

ment was unwilling to accept a Sudanese suggestion that only the Sudanese elections should be conducted in these areas, but without prejudice to the position of Egypt in the boundary dispute.

Shortly before the Council meeting on February 21, the Egyptian authorities, which had denied Sudanese charges concerning troop concentrations, made public their intention not to press for a settlement of the dispute until after the Sudanese elections and the formation of a new Sudanese Government. In the course of its meeting the Council invited the parties concerned to participate in the discussion. The Representative of the Sudan pointed out that the boundary question, and the Egyptian intention to hold a plebiscite in areas which had for fifty years been undisputed Sudanese territory, had only recently been raised by Egypt. The Sudanese Government could not take a decision on such important matters at short notice, especially in view of the impending Sudanese elections. His Government was willing to negotiate with Egypt on the question, but had requested that the discussion be deferred until after the elections. The Representative of Egypt regretted the hasty submission of the question to the Security Council. Although Egypt had well-founded rights to the disputed territories, it had preferred at all times to adopt an attitude of friendliness towards the Sudan. In that spirit his Government had decided to postpone discussion of the frontier question until after the Sudanese elections.

Since it appeared likely that Egypt and the Sudan would be able to find a solution through bilateral negotiations, the Council simply noted the statements made, declared itself still seized of the matter, and adjourned without a vote.

Arab-Israeli Relations

Fundamental Arab-Israeli issues were not considered during the year by the General Assembly except to a limited extent during the annual debate on assistance to Palestine Arab refugees (see Chapter III, page 46), but various other organs of the United Nations — in all of which Canada played a part — continued to exert their efforts to prevent conditions which might lead to a renewal of general hostilities.

Two questions concerning Arab-Israeli frontier problems were debated by the Security Council in 1958. The first of these concerned a Jordanian complaint, submitted in September, 1957, that Israel was violating provisions of the armistice agreement in the zone between the armistice demarcation lines in the area around Government House in Jerusalem. The Council had considered this complaint, as well as an Israeli complaint of Jordanian violations of the agreement, at meetings during the fall of 1957, and had received reports on the complaints from the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO): On January 22, 1958, the Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution which directed the Chief of Staff of the UNTSO "to regulate activities within the zone . . . bearing in mind ownership of property there" and to conduct a survey of property records; and recommended suspension of "activities in the zone such as those initiated by Israelis on 21 July 1957" pending completion of the survey and adoption of provisions for the regulation of activities in the zone.

Conditions on the Israeli-Syrian frontier were disturbed during much of the year, and on December 8 and 15 the Security Council debated an Israeli complaint concerning a particularly serious incident on December 3 in which artillery fire by both sides followed the wounding of an Israeli