

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION  
Official Records



Thursday, 25 September 1958,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

### CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 9: General debate (continued):	
Speech by Mr. Casey (Australia) . . . . .	157
Speech by Mr. Bunaciu (Romania) . . . . .	162
Speech by Mr. Smith (Canada) . . . . .	165
Speech by Mr. Gudmundsson (Iceland) . . . . .	170
Speech by Mr. Krag (Denmark) . . . . .	174

President: Mr. Charles MALIK (Lebanon).

### AGENDA ITEM 9

#### General debate (continued)

1. Mr. CASEY (Australia): Firstly, Sir, let me take this opportunity to offer to you the sincere congratulations of the Australian delegation on your election as President of this thirteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. I am sure that you will bring to this high office, and to the service of us all, the qualities of wisdom and vision which we know so very well that you possess. You succeed as President a notable United Nations figure in the person of Sir Leslie Munro from Australia's sister country, New Zealand, and we are confident that we can look to you for the same integrity and impartiality that has been such a feature of his distinguished tenure.

2. We meet this year in a climate of world tension. People everywhere are oppressed by the danger of world war. This situation is a tragic commentary on the efforts of the United Nations over the past thirteen years. In the opening words of the Charter, this Organization was set up by "the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

3. The present situation represents a critical test for the United Nations. The immediate origin of the present tension lies in the island of Quemoy. This island is, as we know, simply one small element in much bigger differences relating to the whole China question. On this there are many views. Uncompromising positions have been taken up, and I do not think that any of us expects that unanimity can be reached on the basic issues during this session of the General Assembly.

4. But one fact stands out stark and plain: the dispute over the off-shore islands became an imminent threat endangering world peace only in the last few weeks, when Communist China began to bombard Quemoy and to threaten more drastic military action. It is this resort to force, and the threat of further force, that has brought the possibility of war. It is no less than wicked for Communist China to endanger world peace

by taking military action in respect of these islands, which in themselves do not constitute a worthy casus belli. The talks now proceeding between the United States and Chinese Communist representatives at Warsaw provide an opportunity not merely for some easing of tension, but for a considered approach to some of the fundamental questions. I hope that full advantage will be taken of the opportunities that the Warsaw talks make possible.

5. Surely we must all agree that it is criminal folly to resort to force in order to assert territorial claims. I agree completely with what the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Dulles, said in this debate last Thursday, 18 September:

"The fact is that when one régime attempts by force to take additional territory which has long been under the authority of another Government, recognized as such by a respectable part of the world community, that is a use of force which endangers world peace."  
[749th meeting, para. 28.]

6. If there is one thing more than another that the United Nations was brought into existence to do, it was to eliminate the use of force as a means of solving territorial problems. The United Nations is shot through with provisions designed to this end. All nations that join this Organization are solemnly pledged, in the words of the Charter, "to ensure...that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest".

7. The United Nations has many functions, many of which have done a great deal of good in the non-political fields. But it can be said with truth that 95 per cent of the real purpose of the United Nations is to ban the use of force for territorial ends. We have to ask ourselves if the world can continue to run the grave risk of another world conflagration that may well arise from this cause.

8. The most pressing and urgent task facing the United Nations today is to build up throughout all nations an effective recognition that the use of force to settle territorial issues will no longer be tolerated by the world community. Nothing would do more to allay the fears of our generation, and to improve the prospects of peace in the future.

9. Perhaps in particular for the countries of Asia and the Middle East, which are struggling with grave economic problems, and seeking to break the vicious circle of low productivity and poverty, the need for some positive assurance that force will not be used in territorial issues is unquestionable. It would indeed be a great tragedy if all the national effort and international aid that are being devoted to promoting their economic development were to be engulfed in war. In countries where the margin above degrading poverty and even starvation is still narrow, a conflagration arising out of the attempt to settle territorial

torial problems by force could bring immediate catastrophe and set them back a great many years.

10. The Australian Government and people are very greatly concerned with the outcome of this critical situation in view of the highly dangerous potential that it contains. However, we recognize that measures to cope with this situation lie, in the first instance, with the United States, Communist China, Nationalist China and the Soviet Union. Active negotiation is in progress. Australia does not wish to make the delicate task of negotiation more difficult by public comment or proposals at this stage. For this reason my reference on the present occasion to this grave emergency has been very brief and I shall refrain from any more detailed exposition here of Australia's attitude.

11. Apart from the Far East, the Middle East is the region where tension and unrest is making most demands on the attention of the world. I shall not however speak at any length on the Middle East during the present general debate. An emergency special session devoted entirely to the Middle East has recently concluded and the views of the Australian Government, as well as of many other Governments, were set out very fully on that occasion. We now await the report of the Secretary-General<sup>1/</sup> on his mission to the Middle East, where I understand he secured the agreement of interested Governments to certain courses of action. It seems wise to await the presentation of this report at the end of this month before making any further comments on the Middle East.

12. But there is one matter that arises out of the Middle East situation that I am moved to mention, and that is the malicious and inciting uses of radio broadcasting to encourage acts of violence in the interests of foreign Powers. We heard this morning [758th meeting] disturbing recent examples given by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom. This stream of political warfare is beamed to its immediate objective and tends not to be realized by the generality of the world community and so goes practically unnoticed except in the countries to which it is maliciously directed.

13. Surely one of the major objectives of this world Organization must be to take steps to put an end to this throwing of firebrands into dry tinder. The only authoritative world organization that must assume responsibility for such action is we ourselves, this community of the United Nations. I believe we should bend our minds and our corporate authority to devising practicable means of monitoring radio programmes in areas of tension, and methods by which this menace to peace can be arrested.

14. At the instance of Australia the General Assembly will consider the special report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary [A/3849], which met again in June 1958 following the announcement on 16 June that Imre Nagy, General Pál Maléter and two of their associates had been executed, whilst others were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. The rights of a public trial, of an impartial jury, in fact of a fair hearing of their cases, were denied, making a mockery of judicial proceedings. This latest Hungarian tragedy again shocked the nations of the free world which had been living in hope that the

present Hungarian régime would listen to the voice of world opinion expressed through the resolutions of the General Assembly, calling on the Governments of the Soviet Union and Hungary to cease their savage repression of the Hungarian people. These hopes have not been realized and all appeals to enable the creation of an atmosphere in which free elections could be held and cruel repression could be abandoned, have been ignored. Soviet forces remain in Hungary.

15. Not only have the appeals contained in the General Assembly resolutions been completely disregarded but also the General Assembly's Special Representative on the Hungarian Problem, H. R. H. Prince Wan Waihayakon, a past president of the General Assembly, was totally denied any co-operation by the Soviet and the Communist authorities in Hungary in his efforts to carry out his assignment and was even denied admission to Hungary.

16. The execution of Imre Nagy, General Pál Maléter and their two associates was an act of barbarism which no decent people could condone. It was undertaken in flagrant disregard of the solemn written promise given by Mr. Kádár on 27 November 1956, that the Hungarian régime would not start any punitive proceedings against Imre Nagy. The Soviet Union must bear a heavy responsibility for these cruel actions.

17. In its special report on the problem of Hungary issued on 14 July 1958, the Special Committee concluded that:

"The executions of Pál Maléter and Imre Nagy and their companions are striking, but unhappily not isolated, examples of the continued policy of repression carried out at the present time in Hungary..." [A/3849, para. 28.]

"...these men, symbols of the hope of a nation for freedom from foreign domination, were secretly sent to death...in violation of solemn undertakings that their persons would not be harmed, and in defiance of the judgement and opinion of the United Nations." [Ibid., annex I.]

18. In asking for the inscription on the agenda of this Assembly of an item on the situation in Hungary, the Australian Government believed that the General Assembly would wish to have an opportunity to consider the supplementary report of the Special Committee and to decide what further action it might wish to take.

19. I turn now to another field where during 1958 there has been some widening of the area of international agreement, even though important differences still remain. I refer to the law of the sea. A conference of plenipotentiaries representing approximately eighty Governments, called by the United Nations, met at Geneva from February to April of this year in an endeavour to clarify and develop the international law of the sea. The United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea had as its guide a valuable report on this subject by the International Law Commission [A/3159].

20. This Conference produced constructive achievements of great significance. Four conventions covering important areas of the law of the sea were drafted and have now been submitted to Governments. However, the Conference, despite protracted efforts, was

<sup>1/</sup> Subsequently distributed as document A/3934/Rev.1.

unable to agree on a convention fixing the important matter of the breadth of the territorial sea and the extent of the exclusive fishing rights of coastal States.

21. The failure of the Geneva Conference to reach agreement on this vital question has already given rise to disputes, which are not unlike territorial disputes in character, and in some cases attempts have been made to settle the issue unilaterally. This has been a matter of considerable concern to the Australian Government, as we consider that this is not a matter for unilateral decision and we believe that there is substantial authority for this view.

22. In 1951, the International Court of Justice laid down explicitly that the fixing of the breadth of the territorial sea was a matter not for unilateral action by individual States but for international law. The judgement of the Court contained the following reference:

"The delimitation of sea areas has always an international aspect; it cannot be dependent merely upon the will of the coastal State as expressed in its municipal law. Although it is true that the act of delimitation is necessarily a unilateral act, because only the coastal State is competent to undertake it, the validity of the delimitation with regard to other States depends upon international law."<sup>2/</sup>

23. The International Law Commission expressed in 1956 the considered view that the breadth of the territorial sea should be fixed by an international conference, for example by convention. A proposal that each State should be free to fix the limits of its territorial sea at any distance up to twelve miles was not supported at Geneva by a majority of the conference. Instead the Geneva conference has recommended to this General Assembly that the search for a basis of agreement on these matters should be resumed at a second conference.<sup>3/</sup>

24. Australia supports this wise recommendation. At Geneva the Australian delegation, together with other members of the Commonwealth, urged that there should be a "standstill agreement" until the further conference took place. We think it was unfortunate that this suggestion was not accepted. Anarchy in coastal waters is against the interests of international law and order. We urge, therefore, that the second conference should be held at an early date, as soon as sufficient preparatory work has been done to disclose the possibility of a convention along fair and acceptable lines.

25. Agreement to abandon the use of force in territorial disputes and to settle outstanding differences on the law of the sea by multilateral negotiations rather than by unilateral action backed by force, will also contribute to the solution of the disarmament problem.

26. A year ago the outlook for disarmament was very discouraging. In the past discussions have broken down, often apparently on technicalities, but in plain fact by reason of lack of mutual trust between countries, and their refusal to give up any existing advantages in

<sup>2/</sup> Fisheries Case, Judgment of December 18th, 1951: I.C.J. Reports 1951, p. 132.

<sup>3/</sup> See United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, Official Records, vol. II: Plenary Meetings (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 58.V.4, vol. II), annexes, document A/CONF.13/L.56, VIII.

return for concessions that may turn out to be illusory. At the same time, the clear possibility of mutual annihilation has driven the great Powers to continue despite the lack of progress. This determination to press on until worth-while agreement is reached is undoubtedly right. It is easy to say that there cannot be disarmament until there is mutual trust. This is true. However, the reverse is also true—that there cannot be mutual trust while the possibility of unrestrained military threat exists, particularly the risk of surprise nuclear attack. Mankind cannot achieve disarmament in one step, but we may be able to edge forward by making simultaneously several carefully chosen, co-ordinated steps. The search for arrangements to guard against surprise attack must have a high place in our efforts.

27. In spite of the continued tensions in many parts of the world, I believe the outlook for disarmament has improved since the twelfth session. During the past twelve months there have been a number of developments in the disarmament field. Some of them bring fresh problems, but on balance there has been progress. These developments include: agreement in Geneva between the representatives of the two major power blocs on the technical possibilities of detecting nuclear explosions; announcements by the Soviet Union, the United States, and the United Kingdom that they are prepared to suspend nuclear tests for the time being; subsequent arrangements to meet in Geneva in order to reach an agreement on suspension of nuclear tests; and now an agreement to begin international discussions on measures to prevent surprise attacks.

28. I would mention also the continuing breaking-down of scientific barriers and secrecy, which was carried a stage further in the Second United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held in Geneva this month. The United States and the Soviet Union have succeeded in launching artificial satellites into outer space, with obvious military implications affecting both defence and disarmament. During the year also, there has been a valuable and sobering report on radiation by the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation [A/3838].

29. All these developments indicate that things are on the move. Every opportunity must be seized. The suspension, and even the policing, of nuclear tests will give a respite, but possibly not much more than a respite. The time gained in this way must be used to work for a comprehensive agreement which will cover both nuclear and conventional forces and weapons. Our real enemy is war itself. Nuclear weapons and conventional weapons are merely the tools of war. Those of us who have served in one war or another know the frightful casualties which can be brought about by conventional weapons.

30. Consequently, progress in nuclear disarmament demands simultaneous progress in the limitation of conventional weapons and forces. Disarmament, if confined to the nuclear field, would leave many nations exposed to attack from countries which maintain mass armies or, at best, would force them to build up new conventional forces of their own, creating a grave burden to their economies and to their standards of living. This problem is particularly evident in the Far East.

31. It cannot be regarded as fanciful to continue the quest for a comprehensive agreement on disarmament. I believe we would be wholly wrong to say that because all efforts at disarmament have failed in the past, there is no chance of their succeeding in the future. International efforts towards disarmament have been given a new urgency by the threat of mutual nuclear annihilation.

32. It is not appropriate here and now to go into detail on the question of disarmament. Some views of the Australian Government have already been set out in previous meetings of the General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission. These views would be held by many, if not by all, countries represented here. Let me, however, set out a very few points.

33. Australia still believes, as we have said before, that one reason for special urgency in seeking to make progress in disarmament is that it is necessary to reach agreement while nuclear weapons are still confined to three Powers. The more Powers that have nuclear weapons and, in particular, have the capacity to manufacture them, the harder it will be to control their use. We can hope to reach agreement while only the present three Powers possess this capacity. Agreement can be reached, no doubt, if only four Powers possess it. But the chances of securing enforceable agreement diminish as further countries enter the field. The likelihood of such an increase in the number of nuclear Powers will increase as knowledge becomes more widespread and as these dreadful weapons become cheaper and easier to make. Then again, Australia feels it essential that a disarmament system must in due course cover all nations and authorities, whether or not they are Members of the United Nations or have recognition from all its Members.

34. Finally, as I announced during the twelfth session of the General Assembly in October 1957, Australia is willing to agree to the establishment in Australia of international inspection posts as part of a comprehensive agreed programme for the supervision of tests or for disarmament.

35. With regard to atomic radiation, the report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation presents in some ways a less frightening picture than some of us may have feared. But, even so, it does not reflect a situation that any of us can accept with complacency. The report shows that we have not stepped over the precipice. But the precipice is there, whether it is an inch or a mile away. One point which emerges from the report is that the exposure to radiation resulting from nuclear explosions so far, or even in the foreseeable early future, is very much less than that which arises from existing natural causes and from industrial, research and medical application for peaceful purposes. Contamination could well become more significant as the peaceful application of atomic energy proceeds. This will need international as well as national consideration. I notice that the Economic and Social Council has asked the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination to examine the possibilities of concerted action by United Nations bodies in relation to the effects of radiation resulting from the peaceful uses of atomic energy. As far as the Scientific Committee's report is relevant for national action inside Australia, we are now having it examined by the Australian National Radiation Advisory Committee. Australia is a member

of the United Nations Scientific Committee and will continue to play a part in further international work in this field by the United Nations or the specialized agencies.

36. During my remarks on disarmament, I referred to the artificial satellites. When future ages look back on the past year, it may well be that what they will remember will be the Russian and American earth-circling satellites, and not the political quarrels and tensions that loom so large in all our minds at the present time. These earth satellites not only represent a spectacular advance in technology but give promise of a great new field of scientific data about those regions of space immediately around our planet. This information about the extensive outer layers of our atmosphere, about its temperature, about the intensity of radiation at great heights, is all part of man's growing understanding of the universe.

37. In both optical and radio astronomy, the situation of Australia in the Southern Hemisphere has given us special opportunities for research of which we have taken advantage over the years. We like to believe that our Australian astronomers and, more lately, the work of the Radio Physics Division of our governmental research organization (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization), have made notable contributions to the world's knowledge in this field. In this our scientists have co-operated actively with scientists in other parts of the world, including the United States and Soviet Russia. A new giant radio telescope has been designed, and is to be built in Australia in the near future, that will be the largest and most far-reaching piece of equipment of its kind in the world.

38. Outer space beckons to us, pointing to a vast field of new knowledge, some of it frightening. We should not think only in terms of firing missiles into outer space or of space travel; there are other highly important possibilities involving cosmic rays and the harnessing or possible misuse of these and other phenomena. Some of these possibilities we may not even suspect as yet.

39. The decisions ahead of us in this field are serious. They must be met by mankind and not just by individual nations. The earth satellite was the first footprint planted in outer space. However, it still remains true that no vested interests have been established in outer space. Outer space should be recognized as a field of international concern before it is too late. Outer space cannot be regarded like the high seas, in which anyone can do as he likes outside territorial waters, and which have been the arena of competition for naval supremacy. The world's scientists have met the challenge of outer space; on the political side, we have to meet the challenge that it presents to us in our own field of competence.

40. Outer space, atomic energy and electronics are perhaps the fields in which current and coming scientific and technical advances are the most spectacular and impressive to the mind of the ordinary individual. Yet they are only part of a much wider revolution in man's position in the universe, produced by the current wave of research and invention of the past fifty years in practically every field of scientific and technical progress. In the pure sciences as well as in such applied sciences as medicine, agriculture and

engineering, the past fifty years have seen developments much greater than in the preceding thousand years. As one who has had direct contact with scientific activities and their application to the problem of production and human welfare, I am increasingly impressed by what has already been achieved by men of science, and even more so by the promise of the future. The scientific advances of the past fifty years have been dramatic, but it is even more exciting to consider the probable course of scientific development in the next fifty years, for the tide of research and invention flows ever more strongly. For the first time in human history the whole world may have within its reach the attainment of high standards of material welfare and security—provided we can live together in peace and concentrate our energies upon the co-operative application of man's advancing knowledge to the control of our physical environment.

41. With this prospect before us, science must inevitably figure to an increasing extent in the activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. Already the range of scientific activities of the United Nations family is very considerable. I need only mention in this connexion the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the World Meteorological Organization, the Technical Assistance Administration, the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation and the United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. At the same time I would stress the factor of co-operation between these specialized organizations in attacking particular problems that call for the combination of several scientific specialities. The International Geophysical Year, 1957-1958, is the greatest and most encouraging example so far of international scientific co-operation in practice unimpeded by ideological differences.

42. Nevertheless I believe that the United Nations could do still more to stimulate and encourage scientific progress and its application; and could play a still greater part in planning the strategy of scientific advance—which is particularly important when an advance on many fronts is needed, and when the world's scientific resources are unevenly distributed between countries. I should like to mention three aspects in brief.

43. First is the undertaking of research. I do not suggest that very much research can or should be done by the United Nations itself or in the specialized agencies. The great private and national research foundations and the universities should not be set aside or duplicated, but it would be useful for the United Nations to have a look at the total picture to find gaps, to look for promising openings and to look at the adequacy of the men and facilities available for research that should be undertaken.

44. Second is the dissemination of scientific knowledge and the results of research. There is often far too long a time lag between scientific discovery and its widespread dissemination and application. Not only under-developed countries suffer from this delay. Even among the advanced countries of the world, such as the United States, the United Kingdom, the countries of Western Europe, and the Soviet Union, there

is often a very long time between a discovery in one of them and its spread to another. The problem occurs inside individual countries. For example, in agricultural research it frequently takes much too long a period of time between an advance in the laboratory and its practical application by the farmer.

45. Third is the place of science in education. It is generally recognized that we need to produce more qualified scientists to meet the shortage in particular directions in so many countries of the world. But the problem of education is much wider than that. We have to recast our ideas as to what should be the proper content of a liberal or humane education. It is not enough for our educational authorities to tackle the problem by adding one more subject to the curriculum, or of pushing in a science subject and taking out one of the humanities. This is not the answer because, just as I believe that no one is educated who does not know something about science, so too I believe that no one is educated who knows nothing but science.

46. These questions all fall in varying and sometimes overlapping ways within the sphere of the United Nations and some of the specialized agencies. All these bodies have given the natural sciences and research some attention. But I believe that a more concerted approach is needed. The body to do this, I think, is the Economic and Social Council, which under the Charter has the responsibility of co-ordinating the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. This task could well be made to fit in with the decision of the Economic and Social Council this year that there should be appraisals of the programmes of specialized agencies for the period 1959 to 1964. In view of the relatively little attention given in the past to the idea of a concerted approach in the field of natural science, Australia considers that the Economic and Social Council might well give it priority for 1959.

47. The stage has now been reached when, I believe, the General Assembly should request the Economic and Social Council to examine the role of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in relation to the advance of science and to consider methods of stimulating research in most needed directions, and also methods of achieving a wider application, dissemination and understanding of new discoveries, taking account of the great inequalities that exist in the scientific resources of various countries. When the report of the Economic and Social Council [A/3848] is being discussed by the Assembly in committee, the Australian delegation intends to develop this theme.

48. I should like to turn briefly to the voluntary international aid programmes of the United Nations. It is through these programmes that all States Members of the United Nations are given the opportunity to demonstrate in a positive and practical way their support for the objectives of the Organization in the economic and social fields. I am glad to be able to state that Australia's continuing interest in these programmes will be maintained this coming year.

49. Specifically, Australia will make available a total of over \$1.5 million, including the following activities: Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance (for mid-1959), \$625,000; United Nations Children's Fund (for 1958), \$502,000; United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in

the Near East (for the twelve months ending 30 June 1959), \$190,000; United Nations Refugee Fund (for 1958), \$112,000.

50. Apart from these programmes, Australia will continue to make the substantial contributions of the equivalent of \$10 million to the Colombo Plan for economic development and technical assistance to all the countries of South and South-East Asia. Amongst other things, we are increasing this year the number of Asian trainees in Australia under the Colombo Plan from 800 to 950. This is in addition to over 5,000 private Asian students who are now at Australian universities and other educational establishments.

51. On every relevant occasion for a number of years, I have missed no opportunity to stress the need for the major producing and consuming countries to get together, in an effort to work out commodity understandings in order to moderate excessive short-term fluctuations in prices. Once again I bring this most important subject to the notice of this world community, in the sincere hope that something positive will be done about it.

52. We have seen in recent times the disastrous results of lack of stability and predictability of commodity prices, particularly on the economies of the countries, including my own country, Australia, and a number of our friends in South-East Asia, that are largely dependent on the export of a limited range of primary products and commodities.

53. Surely we cannot let the lessons in this regard of the past twelve months in particular go unheeded. There are countries in South and South-East Asia that have lost considerably more in export income through the drop in the prices of their exported commodities without a corresponding drop in the prices they have to pay for their imports. This deterioration in their balance of trade is much more than the very considerable sums that they have had in economic aid from the United States and other countries. We should not have to wait until this process results in some economic catastrophe before taking some action.

54. The tin situation is one example of what I have in mind with regard to South-East Asia. I might add in this regard that Australia, for its part, stands ready to enter into any consultations to restore stability in the tin position and to avoid any permanent breach of the International Tin Agreement.

55. For a great many commodities there is already international machinery in being which can be used for pursuing commodity studies. Australia, as a producer, is greatly interested in sugar, wheat, and now lead and zinc. As a consumer we are now ready to join with our producing friends in Asia in any consultations intended to help to moderate excessive price fluctuations in commodities to achieve greater predictability in export earnings and thereby a sounder basis for investment in development.

56. Even now, as I am speaking, Australia's Minister for Trade is putting forward this matter at the Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference at Montreal. He will be citing the devastating experience of many countries of the Commonwealth in recent times to demonstrate the need for urgent action to smooth out the curves of price fluctuations which have

had such crippling effects on their development plans and on their economies generally.

57. Closely related to this is the fact that many of the actions of the great Powers that alter the terms of trade in respect to any particular commodity have an effect—and sometimes a devastating effect—far beyond their own borders. The trade of the world is so closely integrated between many countries—producers and consumers—that when an existing balance is affected, the result may be highly detrimental to others. Such action may not be taken by a great Power with this intention—I am quite sure it is not—but it is often the result of domestic pressures. But the repercussions on the producing countries are no less devastating for that. We can only hope that the effect of such action on the economies of friendly countries will be taken fully into account before these policies are put into effect.

58. Very valuable studies in relation to this and related problems have already been undertaken in the Economic and Social Council, in various specialized agencies and in the regional economic commissions. Among the latter, the commission which covers the area in which Australia is most immediately concerned, that is, the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE), has made considerable progress in such work. Australia has taken the keenest interest in the activities of ECAFE since its inception, and is glad to note its solid accomplishments. We are particularly pleased that ECAFE has decided to hold its 1959 session in Australia. Arrangements have been made for the session to be held near Southport in Queensland, Australia, in March 1959, when we shall look forward to welcoming the representatives of all Member States as well as Mr. Philippe de Seynes, Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs. We hope very much that the 1959 session of ECAFE will effectively carry forward the Commission's work and make its contribution to furthering the economic stability and prosperity of the countries which are our closest neighbours.

59. The ground that I have attempted to cover reflects the paradoxical situation of the world today. On the one hand, man's creative activity is bursting out into entirely new and challenging fields, such as atomic energy and outer space, where man has never ventured before. But, on the other hand, we are still gravely preoccupied with national rivalries and threats of war. The tragic possibility exists that we may fumble the ball and that the very instrument which opens up vast new horizons of constructive peaceful use—that is, nuclear power—might, if wrongly used, bring the world down in flames. The responsibility for seeing that this does not occur belongs to us, rather than to the scientists.

60. I began what I have had to say today with a reference to the paramount need to avoid any resort to force to settle territorial disputes, and I end on this theme. Once fighting begins, one can never be sure where it will end, who will be drawn in, or what frightful weapons may be used. Whatever territorial differences may exist, let every nation, above all things, resolve not to initiate the use of force as a means of resolving them.

61. Mr. BUNACIU (Romania) (translated from French): The agenda of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly includes problems of great im-

portance to international relations. It reflects the interest of mankind as a whole in disarmament (especially with a view to averting the danger of an atomic disaster), in the relaxation of international tension, in recognition of the legitimate right of self-determination of the peoples of Cyprus and Algeria, in economic progress in the less developed countries, and in other major problems.

62. However, the Romanian delegation believes that the General Assembly should give special attention to those actions which are a direct and immediate threat to international peace and security and which, by their unusual nature, face the United Nations with a grave choice. Within a period of only two months there have been assembled in two different parts of the world, in the Middle East and in the Pacific, enormous concentrations of naval and air forces, units fully equipped with modern weapons, including nuclear weapons and rockets. In both cases warships and strategic bombers, paratroop units and land forces were brought thousands of miles from military bases in four continents. No one can doubt that these military measures constitute the carrying out of the "brink of war" policy formulated some time ago by the Secretary of State of the United States. We have the right to ask where such large-scale military action is likely to lead, and how it should be viewed by the United Nations.

63. First, we must observe that both the exceptional military measures taken by the United States and the United Kingdom in the Middle East and those taken by the United States in the Far East run counter to the United Nations Charter. The authors of these exceptional military measures did not hesitate to invoke the Charter, in an attempt to legalize illegal acts and make black seem white and white black.

64. The lack of any basis or consistency in the attempts made to justify the armed intervention by the United States in Lebanon and by the United Kingdom in Jordan has been demonstrated both by the debates during the third emergency special session and by the events that have taken place in those two Arab countries.

65. As for the events in the Far East, not a day passes without comment from politicians and statesmen all over the world, and even in the United States, on the inconsistency and the lack of principle or veracity in the reasons advanced by the American leaders for their action.

66. The Secretary of State of the United States has stated before this Assembly the two political and legal arguments on which the United States position is based.

67. The first, according to Mr. Dulles, is that "the Chinese Communist régime has never during its nine years of existence exercised authority over Taiwan, the Penghus or the islands of Quemoy and Matsu" [749th meeting, para. 24]. Although this argument is advanced as unanswerable, the whole world knows that it is only American intervention and the support given by the United States to its lackey Chiang Kai-shek which have prevented the reunification of the Chinese territory and the restoration of these islands to the People's Republic of China.

68. The former Secretary of State Mr. Acheson, Mr. Dulles' predecessor, has shown the inconsistency of this argument. On 6 September 1958 he said:

"The important fact is that always, until the present civil war, the off-shore islands—Quemoy, Little Quemoy and Matsu—have been controlled by the same power which controlled the adjacent coast. These, whatever may be said of Formosa, are the coastal islands, as are Long Island, Staten Island and Martha's Vineyard. Their population is minimal. The only purpose of their being held by a force hostile to the mainland government is to block the mainland harbour of Amoy, and to offer a threat as an invasion base."

The first argument advanced by the United States does not hold water. It is contested not only in all other parts of the world but even in the United States itself.

69. Mr. Dulles' second argument is that the Chinese Communist Government is seeking to extend its authority to this area by the use of force. It is claimed that to do so would be to violate the principles on which international order is based. That argument is equally weak because it is applied to an internal problem in which no outsider has the right to interfere. No one denied that the Indonesian Government had the right to put its own house in order when rebel forces gathered in one or other of the islands belonging to Indonesia and rose against the Government in power. The fact that certain foreign Powers supported these rebels did not change and cannot in any way change the basic facts of the problem, since this was a problem to be settled by the Indonesian people, and by them alone.

70. The history of the founding of modern States, including that of the United States of America, abounds with similar examples. They should be continually borne in mind, as there are some who are attempting to create confusion between the internal problems of States and problems that involve their international relations. The Charter of the United Nations and the rules of international law are clear on this point. Thus it is no mere coincidence that those who have decided to flout those rules have preferred to by-pass the United Nations.

71. In spite of the differences which admittedly exist between the situation in the Strait of Taiwan and that in Lebanon and Jordan, it is necessary to stress that the real reasons behind the United States action in these two areas are the same in both cases. In both areas the United States has resorted to armed force in order to interfere in the internal affairs of certain States and to support Governments subservient to it, in defiance of the will of the people.

72. Denial of the right of peoples to organize their own life in accordance with their interests and aspirations, intervention by armed force in order to prevent them from enjoying their rights and to impose on them a subservient government—that is the essence of the doctrine underlying the activities of the United States in the Near East and in the Strait of Taiwan. Clearly the application of that doctrine would throw the door wide open to arbitrary and capricious behaviour in international relations.

73. In a period of history which is so characterized by the national rebirth of many peoples, and by the creation and development of new independent States, encouragement of such a doctrine in the international sphere could only serve to create a source of increasingly grave and ever-multiplying disputes, with

disastrous consequences for mankind. The Romanian delegation believes that the General Assembly has a duty to reject this doctrine as being incompatible with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter.

74. In this connexion, it is a source of profound concern throughout the world that the terms of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its third emergency special session [resolution 1237 (ES-III)] relating to the withdrawal of American and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan have not yet been carried out.

75. During the period that has elapsed since the third emergency special session, events in the Near East have shown once more that the reasons advanced by the United States and the United Kingdom to justify their military intervention are nothing but pretexts. The true cause of the tension in the Near East lies in Anglo-American interference in the internal affairs of the Arab States, in the corruption which the United States and the United Kingdom have organized there, and in the discord and intrigues that they encourage there in order to ensure for themselves an influence in the public life of the Arab States that will give them a free hand in exploiting the oil resources of the area.

76. As regards the unceasing United States intervention in the internal affairs of the Chinese people, and, in particular, the military measures taken recently and the provocation of the Chinese people by American militarists acting in league with their agent Chiang Kai-shek, the Romanian delegation wishes to stress the extremely dangerous nature of the situation brought about in the Taiwan Strait and the incalculable consequences which this may have. Any day and at any hour all these actions may kindle a conflagration in the Pacific that would have catastrophic consequences for mankind. The Pacific area in fact provides mankind with a vivid illustration of the "brink of war" policy in action.

77. The Romanian delegation, like other delegations, is hopeful of the outcome of the Chinese-American discussions taking place at Warsaw. Nevertheless it cannot be overlooked that while, on the one hand, the People's Republic of China maintains a calm sense of responsibility and a truly exemplary patience, units of the Seventh Fleet and of the American Air Force are taking increasingly provocative action, the aggressive preparations on the island of Taiwan are being intensified, and press reports emanating from American military commands indicate that an attack on the People's Republic of China is imminent.

78. There is at present much talk of the need for bringing about a cease-fire in the Strait of Taiwan. What cease-fire is being referred to, however, and between what parties? Some say between the People's Republic of China and the United States. But the People's Republic of China is not at war with the United States, so how can the two countries agree on a cease-fire? In China we have not two countries at war, but a conflict which is entirely and exclusively Chinese. No one has the right to interfere in the internal affairs of China, not even the United Nations.

79. What then is the solution to this situation? The only possible solution is to put an end to all United States intervention in the internal affairs of China, and first of all to the intervention of American armed forces in Chinese territory, i.e., the American forces

stationed on the coastal islands, the Pescadores and Taiwan, and to leave the Chinese themselves to settle their own affairs. That is the only solution in accordance with international morality and the provisions of the Charter.

80. In the circumstances, it is not surprising that the United States should have feared a large-scale debate in the General Assembly on the question of the representation of China. It is also significant that those who voted in favour of the United States proposal which aimed to prevent discussion at this session of the question of the representation of China have prudently avoided explaining their votes to the Assembly. There is a conscience of mankind which cannot be entirely disregarded.

81. This deliberate avoidance of any discussion reflects the flagrant contradiction which has arisen between the foreign policy of the United States and the United Nations, whose task it is to defend international peace and security. The contrast between the actions of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations is too blatant to be hidden, nor can the contrast between aggression and the interests of peace be concealed. To use the words of the Charter, we might say that the actions of the United States in the Pacific region are incompatible with those of a "peace-loving country".

82. The Romanian delegation shares the view of those representatives who emphasized that disarmament continues to be one of the chief problems before the General Assembly at this session.

83. Although the question of disarmament, at this session, must be discussed at a time when three of the great Powers—the United States, the United Kingdom and France—are engaged in military actions, the Romanian delegation believes that, in the period which has elapsed since the twelfth session, a groundwork has been laid which will make it possible to take this matter up within the United Nations in a more specific and effective manner.

84. First of all, it has become clear that our debates, as well as the talks on disarmament, can be fruitful only if the legitimate interests of all parties in their own security are taken into account, without one side seeking to obtain advantages at the expense of the other. This principle of justice should be reflected in the composition of the United Nations organs concerned with disarmament as well as in the composition of the delegations which take part in the meetings between statesmen, diplomats or experts.

85. It is an accepted fact that certain measures can be dissociated from the general question of disarmament measures and can be discussed and adopted separately, if they are immediately applicable and if the method does not entail insuperable practical difficulties. Experience has shown that any other course is tantamount to deliberately preventing the adoption of any measure of disarmament. On the other hand, the acceptance of only a partial measure of disarmament opens the way for wider agreement, contributes to the relaxation of international tension and answers the unanimous wishes of the people.

86. In this connexion, the Romanian delegation considers that the fact that the USSR has put forward three separate items on this matter offers the As-



assembly a concrete and positive basis for discussion and for the reaching of practical conclusions.

87. First, the time is ripe for the adoption of a decision on the question of the discontinuance of nuclear tests.

88. Secondly, the reduction of the military budgets of the great Powers by 10 to 15 per cent and the use of the funds thus set free for peaceful economic purposes will answer the unanimous desire of the peoples of the world.

89. Thirdly, the banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes, the elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries and international co-operation in the study of cosmic space are measures of the highest importance for the security of all States and would give new impetus to cosmic research.

90. Romania, as a State which has American bases close to its territory, is particularly interested in the adoption of such measures, and accordingly its delegation will support the adoption of specific recommendations on all these points.

91. Lastly, we believe that in the highly controversial question of control, a new and extremely significant fact has come into play. The Conference of Experts on the question of the control of nuclear tests<sup>4/</sup> has shown that even in such a complicated field as this, effective means and methods of control can be established, thus obviously shattering one of the chief screens behind which the opponents of disarmament were accustomed to hide their real intentions.

92. In the opinion of the Romanian delegation, the disarmament question offers a real opportunity to pass from words to deeds. The main prerequisite for this is that all the great Powers should demonstrate a desire to take this decisive step. We believe that the General Assembly can play an active role in this connexion.

93. The Romanian delegation greets with satisfaction the Czechoslovak delegation's proposal [A/3847 and Add.1] to have the present session discuss practical measures aimed at implementation of the principle of peaceful coexistence among States, regardless of their political or social systems.

94. Romania, as a European State, is deeply interested in seeing established, first of all, conditions which will lead to a relaxation of international tension and to peaceful coexistence in Europe. Although the attention of the United Nations is now concentrated upon the situation in the Far East and in the Near and Middle East, we believe that this is no reason for regarding the problem of European security as having ceased to be one of the most important questions in the present world situation. The only rational method of guaranteeing European security is the adoption of measures which will lead gradually to the reduction of armed forces and armaments and their withdrawal behind national frontiers and the organization of general co-operation among European States in accordance with the principles of peaceful coexistence.

<sup>4/</sup> Conference of Experts to Study the Possibility of Detecting Violations of a Possible Agreement on the Suspension of Nuclear Tests, held in Geneva from 1 July to 21 August 1958.

Proof that this method corresponds to the real aspirations of the European people may be found in the wide support secured by the recent decisions of those countries which signed the Warsaw Treaty regarding the reduction of military forces and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Romania, and the proposal for a non-aggression pact between the Warsaw Treaty countries and those belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

95. The Romanian Government supports the new proposals of the German Democratic Republic on the unification of Germany, and considers that the arming of the restful West Germans is a serious threat to the peace of Europe.

96. In our view, the Soviet Union's proposal on the conclusion of a treaty of friendship and co-operation among the European States represents a synthesis of the constructive ideas recently put forward with a view to guaranteeing European security. The Romanian Government has declared itself in favour of the conclusion of such a treaty and will continue to do all that it can to bring about the adoption of measures whereby European security will be guaranteed.

97. The Romanian Government attaches particular importance to the questions of the normalization of economic relations between States and the free flow of international trade. This normalization would make it possible to create optimum conditions for the economic and social advancement of the people and for raising their well-being to the level made feasible by the discoveries of science and modern technology. This would be in line with the interest of States as well as that of all peoples and would help to improve the international atmosphere. This goal would be more easily attained if all States could agree on a certain number of principles to govern their economic relations.

98. The Romanian delegation's actions at the twelfth session were governed by this principle and we believe that the favourable reception given by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council to the proposal that such a set of rules should be drawn up confirms the usefulness and timeliness of such a suggestion. The Romanian delegation will continue, during the present session, to support any appropriate steps which may help to bring this about.

99. Lastly, may I express the hope that an awareness of the grave danger which the pursuit of a policy of force contrary to the Charter represents for all mankind, a proper appreciation of the process of establishment and consolidation of new States, and a reaffirmation of the principles of peaceful coexistence will allow this present session, through the joint efforts of all Member States, to reach a successful conclusion.

100. Mr. SMITH (Canada): The prime purpose of the United Nations in its present phase of development is the pursuit of peaceful settlement and peaceful change not by force but by reconciliation. In this process the general debate with which we open our proceedings each year has an important function. It provides an invaluable opportunity for a broad exchange of views on the international situation and on the specific tasks with which our Organization is faced. In the world of today it is not surprising that these declarations of policy by nations great and small demonstrate a wide

divergence of views as to the methods by which our problems might be resolved in achieving the noble aims of the Charter. This clash of policies—this urging of certain courses of action as good and the denunciation, sometimes in heated terms, of other courses of action as bad—which takes place in this forum does, I believe, serve a purpose which is far greater than the mere publication to the world of national policies of Member States. This debate, this exchange of views, is a part of the process of negotiation and conciliation, a part of our efforts to ensure international security. I desire in this spirit to express to the Assembly a Canadian view on some of those matters which we have on our agenda.

101. It is only a few weeks since we met together here in emergency special session to discuss the situation in the Middle East. We look forward to receiving from the Secretary-General a report on the implementation of the Assembly's resolution of 21 August 1958 adopted at the conclusion of that session [resolution 1237 (ES-III)]. I do not wish to say anything which would anticipate the Secretary-General's report, but I do think that we should consider briefly what lessons, what guidance, may be derived from our recent experience in the third emergency special session in order to help us in dealing with the many topics, covering all quarters of the world, which are before us at this session.

102. We recall first that the General Assembly which met in emergency special session last month was a deeply divided and anxious body, many of whose members felt that their interests were vitally at stake in the proceedings. The discussion was, in general, reasoned and moderate in tone; and, as we all know, the result was a resolution adopted unanimously, to the credit of all member nations. There are grave subjects on our agenda now on which opinion is also deeply divided, but surely we can hope and expect that the debate on these subjects can be conducted with a similar lack of polemics and with a similarly reasoned approach. The third emergency special session has shown us that this is possible, and it has provided an example—I think an outstanding example—of the ability of the United Nations, in the words of the Secretary-General last year [A/3594/Add.1, p. 3], to "serve a diplomacy of reconciliation" and, so to speak, "to blunt the edges of conflict among the nations". The Secretary-General has defined the United Nations as "an instrument for negotiation among, and to some extent for, Governments". The adoption of the resolution of 21 August, submitted by the Arab States, was a recognition that this "instrument for negotiation" is beginning—perhaps more than beginning—to constitute a separate entity which is somewhat more than the sum of its eighty-one parts, something to which the nations can turn when other more traditional means of negotiation and mediation are exhausted.

103. The "practical arrangements" which the Secretary-General was requested to make under the terms of the resolution of 21 August to uphold the Purposes and Principles of the Charter may necessitate some innovation and improvisation in the development of United Nations representation appropriate to the circumstances. It is perhaps symbolic of the shift in world opinion in the face of the awful means of destruction that this latest United Nations initiative appears to foreshadow a civilian—a diplomatic and political—

approach rather than a military approach on the model of some of the other bodies of the United Nations already functioning in the Middle East.

104. We must not, of course, be too optimistic in our assessment of the achievements of the third emergency special session. No one will draw the conclusion from the events of that session that the mere entrusting of responsibility for negotiation to a United Nations organism or official is in itself any assurance of abiding success, and we do not yet know the outcome of the protracted and very difficult negotiations which the Secretary-General has been conducting in the Middle East.

105. Nevertheless, the third emergency special session did produce a *détente*, a marked relaxation of tension. It also laid down or reaffirmed certain principles to guide the countries of the area in maintaining this *détente*. We must hope that the countries concerned will continue scrupulously to abide by these principles; other Members of the United Nations can also encourage them to do so by persuasion, by reassurance, by exercising restraint and by adhering themselves to the general principles outlined in the resolution, both in this and other areas of the world.

106. Let me emphasize this point again. It seems to my delegation that the noteworthy fact of this United Nations endeavour to serve the cause of peace in the Middle East is this. We have seen the parties to a dispute willingly and spontaneously joining together, with the unanimous assent of the international community, to entrust to a third party, the representative of the United Nations, a task which they had been unable, in their normal relations with one another, to accomplish. We may indeed find this a valuable precedent for future action. Perhaps I shall be able later to draw some parallel between the results of our discussions at the third special emergency session and some of the vital problems which will undoubtedly confront us at the present session.

107. Representatives have referred to the situation in the Far East and, in our view, it is both appropriate and necessary that the United Nations should pay attention to the danger that the conflict in the Taiwan Strait might spread to engulf more than the Chinese off-shore islands. We should then be faced with a very serious threat indeed to the peace of the world. I record that the Prime Minister of Canada, speaking in Parliament on 6 September 1958, said that he thought that people wanted to be assured that nothing would be left undone to prevent any action which might result in the world sliding into disaster. And he suggested that it might devolve upon the United Nations to exercise responsibility in this direction.

108. I think that we were all encouraged by the fact that the representatives of the United States and the Peking Government resumed direct negotiations with one another through conversations between their ambassadors in Warsaw. We still hope very earnestly that this quarrel can be settled peacefully, rather than through a resort to force, with all its parlous consequences.

109. There is, of course, another side to the matter. Peace cannot be won by giving way to force. That is a lesson which people of my generation anyway learned at heavy cost and we cannot afford to forget that lesson. Negotiations, if they are to mean anything, must

not be conducted under the duress of concurrent aggressive military actions. If, therefore, the leaders of the Peking Government wish to take advantage of the possibility of arrangements for a peaceful solution of the present dispute over disposition of the off-shore islands being made as a result of negotiations, they must be prepared to enter into an agreement to desist from the use of force. But I am bound to say that such a solution would be also greatly helped by a disposition to abandon the threat of force and the techniques of force by the Nationalist Government as well. If one is to condemn the use of force, one must also condemn provocations to the use of force.

110. We have looked with hope, therefore, to the Warsaw negotiations to arrest the dangerous drift towards war in the Far East. If, unhappily, we should be disappointed in this, I think we would come to the point when the United Nations must recognize the existence of a serious threat to the peace and examine in what way it could use its good offices to avert a conflagration in the Far East. Such a threat to peace indeed cannot be ignored by the Security Council if bilateral negotiations fail.

111. The Security Council might itself hear the views of the contending parties, or it might be more appropriate in this delicate situation to make use of one or other of the various methods of seeking agreement by private discussion which the United Nations has found effective in the past. I doubt, however, if a contentious debate in this chamber on that delicate situation would be of present help in the circumstances.

112. The first necessity is, of course, to put a stop to the firing of guns and other warlike activities. For, so long as the off-shore islands are subjected to active blockade and the defenders convoy in their supplies against the blockade, it is obvious that even an accidental armed clash might precipitate a general conflict, even—and this is the tragedy of it—if no one desired it. Surely it is not beyond our power or our will to find the basis of a cease-fire agreement under equitable conditions which would give some assurance that peaceful negotiation of the disposition of the islands would in fact take place.

113. If the Warsaw talks fail, such steps are, to my mind, immediately thereafter imperative. We believe also that thought must now be given by all concerned to look beyond the issue of the off-shore islands and to endeavour to unravel the twisted situation which has produced the present crisis off the China coast. A peaceful solution of the dispute over the Chinese off-shore islands should be a first encouraging step in this direction. The primary responsibility for the distrust and conflict which are at the root of the trouble in Eastern Asia lies in the Communist record of aggressive and arrogant behaviour towards those who are not of their persuasion, and I point out, I emphasize, and I stress, that there is a record which can only, in small part, be excused by reference to the past sins of other imperialisms. We dare not forget the past and present activities of Chinese communism, in Korea, for example, and throughout other parts of Southern Asia. Nevertheless, the adjustments necessary for peaceful solutions require us all to examine the contributions which each and every Member of the Assembly can make towards reconciliation.

114. Along with other speakers, I am going to refer now to disarmament. The small brush fire can easily

become a widespread conflagration. The point has been laboured so often that we are in danger of accepting it as a fact of life and not as something which we must avert at all cost. The sacrifice, not just of sovereignty but of historic conceptions of national policy, is essential if we are to move now towards disarmament. It is foolish to tarry with the argument as to whether disarmament must precede or follow the reduction of political conflicts and tensions. The fact is, as Mr. Casey of Australia indicated a few months ago, that we must move simultaneously along both lines.

115. Despite an uncompromising situation at the conclusion of the twelfth session, the course of events in 1958 has been such as to encourage those Governments which, like mine, hope to find greater security through an agreed programme of disarmament. The regular processes of negotiation within the United Nations were unfortunately disrupted by the refusal of the Soviet Union to participate in the work of the Disarmament Commission. We deplored that Soviet decision last year and we did so with a deeper conviction by reason of the efforts which we from Canada made, in co-operation with other delegations, to reconstitute the Commission in a way which would warrant the approval of the vast majority of the Members of the United Nations. We continue to regret that decision of the USSR, not only because it has meant that no negotiations within the United Nations have taken place, but also because it was an additional illustration of the slight regard in which the Soviet Union holds resolutions, passed with large majorities, of the General Assembly. It is the hope of the Canadian delegation that when our discussions at this session have come to an end the Soviet Union will have adopted a less intransigent position.

116. Notwithstanding these procedural difficulties within the United Nations, there have been concrete negotiations through other channels. We all take satisfaction from the fact that agreed conclusions were reached at the Conference of Experts to Study the Possibility of Detecting Violations of a Possible Agreement on the Suspension of Nuclear Tests, held in Geneva during July and August 1958. We in Canada were pleased to play some part in those discussions. We have welcomed the statements of the USSR [A/3904], the United States [A/3895] and the United Kingdom [A/3896] that negotiations by their representatives would begin on 31 October on the suspension of nuclear weapons tests and the actual establishment of a control system on the basis of the unanimous report of the experts.

117. We look forward to an agreement among the three Powers which have conducted nuclear tests. An agreement which would call for the implementation of a system along the lines which the experts have concluded to be feasible would directly affect many countries, not only those which have engaged in nuclear tests. We would expect that, if a basis for agreement is evolved by the three Powers, suitable arrangements would be made for other Governments to put forward their views with respect to the distribution and operation of the control system. But it will be necessary for us, in so doing, to face the logic of the inescapable fact that these arrangements must apply to countries in Europe and Asia which do not normally participate in United Nations bodies.

118. The Canadian Government regards the development regards the developments which have taken place with respect to nuclear tests as an encouraging start towards a realistic programme of disarmament. We look forward to early arrangements for additional discussions on the technical plane to provide safeguards against the dangers of surprise attack. In our view, the value of a technical approach to specific disarmament problems in a step-by-step programme has demonstrated its worth, and we hope that the procedure may be extended to additional subjects. Such a course would be in keeping with resolution 1148 (XII) which the General Assembly adopted in 1957 and which specifically recommended the establishment of groups of technical experts. An obvious example of a question involving technical considerations to an important extent is the problem of ensuring that outer space is used exclusively for peaceful and scientific purposes. This is indeed an urgent problem, and we have before us as a warning and a guide our experience with respect to the problem of nuclear weapons, the solution of which has become increasingly difficult with the passage of time.

119. We are encouraged that progress is being made, and we are not disposed to question the procedures under which progress has been made possible. It is nevertheless our view, and I express the hope that this view will be shared by all delegations, that the specialized discussions which are in prospect should in some way be brought more closely within the United Nations framework—without interfering, of course, with the prospects of their success.

120. The Conference of Experts in Geneva had the advantage of the services of the United Nations Secretariat. Moreover, we have before us in the form of a United Nations document the report of the experts [A/3897 and Corr.1]. But it is a fact that the experts attending the Geneva Conference submitted their reports to their respective Governments and not to the United Nations. I trust that means suited to this purpose will be agreed upon during the course of this session so that the continuing interest of the United Nations, the continuing concern of the United Nations, in the topic of disarmament may be formally safeguarded. Agreement among the great Powers is, of course, fundamental in achieving disarmament, but there is a general world interest beyond that of the major countries involved which can find best expression and satisfaction only through the United Nations.

121. Reference has been made today on several occasions to the proposal of the United States [A/3902] to set up an ad hoc committee to study the potentialities for international collaboration in the peaceful use of outer space and to make recommendations for action by the United Nations. I should like to record here again the views of the Canadian Government. The Prime Minister of Canada spoke recently of the desirability of establishing an international space agency which would assure that jurisdiction in outer space, so far as it is possible for man to exercise that jurisdiction, would be vested in the United Nations and would ensure its use only for peaceful and scientific purposes. We in Canada have been devoting attention to the possibilities of international collaboration, and we desire to share the results of our studies with any committee which the General Assembly may decide to establish.

122. Reference was made by my Australian colleague to the law of the sea. It will be recalled that, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 1105 (XI) of 21 February 1957, eighty-six nations gathered in Geneva in February 1958 to attend the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. Very significant results indeed were reached at this Conference on a wide variety of questions, and the four conventions which were drawn up by the Conference may be said to constitute a code of almost the whole range of maritime law; those conventions stand out as one of the most notable achievements in the recent history of international law. Unfortunately, no agreement could be reached by a two-thirds majority vote of the Conference on the difficult and exceedingly important questions of the breadth of the territorial sea and of a coastal State's right to a contiguous fishing zone.

123. The representatives in this General Assembly are undoubtedly aware that recent events in the North Atlantic area have dramatically, if not dangerously, demonstrated the great and dire necessity of reaching agreement on a rule of law for those questions. I think that it is beyond dispute that there is, as illustrated in this area, an urgent need for the adoption by the international community of nations of a rule of law which can serve to reconcile the conflicting interests of various States and which can command the respect of all nations. The present situation regarding the law of the sea cannot be allowed to deteriorate further.

124. At Geneva, the Canadian delegation put forward a proposal<sup>5/</sup> which in its final form would have given States the right to fix their territorial sea up to six miles and a fishing zone contiguous to their territorial sea extending twelve miles from the baselines from which the territorial sea is measured, in which zone the coastal State would have the same rights in respect of fishing as it has in its territorial sea. Believing as we do that extension of the territorial sea should be curtailed as much as possible in the interests of the freedom of the sea and freedom of air navigation, we considered that this proposal would meet the growing concern among coastal States for their off-shore fisheries and at the same time obviate the need to extend the territorial sea. It is the goal of the Canadian Government to see such a clear and, may I suggest, easily applied formula established as a rule of law.

125. One of the items to be found on the agenda will be the question of the advisability of convening a second United Nations Conference on the law of the sea to deal with those matters left unsettled at Geneva. My delegation is convinced that the international community of nations can reach a satisfactory solution in another conference. We believe that the best way is to convene that conference as soon as possible and as soon as is practicable. We intend to give our full support to that recommendation<sup>6/</sup> which has come to us from the Conference held in Geneva last winter.

126. I would refer to another matter, and that has to do with the United Nations peace machinery. In the course of our deliberations here we will undoubtedly consider an item proposed by the Secretary-General

<sup>5/</sup> See United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, Official Records, vol. III: First Committee (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 58.V.4, vol. III), annex, document A/CONF.13/C.1/L.77/Rev.3.

<sup>6/</sup> See note 3.

on the experience of the United Nations Emergency Force and the lessons which might be derived therefrom for future United Nations Policy. We shall consider with great interest the views of our Secretary-General, whose remarkable accomplishments in setting up various kinds of United Nations agencies in this field should inspire us to work hard to further the aims as so well set out by him on other occasions. He has indeed been a pioneer in this field, and I hope that action by us on the basis of his comments or recommendations may enable us to give him more adequate support when we call on him again—as I am sure we will have to call on him, whether it be in the immediate future or later, through the months and years.

127. The Members of this Organization are aware that Canada has consistently supported the United Nations Emergency Force. We have supported and advocated its maintenance because it has been effective and we are confident that it will continue to be effective in bringing and maintaining stability in that area. A glance at the figures regarding incidents which are contained in the Secretary-General's report of 27 August 1958 on the United Nations Emergency Force [A/3899] will illustrate well my point. Not only has the Force been able to prevent a resurgence of violence and bloodshed along the Armistice Demarcation line, but also, by so doing, I believe, and my delegation believes, that it has contributed towards a final and durable settlement of the problems in that area.

128. Canada would welcome a renewed effort in the direction of more permanent and effective arrangements to meet the requirements of the United Nations. I do not suggest that our summary study in connexion with the Secretary-General's report should necessarily constitute the basis for the creation of a permanent United Nations force of the Emergency Force type. Clearly the employment of such a Force would not be appropriate in every conceivable emergency situation. However, we think the experience derived from the Force should serve as a starting point and a useful guide to the drawing up of a blueprint for effective United Nations action to meet various future contingencies. We recognize and realize that these contingencies are many and varied and that it is not simple or even perhaps desirable to try and specify them.

129. It is just as important, however, to study the precedents set for us by those United Nations emergency agencies, none of which could be described as a Force. While in certain circumstances something of the proportions of the United Nations Emergency Force may be required, it is often better to make use of the truce-supervision type of body or something along the line of the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon. We Canadians have also had a good deal of experience in these agencies both under United Nations auspices and in the international supervisory commissions in Indo-China and we believe firmly in their effectiveness under proper conditions. It is worthy of note that the officers of the commissions in Indo-China have now completed four years of collaboration with the authorities of the countries in that area and they have done so without carrying arms of any kind. The moral authority of an international commission, carrying with it the sanction of the United Nations, should not be underestimated.

130. The need for flexibility in our approach to breaches of the peace is made all the more necessary by the complexity and the delicacy of the issues which so often confront us. The dispatch of armed forces under a United Nations banner is by no means always the best method of dealing with situations in which internal and external forces are engaged simultaneously.

131. There can be no question as to the interest of the United Nations in preventing any outbreak of violence which may affect international peace and security. I am running the risk of expressing again one or two thoughts that I stated at the third emergency special session of the Assembly. There are very grave questions as to how far it may be appropriate or expedient in particular cases for the United Nations to intervene, even in order to prevent a disturbance of the international peace, by measures of force which are not directed against an aggressor but against one or other of the parties to an armed conflict which can be best described as a civil war.

132. The United Nations has no responsibility to maintain by force the established authority of any régime against its people or to prevent an established régime from putting down a rebellion. We cannot go so far, however, as to say that all force in cases of civil conflict is illegal and we could hardly expect the United Nations to maintain the status quo in every individual country throughout the world. We could not expect that. Clearly, it is equally wrong to suggest that if the régime in power in any country is changed by force from within that country the United Nations should intervene to protect the newly established authority against the old. Nobody contemplates the assumption by the United Nations of any such responsibility and it would be generally expected that no United Nations force or measure of force should be utilized either to aid or to quell an internal rebellion. But when a civil conflict develops in such a way that other nations become directly involved or threaten to intervene and the international peace is in danger, the United Nations must be concerned. There is room then in such cases for the exercise of good offices, for efforts of mediation and conciliation and perhaps indeed, with the consent of the countries concerned, for the establishment on their territories of some United Nations force or body as a safeguard for the international peace and to preserve the integrity of a nation from outside aggression. I emphasize that this must be with the consent of the countries concerned, because the Soviet representative has attempted to distort the intentions which have been expressed. My country would not be a party to an effort to impose any kind of international police force on the countries of the Middle East or elsewhere. We think the widespread use of the term "international police force" in this connexion is perhaps unfortunate. The role of the United Nations is to assist Member States to find peace. It could not even if it would impose its will upon countries in this form.

133. We have failed to put into effect the provisions of the Charter under which it was envisaged that the United Nations would have adequate force to intervene in any case of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, and take effective measures to maintain or restore international peace and security. There is no immediate prospect, as I see

it, of our reaching agreement on the provision for the United Nations of forces available to act against any country which the United Nations should declare to be an aggressor. We can earnestly hope and pray that the need for such a force under Article 43 will never arise. In the meantime, we need not fail in more modest efforts to provide less complicated machinery which could take the action necessary to prevent small wars from developing or to maintain and supervise a peace which has already been established. The success which has been achieved by the United Nations Emergency Force and by various observer groups established by the United Nations points to the need of further development of machinery of this kind in order to help the United Nations to discharge its responsibilities.

134. The increasing importance of the peace-making activities which I have mentioned emphasizes the role of the smaller Powers in the United Nations. The assumption of greater responsibility is perhaps good for the souls of the middle size Powers. It has been all too easy for us, who are middle size Powers as against great Powers, to belabour the great Powers and find in their sins the causes of all our trouble. It is not infrequently the irresponsibility of those of us who belong to a lesser Power which has involved the United Nations in a crisis, and we should bear in mind that such irresponsibility inevitably encourages the great Powers to assume, or try to assume, a greater authority. The smaller Powers are not wiser or more virtuous just because they are smaller. Nevertheless, the lack on the part of the smaller Powers of the capacity to undertake global aggression and our limited involvement in world affairs does give us the chance to play a peace-making role which is denied by the circumstances to the great Powers. This represents to some extent a shift in the nature of the United Nations as envisaged by its founders. The Charter, as we all know, was based upon the principle of collaboration among the great Powers to keep the peace. If this basis is not as yet possible, then it is up to the lesser Powers in this Organization to do what they can in the meantime to maintain peace. We should then be in a sounder position to warn the great Powers that the United Nations was not established as a forum in which they could play the game of power politics and in which the lesser Powers would be assigned the roles of pawns in a "cold war".

135. I take this opportunity to pledge the intention of Canada to contribute as can be reasonably required of us to work for peace through the United Nations.

136. Mr. GUDMUNDSSON (Iceland): My country has not participated in the general debate during the past few years. We have listened with interest to all those who have had anything to offer towards the solution of any of our many world problems or had some guidance to give to a bewildered and frightened world. Our delegation has generally chosen to make its voice heard during the handling of the different problems in the committees, well knowing that a small nation like ours has little to contribute to the actual and factual disposal of the world's troubles and to the elimination of the great and imminent dangers hanging like the sword of Damocles over all mankind. Such great problems are for the biggest Powers to settle. They are often caused by the great Powers, and they alone can and must solve them. All the world, all the

peoples of the world, look to the great Powers and demand that they settle their differences so that men can live and breathe peacefully and enjoy freedom from fear of annihilation.

137. This year Iceland has an urgent need to make its voice heard immediately during the general debate, and I shall revert to that later. But let me first glance at a few of the seventy-two items on the agenda of this General Assembly. Some are old friends which have been discussed at many past sessions and are equally unsolved and insoluble today as they were years ago. This refers in particular to such items as the "Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa", which question has been before the General Assembly since 1946, and the item called "Question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Union of South Africa", which has been before the Assembly since 1952. The Icelandic delegation has always held the view that the General Assembly is entitled to handle these questions, and we must endeavour to find a solution in compliance with Article 55, paragraph c, of our Charter, where all Members pledge themselves to promote "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion".

138. The Icelandic people, who are all of one race, have difficulty in understanding any policy or practice of discrimination on account of race. We desire to stand on the side of humanity and we still hope the Government of the Union of South Africa will see the wisdom of revising its policy to the effect of eliminating injustice in order to avoid grave consequences and dangerous conflicts.

139. As in previous sessions, the question of disarmament will this year be the main problem in our deliberations. Since the beginning of the United Nations activities in 1946, the United Nations has always been greatly concerned about the question of disarmament, or—more correctly expressed—the question of reduction of armaments. This matter has been on the agenda of each of the twelve previous sessions of the General Assembly. It has been discussed here for months. A total period of more than a year must have been devoted to its handling in the General Assembly alone during these twelve years, not counting all the months in the various disarmament committees. A whole bunch of resolutions expressing pious and well-meaning desires for reduction of armaments, for the lessening of world tension and for peaceful coexistence and friendly, neighbourly relations, have been passed year after year—a whole bible of good intentions. But no result has yet been seen. The armaments race has continued and has been intensified and accelerated. New and constantly more effective means of destruction have been invented. We are told that during 1948 to 1956 the nations of the world spent about \$420,000 million on armaments, and in 1957 alone the military expenditure amounted to well over \$100,000 million. Now all the world wonders where we are being led, where we are going, what comes next.

140. Let me, however, admit with a feeling of relief and satisfaction that during the last few months some progress on the road to understanding and co-operation between the big Powers has been made. I refer to three points. Number one is the recent meeting in

Geneva of experts from eight countries, including the United States and the Soviet Union, to study the technical possibility of detecting violations of an eventual agreement to suspend nuclear weapons tests. The experts reached unanimous conclusions on what would be needed technically and they expressed the opinion that control over nuclear tests was possible and feasible. This should augur well for further steps along this road in the future. Point number two is that the big Powers have agreed to meet in Geneva on 31 October 1958 to consider the suspension of nuclear weapons tests. It is to be hoped that no political manoeuvring will hinder this conference from taking place and that the negotiators will arrive at a successful result. The third ray of hope is due to the fact that the big Powers have further agreed to send technical experts to Geneva on 10 November for discussions on the ways of preventing a surprise attack. All these are steps in the right direction and seem to guide the way for the future. It seems that the most likely method of achieving understanding and removing the political hindrances is for the international scientists and experts first to scrutinize the matters between themselves and prepare the ground for the statesmen to meet to proceed further.

141. It was regrettable that the twelfth session of the General Assembly ended in a deadlock on the work of the Disarmament Commission. Every effort should be made during our deliberation of the all important disarmament question at this session to take measures to enable the Disarmament Commission to resume its meetings which could only have any meaning or purpose if all the major Powers are present, assisted and possibly guided by several other Powers. All the preparatory work on disarmament may at a later stage lead to the great summit conference where the leaders of the world finally would give the world assurance of a peaceful future and friendly relations between all nations, large and small. My nation follows with anxiety all negotiations for disarmament, and has only one wish in this respect: that stage by stage, and as soon as possible, mankind may be led away from the armament race to a future of security and freedom from fear and anxiety.

142. In respect of securing a more peaceful future, it is our opinion that a United Nations peace force could play a major role. We do not consider it necessary that a special United Nations force be established on a permanent international basis, and we consider that a contingent of military personnel could be kept available within many different nations, to be called upon in cases of emergency by the decision of the United Nations. Thus, the new peace force of the United Nations would function as a kind of international fire brigade to prevent minor disturbances and local fights from turning into a world conflict. We must always bear in mind that any hostilities, wherever they arise on the globe, are in our present condensed world likely to spread into a major war. In our endeavours to avoid hostilities let us not forget that many wars in the past might have been averted by patience, tolerance and extended negotiations, and that we are all bound by our Charter, as stated in Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4, all Members have pledged themselves to "settle their international disputes by peaceful means" and to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independ-

ence of any States". Therefore, and in view of this solemn pledge, it seems rather inconsistent that the great Powers, and so many other nations, have to spend the greatest amount of their budget yearly on building up forces and engaging in all kinds of military expenditures, most of which nowadays are for the devices of the utmost destruction and annihilation.

143. It seems so evident how enormously beneficial it would be for all mankind if the burden of armaments could be reduced and part of the military expenditures diverted to pacific and humanitarian projects all over the world. In that way the standard of living could be raised, particularly where people are deprived of so many of the good things in life in the under-developed countries, employment could be increased, education tremendously increased, and the general well-being of people secured. Here in the United Nations, my country has always expressed its fervent adherence to such high ideals, although we have little to offer to others. But every country, large and small, has the primary duty to keep its own house clean and to give a fair share in life to each of its individuals, and in that way also the small nations can, separately and for themselves, contribute to the general welfare of the world. We are mindful that the small nations also have their duties, that they cannot shirk their responsibilities in international affairs, and that their conduct can also lead to great events, both for good or for ill.

144. As regards some of the specific matters on the agenda of our Assembly, may I make further mention of a few. The third emergency special session was convened only last month because of the dangerous situation in the Middle East. Fortunately, that session succeeded in adopting a unanimous resolution [1237 (ES-III)], thanks largely to the understanding and the intelligent approach of all the Arab States. We now await with great interest the report of the Secretary-General, to whom the Assembly entrusted the task of trying to make arrangements for a prompt settlement. The Near Eastern countries have presented many varied problems in the past, and most of them are still unsolved. Some of them are highly political, others are economic or humanitarian, and until the whole question of the Middle East is treated on a broad basis, additional difficulties will arise, and threatening clouds will remain over our heads. In the opinion of my delegation, the problems of the Middle East will never be solved unless the people there show their willingness to solve them together and agree to live together as good neighbours with all the countries in that region.

145. Regarding the question of Algeria, my delegation also stands for the principle of the right of self-determination, and has always maintained that in the United Nations debates. Thus we firmly supported the pleas for the independence of Tunisia and Morocco, which at one time was strongly contested during our considerations of those problems here. If the great majority of people of Algeria are desirous of claiming their independence, no continued fighting will in the long run hinder them from achieving it. The first sensible step should be to bring about a cease-fire and to renew negotiations. In this case, as in so many others where tension and fighting have existed, it is wise to allow time to pass before fruitful negotiations can be expected. It should also be recognized that full independence does not have to come all at once, and even if it is desired by the majority of the people, it

takes time to build up a new State with all its functional organizations, and to safely bring about necessary adjustments.

146. We once more have the controversial and, as yet, insoluble question of Cyprus. Here again, my delegation has always favoured the principle of self-determination, and we also think that some time should elapse before the last steps are taken. But we must bear in mind that although there are some 400,000 people of Greek descent on Cyprus, there is a large minority of approximately 100,000 people of Turkish descent.

147. Allow me to mention a matter that my Government, as all other Governments of Western Europe, views with great concern, and that is the question of the unification of Germany. So long as Germany remains divided, this situation presents a serious threat to the security of Europe and to the peace of the world in general. Here we feel that the principle of self-determination should be applied and that all the German people should be given the opportunity to conduct free elections in both parts of the country. Germany should be given the right of self-determination and in free elections to decide on the future fate of this highly developed and intelligent nation. We express this without prejudice towards anyone, and only with the conviction that the German people are one nation, strongly united by ties of brotherhood and blood. The unified German nation should be welcomed within the United Nations.

148. As I mentioned previously, we can never build a peaceful and secure world unless we continue and intensify our fight against poverty, malnutrition and disease in vast areas of the globe. Any step in this direction, we therefore welcome. We are convinced that the establishment of the Special Fund marks a milestone in this direction and can have highly beneficial effects in various parts of the world. The programme of technical assistance has spread its blessings and benefits to more and more lands and is to be increased and strengthened.

149. On our agenda we have now for the first time the question of the use by humanity of outer space, since man's penetration into outer space is gradually becoming a reality. With this newest achievement of science, it has now become of utmost importance to secure international co-operation for the peaceful use of cosmic space, and arrangements to that effect should be accelerated in order to assure that the exploitation of outer space should be permitted only for the benefit of humanity.

150. As I mentioned at the commencement of my statement, Iceland now feels an urgent need to make its voice heard in the general debate, particularly in reference to item 59 on the agenda of the General Assembly, which bears the title "Question of convening a second United Nations conference on the law of the sea". In this connexion I would be failing in my duty if I did not raise my voice here in regard to the problem of fishing in Icelandic waters, a problem which is of such a nature that it has resulted in a most serious dispute between two friendly Member nations.

151. In my opinion, there are a few fundamental points which should be kept in mind in this connexion. First, as has repeatedly been emphasized before this General Assembly and elsewhere, it is an indisputable

fact that my country, Iceland, would hardly be habitable without its coastal fisheries. Iceland is a country practically without any natural resources other than its fisheries. Due to our northerly position, the possibility of agriculture is very limited. No minerals or forests exist. Consequently, most of the necessities of life have to be imported from abroad and financed mainly through the export of fishery products, which amount to 97 per cent of the total exports of Iceland. Thus, whether we can sustain our coastal fisheries is a matter of life or death to us. This is my first point.

152. Secondly, the experience of the last few decades has proved beyond dispute that if the necessary steps are not taken to prevent overfishing, the fishing grounds around Iceland will be depleted. In view of these vital considerations, my Government has found it necessary to safeguard the interests of my people in this respect. At the same time, let us not lose sight of the fact that, in so doing, my country also protects a stock of fish and spawning grounds essential for the fisheries in the North Atlantic as a whole, and for the future benefit of all nations concerned.

153. I am not going to mention any specific figures in this connexion. It is sufficient to recall that in the years between the two World Wars, and the years prior to World War I and after the second, when great and increasing fleets of foreign trawlers fished off the Icelandic coast, the catch became constantly reduced so that utter destruction was imminent. On the other hand, during the years of the two world wars when no foreign trawlers fished in Icelandic waters, the catch increased constantly. It is an established fact that without this involuntary protection, the spawning areas and nursery grounds in Iceland would have long since been destroyed, and thereby the fisheries themselves. If that had been the case, Iceland would hardly be habitable today.

154. It has been the policy of the Icelandic Government to protect the resources of the sea as far as possible through the rules of international law. For years we tried, through international co-operation, to safeguard these interests. Thus, in 1949—almost ten years ago—we suggested to the General Assembly<sup>7/</sup> that the International Law Commission should be entrusted with the task of formulating rules concerning the extent of coastal jurisdiction. By this proposal we hoped to achieve, within a relatively short period of time, a solution to this problem so vital to the future existence of my country.

155. It is a fact that in former times, prior to the development of modern fishing techniques, the Icelandic fishery interests were more fully protected than they are today. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and the first half of the nineteenth century, the fishery limits around Iceland were four leagues—the league being at first the equivalent of eight, later six, and finally of four nautical miles. In other words, at the beginning of the period the limits were thirty-two miles, later they became twenty-four miles, and in the nineteenth century they had been reduced to sixteen miles. During the latter part of the nineteenth century, a four-mile limit seems to have been practised. But all bays were closed to foreign fishing during the entire period.

<sup>7/</sup> See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Sixth Committee, 163rd meeting, para. 19.



156. In 1901, while Iceland was still under Danish rule, an agreement was made by the Danish Government with the United Kingdom, providing for a ten-mile rule for bays and a three-mile fishery limit around Iceland. This agreement was terminated by the Icelandic Government in 1951. At that time, the approaching ruin caused by overfishing was quite clear, and the Overfishing Conventions of 1937 and 1948 did not offer any assistance in counteracting this ominous development.

157. In 1952 regulations were issued providing straight base-lines and the fishery limits were then drawn four miles from the base-lines. These regulations were violently objected to in some quarters. Three or four Governments maintained that the regulations were contrary to international law and that by barring foreign fishermen from areas where they had previously been fishing the regulations would have the effect of greatly reducing their catches. In the United Kingdom where Iceland had previously sold approximately 25 per cent of its catch of demersal fish, the market was forcibly closed entirely for a period of four years, which at that time was intended as a serious blow to the Icelandic economy.

158. Later events clearly have shown that the fears of foreign fishing interests about a reduced catch were quite unjustified. It is now recognized by all concerned that the regulations of 1952 not only halted the disastrous trend, but even succeeded in starting an upward trend for the benefit of all those fishing in Icelandic waters. However, there are definite signs that even a slight increase in the fishing effort would result in overfishing. There is also another aspect to be considered, and that is the possible development of entirely new fishing methods. The use of gigantic factory vessels equipped with electric fishing apparatus and pumps may seem, perhaps, exaggerated, but in the present era of technical progress, events of that kind may be just around the corner.

159. In view of the developments and the problems involved, the Icelandic Government was firmly convinced that further measures would have to be taken for the twin purpose of ensuring necessary conservation and safeguarding vital fishing interests in the coastal area. Therefore, new regulations were issued on 30 June 1958 concerning twelve-mile fishery limits off Iceland, which, however, were not to become effective until 1 September 1958.

160. I am not going to elaborate further on this point, since my Government in a few days will submit a memorandum to the Sixth Committee, where these problems will be explained in detail. I shall now proceed to my third point.

161. As already indicated, the Icelandic Government would have liked to solve this particular difficulty through international co-operation. My Government brought this entire problem before the United Nations almost a decade ago in the hope that a proper and speedy solution thereto could be found. The Icelandic Government had already waited for ten years for a solution on the international level. It did not find it possible to wait any longer.

162. Before we extended our fishery limits to twelve miles on 1 September 1958, we discussed the matter with our neighbours in the North Atlantic area in order to achieve a satisfactory result. It was always

understood that the time from 30 June 1958, when the new regulations were issued, until 1 September, when they came into force, should be used to explain them and gain understanding and support for them. I think it is only proper for me to state that throughout these discussions we sincerely hoped and thought that the problem would be solved in a friendly manner. But, unfortunately, our hopes were not fulfilled.

163. Hard and fast rules do not exist in international law concerning the delimitation of coastal waters—a fact which has been amply demonstrated by the judgment of the International Court of Justice in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries Case<sup>8/</sup> and by the work of the International Law Commission and the results of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, held in Geneva in 1958. The specific and extraordinary features governing the delimitation of the fisheries zones of Iceland should also be taken into account, features of a geographical, economic, political and historical nature specific for Iceland and for Iceland alone.

164. The widely varying practices of coastal states as to the delimitation of their territorial waters and fishery limits, and the latest developments in this field as a whole, should be recalled. Although the International Law Commission did not finish its work concerning the extent of coastal jurisdiction, it is a fact that it did submit that it would be illegal to extend this jurisdiction beyond twelve miles. That fact clearly supports the Icelandic action. At the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, no final solution was found, but it is quite clear that a majority of States, representing an overwhelming majority of mankind, favours the distance of twelve miles in one form or another.

165. It is the sincere conviction of the Icelandic Government that it has acted within the confines of international law in putting into force and effect its twelve-mile fishery zone. Some of the nations fishing in Icelandic waters have protested against the regulations, and we have also been criticized for having laid down our fishery limits by unilateral enactments. Such criticism is unfounded. It is not unique, and indeed it is a generally accepted practice, that a coastal State may and does fix unilaterally, by its domestic legislation, the limits of its coastal waters. It is not necessary to elaborate on this self-evident point. But it must be borne in mind that a host of coastal States, by unilateral enactments, have fixed the limits of their fishery zones or of their territorial waters at twelve miles, or even at distances far in excess of this limit. And a number of other States have expressed their intention of doing so in the not too distant future.

166. During the talks between Iceland and her North Atlantic neighbours, it was emphasized by all concerned—even by those protesting against the new regulations—that it was of the utmost importance that no serious incidents should occur. The Icelandic Government would like to take this opportunity to express its gratitude to the Governments concerned which have maintained this view and have kept their respective nationals from fishing in Icelandic waters. One Government alone—and I am here referring to the Government of the United Kingdom—did not co-operate in this effort. The Government of the United Kingdom has

<sup>8/</sup> Fisheries Case, Judgment of December 18th, 1951: I.C.J. Reports 1951, p. 116.

expressly advised its trawlers to fish inside the Icelandic twelve-mile zone and has sent several warships into these waters to protect the illegal trawling of its fishermen and to force its views upon the Icelandic Government at gunpoint. Against this we have already protested, and we repeat our protest.

167. I would like to mention that one of the great Powers of Europe, the USSR, has claimed and enforced territorial waters of twelve miles for a considerable period, but the United Kingdom has not found it necessary to send warships into that area to protect its alleged rights under international law, even at times when no treaty arrangements regulated the situation. It is a fact that the British through their present activities in Icelandic waters are not supporting international law, but rather are trying to uphold an obsolete policy by claiming resources that rightfully belong to the Icelandic nation.

168. This attitude will not cause the Icelandic people to surrender to force. On the contrary, they are more than ever united on the question of the twelve-mile fishery limits. Because this is a matter of survival for the nation, the Icelandic people are confident that the fairness and legitimacy of their claims will prevail. It will not be possible in the long run to engage in trawling under the protection of warships, and it is known that the catch of British trawlers has never been less than now under this novel and unique form of fishing. Although the Icelandic people are confident as to the final result, they realize that serious incidents would be created, for instance, if British vessels continued to try to ram Icelandic patrol vessels. It would create serious consequences in the relations between nations in the North Atlantic area. Nevertheless, the Icelandic Government has not wanted to make charges against the United Kingdom in the international arena. Because of the long-standing friendship between these nations, the Icelanders will proceed to avoid excessive measures on their part which might make it more difficult for the United Kingdom to adopt a proper policy in this matter. It is also our opinion that British statesmanship will sooner or later prevail, and that these obsolete tactics will be discontinued.

169. World public opinion has often proved to be a sound guide for the great Powers in questions of oppression, which rightly belong to the past. The reason why we want to discuss this matter here is that my people are confident that other nations will appreciate and understand our exceptional position as regards the protection of our fishing grounds, and that world public opinion will convince our United Kingdom neighbours of the advisability of discontinuing their resort to force and violence in Icelandic waters.

170. My final point is, where do we go from here? It goes without saying that a solution to the problem in general must be found as soon as possible and, we hope, by this General Assembly.

171. It may be recalled that at the eleventh session of the United Nations General Assembly the Icelandic delegation ventured to suggest<sup>9/</sup> that, in view of the fact that the International Law Commission, for a number of years, had not produced a formula for the

proper delimitation of coastal jurisdiction, it was not very likely that a conference of experts would be able to solve this particular problem. It was then our painful privilege, if I may say so, to stand alone in suggesting that the General Assembly itself should try to solve this problem.

172. Now we know that the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea which was held in Geneva this spring was not able to find a workable formula as to the extent of coastal jurisdiction. Consequently, I submit that the experts have had their say and that no greater success could be anticipated from a second conference. It is the opinion of my Government that we must, therefore, not run the risk of further grave incidents while waiting for a new conference to convene—a conference which, I repeat, would not be more likely to succeed in solving this delicate political question than its predecessor.

173. In the opinion of my Government the General Assembly itself could and should find an international solution in this field in such a way that reasonable rights of coastal States would be secured, and that the special position of those States which are overwhelmingly dependent on their coastal fisheries, as is Iceland, would be fully taken into account.

174. The Sixth Committee possesses all the necessary qualifications for undertaking a careful consideration of this matter. If neither the Sixth Committee nor the General Assembly is able to find a solution, it is not probable that a new conference would succeed in that endeavour.

175. I have now come to the end of my statement, and I trust that all the relevant points have been covered, but before I leave this rostrum I want to emphasize that, above all, it is the demand of my Government that military activities in Iceland coastal waters should at once be discontinued—activities which never before in history have been directed against any State which has unilaterally extended its jurisdiction over coastal fisheries. The gunpoint diplomacy must come to an end.

176. Mr. KRAG (Denmark): I will first say a few words about disarmament. Denmark has always followed with keen interest the discussions of the United Nations on the question of disarmament. In action, too, we have demonstrated that we are determined to contribute towards a solution. Thus, the Danish Government declared itself in agreement, in principle, to Danish territory being included in the inspection zones proposed for Europe and the Arctic regions. When the question of establishing an Arctic inspection zone was recently brought up again in the United Nations by the United States,<sup>10/</sup> we confirmed our readiness to allow the Greenland territories north of the Arctic Circle to be incorporated in such a zone.

177. The Danish Government—and I can say the Danish people—earnestly hope that we may very soon be able to break the present deadlock in the disarmament negotiations. Denmark has not been able to accede to the proposal of allowing all States Members of the United Nations a seat on the Disarmament Commission because we must stress the importance of the Com-

<sup>9/</sup> See Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Sixth Committee, 494th meeting.

<sup>10/</sup> See Official Records of the Security Council, Thirteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1958, document S/3995.

mission's being so constituted as to function in a practical way. It is a question not just of having a few members more or less, but of securing a workable Commission; and it should not be forgotten that the great Powers bear the major responsibility in this matter.

178. The obstacles which negotiations on disarmament have encountered in the United Nations should not cause this forum to be given up as the proper place for dealing with the problem. Retention of this question within the framework of the United Nations does not, however, preclude a summit meeting between East and West.

179. In line with this, Denmark has fully supported the efforts being made to achieve progress in the disarmament field through East-West discussions at the level of Heads of Government. Even though the preparatory diplomatic talks on such a meeting have been discontinued since the middle of June, the most recent developments seem to hold out some hope of a more positive trend in the whole disarmament question being within sight. I am thinking primarily of the Conference of Experts to Study the Possibility of Detecting Violations of a Possible Agreement on the Suspension of Nuclear Tests which was recently held in Geneva and which resulted in agreement on the technical prerequisites of a control system, the subsequent declarations by the United States [A/3895] and the United Kingdom [A/3896] on the suspension of their nuclear weapons tests and, finally, the Soviet Union's acceptance [A/3904] of the proposal made by the two Western Powers for negotiations to be initiated at the end of October on an agreement to cover the controlled suspension of nuclear weapons tests. Also, the agreement on expert studies of control measures to prevent surprise attacks appears to us to be a step forward.

180. Naturally, it is confidence among nations which, in the last resort, decides whether a real relaxation of tension can be brought about. This confidence can hardly be created in one single move, and consequently it would be too ambitious to entertain hopes of achieving more comprehensive plans for disarmament at the present moment. The Danish Government therefore urges that disarmament efforts should be concentrated on the attainment of solutions by stages.

181. We agree with the Secretary-General in the view that the more we try to "depoliticize" the outstanding issues by referring them to discussion at the technical level the better are the prospects of achieving favourable results. Denmark therefore finds it worth considering that the practical implementation of possible control measures agreed upon on the basis of the Geneva talks concerning the suspension of nuclear weapon tests should be delegated to a special administrative body within the United Nations.

182. As to the problems of outer space which are gaining increasing interest with the constant progress made in the field of technology, we shall give our full support to efforts aimed at bringing about, through joint discussions, an international agreement to promote scientific co-operation and to ensure that outer space shall be used solely for peaceful purposes. We also fully support the proposal for the setting up under the auspices of the United Nations of an agency to promote international scientific co-operation on the exploration of space.

183. In Denmark we witnessed with satisfaction how the tension in the Middle East was successfully eased through the United Nations. We felt, and we still feel, that this question is of such a nature that it naturally comes under the United Nations. Accordingly, during the crisis Denmark whole-heartedly supported the desire to have the matter discussed and settled within the framework of the United Nations.

184. The Danish Government is of the opinion that the events in the Middle East have once again demonstrated the great value of an international forum such as the United Nations to deal with situations where the welfare of the entire world depends upon a successful settlement. Among the States Members of the United Nations there are widely differing opinions about the recent happenings in the Middle East. These differences were also expressed when the crisis was considered in the Security Council and at the third emergency special session of the General Assembly convened to deal with the question. Notwithstanding this, it eventually proved possible at the third emergency special session to muster unanimous support for a resolution drafted by the Arab States themselves [resolution 1237 (ES-III)]. This paved the way for a constructive and, we hope, lasting settlement of the many and complex problems that are still outstanding in the Middle East. Together with other nations, Denmark contributed, in accordance with its principles, towards the achievement of results acceptable to all parties. Denmark will continue to give its full support to the efforts of the United Nations to solve the extraordinarily difficult political and economic problems in the Middle East.

185. We now look forward to the Secretary-General's report on the results of negotiations which he has been conducting with States in the Middle East. It is to be hoped that the United Nations, in co-operation with these States, will be able to reach a settlement which will bring about peace and prepare the ground for the economic progress needed in the whole of that area.

186. In this connexion, I must stress one of the proposals mentioned at the third emergency special session of the General Assembly as a means of preventing the existing antagonisms from leading to aggressive action, namely, the question of establishing a stand-by United Nations peace force [A/3878]. The General Assembly is aware that Denmark is among the countries that have provided troops for the United Nations Emergency Force in the Gaza sector. Naturally, it is not possible at the present juncture finally to assess the usefulness of this Force—this question will be fully discussed later on the basis of the Secretary-General's reports under item 65 of the agenda—but so much may already be said that the Emergency Force has apparently contributed greatly towards easing tensions in that area. With this experience in mind, there is reason to believe that a more permanent arrangement, or arrangements, for an armed United Nations force would have a favourable effect in a future emergency, namely, that of producing a calmer atmosphere and of gaining time, so that the United Nations could consider and possibly carry out measures to remove or lessen the causes of the crisis. The solution of the question of such a United Nations force will involve difficulties and the question of its application will give rise to problems, but there is every reason to assume that the United Nations

will succeed in overcoming these difficulties and reaching agreement on the competence and functions of the force.

187. The Danish Government would consider it desirable that the Secretary-General be authorized by the General Assembly to make a study of the technical aspects and, on the basis thereof, to prepare such proposals as the study might inspire. In our view, such proposals should be founded on the principle of voluntariness.

188. Now a few remarks about the Far East. The present state of tension in the Far East occupies the minds of all of us. The differences between the directly concerned parties in the region are vast, and the Danish Government views with the greatest anxiety the attempts of the Peking Government to put through its territorial claims by force. A problem of the nature in question should be solved by negotiation, and not by the use of force. It would have been of considerable advantage if the conflicting views had been represented here and if, on that basis, the United Nations could have taken up the matter with a view to bringing about at least immediate relief of tension as the prerequisite for further negotiations to obtain a lasting settlement. Regardless of the considerations that have operated to the contrary, we feel that we must maintain our fundamental attitude, which is that China should be represented in the United Nations by the Peking Government.

189. In our desire to avert the use of armed force, we noted with satisfaction in Denmark that negotiations would be initiated in Warsaw between representatives of the People's Republic of China and of the United States of America. It is our hope that, through these negotiations, it will be possible to reach a solution, or at least to create the basis for further negotiations for a settlement in keeping with the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

190. I shall now turn to the problems concerning the breadth of the territorial sea and the extent of fishery limits. One of the many topics to be dealt with by the General Assembly is the question of the breadth of the territorial sea. I believe that, like Denmark, many other countries attach great importance to this problem. The question is of great concern to my country, both as a seafaring nation and as a coastal State. Therefore, the Danish Government fully supported the proposal to convene a United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, and the Danish delegation did its best to contribute to the work of this most important Conference when it was held in Geneva last spring.

191. As you all know, four significant conventions on the law of the sea, as well as a number of resolutions, were adopted. There is no doubt that, in many respects, the Conference obtained results which will prove to be of lasting value to the community of nations.

192. Unfortunately, however, the two-thirds majority was not secured for any ruling on the breadth of the territorial sea, and this extremely important question still remains to be solved. I feel that everything possible should be done to reach a clear decision on this question as soon as possible. If we do not succeed, we run the risk of exposing to real and actual danger the very principle of the freedom of the seas, one of the fundamentals of international law.

193. It is the view of the Danish Government that the seas should be open to all, and consequently, that

coastal States should only extend their sovereignty over a narrow belt along their coasts. In view of the technical and political developments of the past decades, we feel, however, that maintaining the classical three-mile limit is no longer feasible and that the maximum breadth of the territorial sea should be fixed at six nautical miles. The Danish Government is of the opinion that one should not go further than that, nor should countries generally be allowed to exercise special fishery rights beyond these six miles.

194. My Government thinks, however, that one important exception to this should be made. In those special cases where populations are living in areas which, on account of their isolated geographical position, are dependent to an exceptionally high degree on the resources of the sea, provision should be made for the establishment of a special fishing territory of up to twelve nautical miles.

195. At the Geneva Conference a resolution<sup>11</sup> on the special position of such regions was adopted. During the debate it was clearly and expressly indicated that this resolution referred to areas such as Iceland, the Faroe Islands and Greenland, the latter two regions being parts of Denmark. In the Danish view this resolution does not seem sufficient. It appears to us that in really genuine cases, such as the islands I mentioned, where an isolated community lives under such conditions that its livelihood and entire economic development is dependent on the sea, it is necessary, indeed it is an act of justice, to safeguard the livelihood of these peoples. In our view this should be done by giving the population in these areas the exclusive right to fish within a comparatively broad belt along their own coasts. Only by doing so can we give these populations the much needed feeling of having their existence safeguarded.

196. In line with the views I have briefly presented here, the Danish Government is of the opinion that it is an urgent task for the United Nations to proceed with this matter and to reach a clear and lasting solution as soon as possible. It might be possible, as suggested by my Icelandic colleague, for the General Assembly to take this matter into its own hands for immediate decision. My Government is deeply interested in the question and in its speedy solution. Should it prove most expedient to seek to have the matter solved at a new international conference, we shall strongly support a proposal for the prompt convening of such a conference.

197. In the economic field, the United Nations, in our opinion, ought to intensify its efforts to achieve international co-operation in solving economic problems which we all realize are intimately related with our political problems. It is an important step in the right direction when the United Nations increasingly recognizes its collective responsibility for the level of prosperity of economically less developed areas.

198. One of the important contributions this session of the General Assembly can make is to establish the Special Fund to begin operations in the coming year.

<sup>11</sup>/ See United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, Official Records, vol. II: Plenary Meetings (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 58.V.4, vol. II), annexes, document A/CONF.13/L.56, VI.

We feel that the Fund's resources, although important, are less significant than the fact that the Assembly recognizes its responsibility, through multilateral action, to raise the levels of living in the less developed countries of the world. I feel convinced that an honest and friendly co-operation of Member Governments, recipients as well as contributors, will benefit both and increase the possibility of furthering the much desired expansion of world trade.

199. May I say, in conclusion, that we live in an insecure world, but at the same time in a world with immense possibilities. At the cross-road between des-

truction and peaceful constructive possibilities there is no doubt which course mankind will wish to follow. The question is, which road will lead to the goal? Traditional diplomacy can undoubtedly help us on our way. But I think that all the eighty-one countries which are represented here will note with satisfaction that the United Nations itself during recent events in international policy has proved itself to be a world political instrument of increasing significance. We are still at the beginning, but we are hopeful that this constructive evolution will be further pursued.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.