

could, because of the absence of comments during their preparation by major contributors, easily be unacceptable to those major contributors and make eventual participation by them less likely. All these questions are hypothetical but those delegations like my own which have participated in the negotiations preceding the establishment of the major United Nations organs, will perhaps agree that the time to discuss and negotiate different problems is during the preparation not after the publication of even a preliminary text of statutes. The drafting of statutes for any genuinely multilateral United Nations capital aid fund would be a very difficult undertaking if embarked on prematurely, by which I mean without the participation of representatives of all important points of view and without agreement in advance on some basic principles. It could seriously damage those prospects which may exist for the establishment of a SUNFED.

There is, however, a perhaps even more important reason for believing that it is not desirable at the present time to attempt to draw up a statute for SUNFED. The Canadian Delegation has participated actively in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on SUNFED. In that committee, and this is not surprising, major differences of opinion emerged. In fact those differences were so serious and so numerous that it was difficult for the committee to carry out its mandate and, on the basis of an analysis of the replies of governments, to draft any conclusions at all. I am sure all delegations at this meeting are as familiar as I am with the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on SUNFED. Perhaps I might, however, draw attention to some of the features of that report which are of direct relevance to my present argument. Page 100 of Document E2896 of June 8, 1956 is undoubtedly the most significant part of this report.

In the first place, the committee emphasizes that the conclusions which it was able to draw should not be read by themselves but in conjunction with Parts 1 and 2 of the report. These first two parts consist of a factual summary of the comments of governments and of a purely statistical analysis of that summary. The report goes on to stress that the general pattern of the proposed special fund which emerged from the replies of governments merely brought together the most frequently indicated views on various aspects and did not take into account the diversity of opinions put forward. Furthermore, and I quote from the report, "the group of governments representing the most frequently indicated view on a particular aspect is not necessarily always the same. Consequently, it is possible that some features of the pattern which emerges are not fully consistent with each other". While the report noted "that there is support for the proposal to establish a special fund" it also noted that governments were not expressly requested to indicate to what extent they would be prepared to give a special fund their financial support and that governments, therefore, generally did not deal with this question. In the light of all these qualifications, I am obliged to differ with those delegations which have stated their belief that the Ad Hoc Committee's report represents a sufficiently advanced basis of agreement from which to proceed at once to the drafting of statutes.

I would now like to turn to the pattern of the special fund as it emerged with all the above qualifications and to note some of the contradictions of even this limited pattern. One of these contradictions was suggested by the distinguished representative of the United States the other day. It is the contradiction between a fund which would finance "more especially economic and social infrastructure projects" and possibly even broader programmes on the basis of an initial sum "centring around the range of 200 to 250 million dollars". It is obvious that a fund of that size would