

concerned with the developments in Laos and was prepared to consider any steps which would help to reduce tension in the area. He noted that it had been the consistent position of the Canadian Government that the principles of the Geneva Settlement should be maintained in Laos and that the obligations arising out of that Settlement rested on all the parties who participated in it. In the Canadian view the most urgent task facing the Council was to agree on a procedure for obtaining the facts of the situation. It was not considered by the Canadian Government that the Security Council would be justified in attempting to impose the International Commission on the Laotian Government for that purpose and Canada therefore supported the resolution. The Representative of the USSR opposed the resolution on the basis that the responsibility for the situation in Laos rested with the Government of that country and that the proposed action by the Security Council was an attempt to by-pass existing international instruments and would in fact subvert the Geneva Agreements. In the Soviet view a strict adherence to the Geneva and Vientiane Agreements and the immediate re-establishment of the International Commission were the only methods of achieving a peaceful settlement in Laos.

The draft resolution had been introduced under Article 29, which permits the Security Council to establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary. A controversy developed prior to the vote on the resolution as to whether it was to be considered procedural, permitting approval by a majority vote, or non-procedural and subject to a veto. It was the view of the Soviet Delegate that the establishment of the sub-committee should be considered non-procedural since the nature of the action proposed could only have far-reaching implications and, therefore, should be subject to the unanimity rule in accordance with the "San Francisco Declaration" of June 1945. This opinion, however, was rejected by a vote of 10-1 (USSR).

The resolution itself was adopted by a vote of 10-1 (USSR) and after examining documents already available at United Nations headquarters the sub-committee departed for Laos on September 12. Under the terms of the resolution the sub-committee interpreted its mandate as one of inquiry rather than investigation and limited to fact-finding on the basis of information submitted to it. It was not considered within the competence of the sub-committee to concern itself with the substance of the issues involved or to make recommendations on future courses of action.

The report of the sub-committee was made public on November 5, 1959. In summarizing the findings of the sub-committee the report stated that opposition to the Laotian Government consisted of former members of the Pathet-Lao and troops which had deserted in May 1959, as well as minority groups living in the border areas. It noted that while some witnesses reported the participation on the side of the Pathet-Lao of forces which had North Vietnamese ethnic characteristics, it was not clearly established whether regular North Vietnamese troops had actually crossed the border into Laotian territory. The report stated, however, that the rebels had received support from North Vietnam in equipment, arms, ammunition, supplies and "the help of political cadres".

Following the publication of the report the Secretary-General accepted an invitation of the Laotian Government to visit that country. He stated that his visit had no link with the sub-committee's report but was based on the general responsibilities of the Secretary-General and his administrative authority under the Charter. During his visit in Laos he appointed the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, Mr. Sukari Tuomioja, as a personal representative in Laos to review the economic situation and the role of economic and technical assistance which might be given by the United Nations. He was also empowered to