form the working capital, the resources of the Fund, which must constantly grow. Only if the accumulation and growth of resources is assured, can the

activities of SUNFED be developed along the lines desired by the under-developed countries.

138. In carrying out its functions, SUNFED should strive to finance under-developed countries in such a way as to promote their national economies, particularly their industrial construction, agriculture, transport, housing construction and so forth. In that connexion, we do not consider that the much-used term "infrastructure" reflects the real needs of the under-developed countries.

139. We have always considered that SUNFED should provide credit facilities and should grant the under-developed countries low-interest or interest-free loans and subsidies, but that it should not disburse all the contributions and funds it receives, as would a charitable organization. It is only in this way that SUNFED can increase its capital and expand its operations, ultimately raising them to the levels required to meet the vast needs of the economic development of the under-developed countries. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, it is on these principles that the establishment of SUNFED should be based.

140. The draft resolution of the Second Committee, which has just been adopted, contains provisions that do not correspond to our principles and our understanding of the organization, purposes and functions of SUNFED. The Soviet delegation abstained from voting in the Committee on the last paragraph of the preamble, on paragraph 2 of section II and on the phrase "taking into account the principles set out in the annex" in paragraph 4, because these paragraphs either contain provisions which do not correspond to our basic views and to the principles which we believe should underlie the organization, purposes and functions of SUNFED, or provisions relating to financial obligations which, in our view, are not clear.

141. While the Soviet delegation found it possible to vote in favour of the resolution as a whole in the plenary meeting of the Assembly, it considers itself bound to recall here, in the plenary, the fact and significance of its abstentions on specific paragraphs during the voting on the resolution in the Committee. The Soviet delegation voted in favour of the resolution as a whole, because many of the under-developed countries consider that the adoption of this resolution to some extent meets their views and interests. We do not want to place obstacles in the way of their hopes and expectations.

142. Mr. JUDD (United States of America): My delegation has of course voted in favour of draft resolution C, which we had the honour of co-sponsoring. My delegation worked hard during the discussion of this item in the Committee to achieve an agreement on the present resolution because it achieves two extremely important objectives.

143. First, it initiates further constructive action designed to assist the less developed countries in their striving for economic and social development and the achievement of improved standards of living. It adopts the United States proposal for establishment by the United Nations of a special fund for a new and different approach to technical assistance and technical development to help meet the basic needs of the less developed countries.

144. In this connexion I should like to recall that, while the United States proposal for a special fund has

not envisaged that the Fund would be subordinated to the present machinery of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and in that sense would have an identity of its own, we have always made it clear, and so does the resolution, that the Fund would be integrally related to the existing United Nations programmes of technical assistance and would make the fullest possible use of the existing technical assistance machinery of the United Nations.

145. Second, the resolution clearly recognizes the need of the less developed countries for larger amounts of capital investment. In the preamble it makes this point by emphasizing the importance of an increased flow of capital to the less developed countries from all sources, private and public, national and international. Moreover, in section III the resolution leaves open the possibility of later action by the United Nations with respect to capital investment in the less developed countries, as and when sufficient resources become prospectively available to enable the United Nations to enter into this field. As the representatives of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union have already pointed out, section III properly reserves until the time when adequate funds are available, any decision by the General Assembly to enter into the field of capital development. Likewise, the resolution reserves until that time the question of any commitment on the part of any Government to that decision. It should be pointed out also that nothing in this resolution authorizes the transformation into a capital development fund of the Special Fund established by the resolution for expanding existing technical assistance activities of the United Nations.

146. The decision by this Assembly to consider the question of what action might be appropriate with respect to a United Nations capital development fund only when sufficient resources become available is, in the view of my delegation, a reasonable, realistic and wise decision. It is a frank recognition of the plain fact that sufficient funds are not now available or in prospect to establish such a fund that would do more than raise hopes that could not be fulfilled. That would not be of service to anyone. It is therefore clear that adoption of this resolution does not mean or even suggest any change in the United States position of opposition to the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund at this time. That position of my Government was made plain in my statements in the Second Committee during our discussion of this agenda item. It will continue to be the position of my Government as long as the conditions on which the position is based remain unchanged.

147. We feel that for the United Nations to act on any less realistic basis would only lead to disappointment and disillusionment and would be a disservice to the less developed countries which are looking to the United Nations for aid.

148. So far as my own Government is concerned, and as my delegation has indicated repeatedly to other delegations during our prolonged discussions on this resolution, it is my Government's view that sufficient resources would be in prospect only when there is dependable evidence that financial support in the neighbourhood of 400 or 500 million dollars in generally usable currencies will be available on an annual basis. As my delegation previously indicated and others have confirmed, this amount for capital development would

have to be in addition to the sums provided for United Nations programmes of technical assistance, including the Special Fund envisaged in this resolution.

149. It should also be made quite clear that as and when voluntary contributions by Governments become prospectively available in such amounts to make possible a multilateral fund for financing economic development it would, in the case of the United States, in all likelihood involve some shifting of funds from contributions now being made for similar purposes on a bilateral basis. We note with satisfaction the last preambular paragraph of the resolution which recognizes the fact that some Governments are not in a position to make commitments to United Nations programmes without the consent of their legislatures or on other than an annual basis. As is well known to all I think, that is the situation in my own country.

150. Our support for draft resolution C was made possible by an agreement that the annex to the resolution would not be specifically voted upon or approved by the General Assembly, just as it was not specifically voted upon or approved by the Second Committee. As the resolution itself makes clear, the annex will have no special standing different from or superior to the views and suggestions to be forwarded by Governments to the Preparatory Committee for its consideration in recommending appropriate arrangements for the Special Fund. Neither the Preparatory Committee nor any member of it, nor any Member of the United Nations, is bound by the principles set forth in the annex.

151. On the basis of these understandings, my delegation was happy to vote for the resolution, much of which, as I have said, reflects principles originally proposed by the United States. The final form was arrived at after long discussions, in which there was displayed a fine spirit of fairness and conciliation in reaching agreement to go ahead with all that the United Nations is now in a position to do in this exceedingly important field. Adoption of the resolution will be, we believe, a positive advance, a real milestone in the development of sound programmes of assistance to the less developed countries which need such assistance most.

152. The United States of America will, I can assure the Assembly, do its best, in co-operation with others, to translate the decisions embodied in this resolution into concrete actions which we deeply hope and believe will contribute substantially to helping the less developed countries to achieve for their people a better life in greater freedom, and thereby contribute also to the well-being of all peoples, and to the peace of the world.

153. Mr. JUNG (India): As my delegation had occasion to point out, both in introducing this draft resolution in the Second Committee and in explaining the delegation's vote, we arrived at the terms of the draft as a result of a compromise and of intensive discussions between groups representing two opposite points of view. Therefore my delegation stated that it was not altogether happy about the agreed conclusions, but would take them for what they represent, because they were agreed conclusions. We view the draft resolution principally from that point of view and voted in favour of it for that reason.

154. We think that it would be wrong—whether in our explanations in the General Assembly or in the expres-

sion of views outside—to go beyond the terms of the resolution itself. Words signify some meaning, and it is our view that the meaning should be clear in itself. In any case, since some newspapers here have tried to plant flags on this resolution—and I am sorry to have to refer to this—I must express the regret of my delegation at this effort, towards which I know that the principal delegations concerned have themselves not contributed, either in their speeches today or in the Second Committee. In neither body, in neither forum, has there been any effort by any delegation, on one side or the other, to plant those flags.

155. For us, this resolution stands, as the representative of France put it, as laying the foundation of the institution to which we were all aspiring. It may be that some delegations do not view, in the process of laying foundations, the other process which we have been stressing—that of staggering operations according to availability of funds. But we view it as being of the same order, as making a beginning and as laying the foundations of the institution to which we have been aspiring. That is our understanding of paragraph 1, which is different from paragraph 2, of section II. And as I submitted in the Second Committee, our understanding of paragraph 1 is that it is integrally linked with section III, and since many of us took a hand in drafting the resolution, we may be trusted to know our own intentions.

156. There have been, in the course of the explanations offered here today, some references to wordings which I do not find in the resolution, and which my delegation cannot therefore accept. For example, it has been stated that the resolution clearly lays down that the Fund established and its operations are an integral part of the technical assistance programmes. There is no such wording in the resolution itself. Another representative said, in regard to the contents of section III, that the resources prospectively available would apply to additional resources. There were discussions on that word, and the word was not accepted, and I do not find it in section III.

157. It would be wiser to confine interpretations to the wording as it stands, and although I must recognize that there may be differences of interpretation, I think that those differences need not go to the extent of adding terminology which does not exist in the draft itself.

158. For the rest, one delegation in particular laid down certain principles in connexion with the annex. As

my delegation made it clear, we ourselves are not very happy about paragraph 1 of the annex, and in the Preparatory Committee we shall have much to say about that paragraph. But I should like to emphasize the fact that the annex as a whole is born out of the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee and represents the general consensus of agreement. It is only in that sense that it has been annexed to the resolution, and delegations in the Preparatory Committee would, of course, be free to stress their views, and I presume Governments, in sending in their views, will also deal with particular matters brought up in the annex.

159. My delegation feels that it owes it to itself, to the other under-developed countries, and to the General Assembly as a whole, to say that, even though it considers that this resolution lays the foundation of the sort of institution which we wanted, while curtailing or limiting its activities on account of non-availability of sufficient funds, it will continue to strive for the further expansion of the activities of the Fund that we are establishing today.

#### AGENDA ITEM 12

#### Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter X)

##### REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/3792)

160. The PRESIDENT: In connexion with the report of the Economic and Social Council [A/3613], there is also a report of the Fifth Committee concerning chapter X [A/3792]. The draft resolution recommended in that document merely takes note of this chapter of the report of the Economic and Social Council and, since it has been unanimously recommended, I think I can assume that the draft resolution is adopted unanimously here.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

#### Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters I, VIII and IX)

161. The PRESIDENT: No specific action is required in connexion with these chapters of the report. I propose that the General Assembly should take note of chapters I, VIII and IX, of the report of the Economic and Social Council.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.