

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 573rd
MEETING**



Wednesday, 29 November 1967,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 37:

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations (continued) 135

Chairman: Mr. Humberto LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras).

AGENDA ITEM 37

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations (continued) (A/6815, A/SPC/L.148, A/SPC/L.150)

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Lannung (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

1. The CHAIRMAN: Before calling upon the first speaker I should like to remind the Committee that the Chairman, Mr. López Villamil, said yesterday that the would consult the Committee today concerning the closure of the list of speakers. He has asked me to propose that, at the request of some delegations, the list of speakers on the item under consideration should be closed at the end of the meeting tomorrow morning. If I hear no objection, I take it that the Committee so decides.

It was so decided.

2. Mr. ÅSTRÖM (Sweden): I do not need to stress the importance that the Swedish Government attaches to the question now before the Committee. We believe that the type of United Nations activities which has come to be known as peace-keeping operations constitutes a major break-through in the search for means to keep dangerous situations under control and to prevent them from developing into armed hostilities which might threaten general peace. Peace-keeping operations are now indeed an indispensable instrument at the disposal of the international community as represented by the United Nations. They are an expression of the collective concern for peace in a world of ever-increasing interdependence. As experience shows, they are in the interest of great and small Powers alike. Their basic characteristic being their essentially voluntary character, they cannot be imposed on any State and they cannot, therefore, be detrimental to the legitimate interests of any country.

3. The study in which the United Nations has been engaged for some years should, in our view, be designed to clarify the concept of peace-keeping, to refine the practical instrumentalities and to spread

knowledge about those most useful operations. We should not do anything that would tend to dilute or confuse the concept, to make its practical application more cumbersome or to lower its standing among Member countries. A study that did not meet that general test would not be helpful and might do some harm.

4. It has been clear from the very beginning of this work that the deep and far-reaching differences on some of the constitutional aspects of the subject have made it extremely difficult to arrive at agreed guidelines designed to facilitate the initiation, financing and conduct of future peace-keeping operations. At the same time it is widely felt that guidelines adopted by majority decisions would have only limited value.

5. On the other hand, when the need for a peace-keeping operation arises, usually in a situation of high tension and immediate urgency, there is often general agreement on the practical measures to be taken. Divergencies of views as to legal interpretations then seem to fall into the background. The possibility cannot be excluded that the United Nations will have to deal with some new concrete case in the not too distant future. We feel that if that is so and if it is the Security Council that is called upon to take the basic decision, the Council would be well advised, as long as no other agreed guidelines are worked out, to refer the matter of financing to the General Assembly, possibly with some recommendation as to the method it would like to see the Assembly adopt. This, of course, is a suggestion that has already been made during the discussions in the Committee of Thirty-Three.^{1/} We think it is still valid.

6. In other words, when the matter of peace-keeping is discussed in abstracto, the common denominator is low and tends to become lower as the discussion goes on. In the specific practical case, however, steps can be taken without much theorizing because they are found useful and necessary and because nobody wishes to deny Member countries the possibility, if they so wish, of seeking the assistance of the United Nations to reduce tension in a dangerous situation. Furthermore, we should not exclude the possibility that a rapprochement even on matters of principle may come about some time in the future as a result of continued United Nations practice and changing international relationships.

7. With these general considerations in mind we feel that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations should be given a chance to work on the basis of the mandate which it was given after much thought and discussion at the fifth special session in May this year. As is well known, the Special Com-

^{1/} Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations.

mittee until now did not have that chance. We seriously hope that some progress can be made with regard to the two questions that are specially mentioned in the mandate, that is, financing of peace-keeping and standby forces for peace-keeping. Some interesting ideas were advanced during previous discussions and they should be further explored. Consequently, we favour a resolution which would request the Committee of Thirty-Three to continue to carry out its mandate.

8. At its twenty-first session the General Assembly decided [resolution 2220 (XXI)] to refer the report of the Special Political Committee, containing the three resolutions that were adopted by the Committee, to the fifth special session. The General Assembly, at that session, resolved [resolution 2249 (S-V)] to transmit this same report to the Committee of Thirty-Three. It is our understanding that in doing so, the General Assembly wished the Committee of Thirty-Three to study the three resolutions before it renewed its own consideration of them and, in particular, before it took a final decision on them.

9. It follows from what I have now said that my delegation feels that the wise and proper course for the General Assembly would be not to adopt, at this session, any resolution on single substantive aspects of the total problem of peace-keeping.

10. This does not mean that the efforts to prepare for peace-keeping operations in the future should be stifled or halted. Beyond the studies to be undertaken by the Committee of Thirty-Three, there is much that can be done by the Organization itself, by the Governments and by academic and other institutions. In particular, Governments should consider carefully the desirability of making preparations for participation in peace-keeping operations in the form of standby forces. The experience gained from previous operations is easily available and can be put to good use when making such preparatory arrangements. Where appropriate, two or more countries can consult together for the purpose. The four Nordic countries have found such consultations amongst themselves of very great value. Finally, academic and other institutions in Member countries should be encouraged to do research into various practical and legal aspects of peace-keeping.

11. The Secretary-General has suggested, in the introduction to his annual report, on the work of the Organization [A/6701/Add.1, para.31], that a study be made of certain technical problems pertaining to preparations for peace-keeping. He would like that study to embrace such problems as standardization of training and equipment and the relationship between the Organization and the countries providing the personnel or facilities. The Swedish delegation wholeheartedly supports the Secretary-General's suggestion and hopes that, at the appropriate time, action will be taken on it.

12. Although the item before us concerns the problem of peace-keeping operations in the sense that this term has acquired over many years of United Nations experience and practice, the Swedish delegation finds it natural that some delegations have wanted to give consideration to the possibility of making available

to the Security Council armed forces in accordance with a special agreement or agreements in accordance with Article 43 of the Charter. If the United Nations is to acquire increased authority as the main instrument for keeping the peace and maintaining a stable and just world order, it is wise to keep this wider perspective in sight and to explore the potentialities of the United Nations for action under Chapter VII of the Charter. The Swedish delegation, therefore, would view it with satisfaction, if efforts were made by the Security Council to resume its study of this problem. We feel that such a study, although essentially pertaining to enforcement action, might yield some useful results too for the problem before the Committee of Thirty-Three regarding facilities, services and personnel that Member countries might voluntarily provide, in accordance with the Charter, for United Nations peace-keeping operations.

13. Finally, let me express the regret that my delegation feels at seeing the appeal for voluntary contributions, renewed by the General Assembly at its fifth emergency special session [resolution 2249 (S-V)], still going unheeded. In particular, we feel, in view of the consensus of 1 September 1965,^{2/} as well as of commitments undertaken and assurances given, that it is not unreasonable to expect those countries, in particular those great Powers which have not yet done so, to make voluntary contributions soon in order to wipe out the still existing financial deficit. The reasons for delay that have been given or surmised are not convincing. If contributions are not forthcoming, we feel that the appeal should be repeated and, possibly, strengthened.

14. The Swedish delegation does not intend, at this juncture, to comment on the proposals before the Committee beyond what follows from the general remarks I have now made. My delegation hopes that these remarks indicate the kind of resolution we would like the General Assembly to adopt at this session.

15. Mr. JIMENEZ (Philippines): The report of the Committee of Thirty-Three, [A/6815] which has received the mandate to make a comprehensive review and study of the whole question peace-keeping operations since 1964, is once again before us for our consideration.

16. It appears that, despite the efforts of the members of the Committee of Thirty-Three to find a solution, the question of peace-keeping operations continues to be as intractable as ever. It is unfortunate that the problem, which has been tossed from a regular session to a special session and back to another regular session of the General Assembly, remains unresolved. Furthermore, the problem has been overtaken by developments in some parts of the world which require urgent peace-keeping action to preserve international peace and security. The Special Committee reports this year to the Assembly that:

"Owing to the preoccupation of the entire membership of the Organization with certain international developments, the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations was unable to undertake the task entrusted to it by the General Assembly. In the

^{2/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1331st meeting, paras. 3 and 4.

circumstances, the Special Committee is of the view that it should continue to carry out its mandate." [Ibid., para. 5.]

17. The seriousness and importance of the problem require urgent action by all Member States. The Secretary-General, in his introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization this year, commented that

"It is not to the credit of the United Nations that after nineteen years of peace-keeping efforts each operation has still to be improvised for lack of measures of a general preparatory nature by the appropriate organs." [See A/6701/Add.1, para. 30.]

18. In the field of peace-keeping, our Organization has reached a dangerous political, constitutional and financial impasse. Records of our past deliberations show that Member States are still unable to agree on a generally accepted formula for authorizing, directing, or even financing future peace-keeping operations. There are those who claim that, under the United Nations Charter, peace-keeping operations involving the use of armed forces can be authorized only by the Security Council. There are those who made a distinction between operations that employ armed forces and those entrusted with observation, surveillance or investigation, so long as these are not carried out by units placed under military command and these units are not responsible for their own security. They hold the view that the General Assembly has the competence to authorize the latter but not the former, even if armed forces were created with the agreement of the States concerned and even if the actual use of armed force was theoretically limited to certain exceptional cases. A number of Member States, especially the small and medium-sized countries, argue that these interpretations of the Charter are unduly restrictive. Furthermore, they feel that the United Nations should not be paralysed by great-Power disagreement in the Council and the Assembly has residual authority when there is urgent need for a non-enforcement, peace-keeping type of operation.

19. In spite of differences of opinion, however, the discussions conducted by the Special Committee were not entirely in vain. They provided an opportunity for the exchange of views that might eventually lead to a consensus on the constitutional and financial problems of peace-keeping. My delegation would have wished the Special Committee to present at this time some concrete proposals on peace-keeping.

20. I need not elaborate again on the position of the Philippines concerning the constitutional aspect of the problem of peace-keeping. Suffice it to say that my delegation is gratified to note the recent developments in the United Nations which seem to sustain the validity and practicability of the position taken by a number of States, including my own. I refer to the position that whenever the Security Council, which has the primary responsibility under the Charter, is not able to discharge its responsibility for peace-keeping, the General Assembly has the residual authority and competence to consider the matter and take appropriate measures under the Charter to maintain international peace and security. I specifically refer to the convening of the fifth emergency special session of the

General Assembly on the Middle East crisis after the Security Council failed to take action thereon. While it is true that the matter has been referred back to the Council, the Assembly has authorized the President of the Assembly to reconvene the session as and when necessary.

21. My delegation considers this development a significant step towards recognition of the residual authority of the Assembly. It reflects a strong desire on the part of the great majority not to permit the inability of a principal organ of the United Nations to act in a crisis to paralyse the entire Organization.

22. With reference to the financial aspect of the problem of peace-keeping, there are those who maintain that only the Security Council can authorize and allocate expenses. A number of delegations have also expressed the view that, under Article 17 of the Charter, the power to make assessments on Member States is exclusively committed to the hands of the Assembly.

23. As I stated earlier, discussion of the problem of peace-keeping operations has been overtaken by events in various parts of the world which require urgent and positive action if peace and security are to be maintained. It appears that unless the intractable problems of peace-keeping are solved, voluntary contributions seem to be the only way of meeting the costs of any significant peace-keeping operations at present. But this type of financing peace-keeping operations, as pointed out by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his 1967 annual report on the work of the Organization is a "fragile and undependable foundation for operations which are usually vital to international peace and security" [see A/6701/Add.1, para.29].

24. There is, therefore, an urgent need of a firmer and more reliable basis for financing peace-keeping operations. It is because of this need that my delegation has decided to co-sponsor again this year the Irish draft resolution [A/SPC/L.148]. I need not elaborate further on the provisions and merits of this draft resolution as they have already been ably and clearly explained by the Foreign Minister of Ireland [570th meeting]. My delegation wishes to reaffirm its conviction that a previously agreed method of financing is preferable to an assessment made under the stress of extreme necessity, or one made on the spur of the moment, when a peace-keeping operation is on the verge of being undertaken. The absence of guide-lines, in our view, might cause the failure of a proposed operation.

25. My delegation notes with interest the various suggestions made concerning the facilities, services and personnel which Member States of the United Nations might voluntarily provide in accordance with the Charter with respect to peace-keeping. Experience has shown us that a United Nations presence in sensitive areas of the world has helped to a considerable degree in reducing tension, thus contributing to the creation of conditions of stability in the areas concerned. My delegation will continue to keep an open mind on this aspect of peace-keeping.

26. Let us all continue our efforts in the search for the means of maintaining a durable peace, no matter what the obstacles may be. The solution of the problems

of war and peace is within the realm of the possible, so long as we do not lose heart. But we will keep on trying. Let us therefore make the first forward step by providing for a reliable method of financing peace-keeping operations, even on an interim basis. If we make this first step, we hope that we shall then be one step nearer our goal.

27. If the United Nations is the last best hope of mankind for our survival in this nuclear age, every effort should be made to strengthen our Organization through the co-operation of all the Members. My delegation appeals to all Member States to extend a helping hand in bailing the world Organization out of its present and future financial difficulties. Let it be remembered that the founding Members of this world Organization at that historic Conference in San Francisco were by the spirit of brotherhood and co-operation in making possible the birth of the United Nations. They were further inspired by higher and nobler ideals—to save mankind from the scourge of war and to enable all peoples of the world to live in peace, progress and prosperity.

28. I trust that we are still guided by those ideals and that the greater interest of mankind transcends whatever rigid positions might have been taken on certain issues, like the vital one of financing. For the choice is this: either, through concerted efforts, we pursue and develop the possibilities of the United Nations peace-keeping function as a rational and civilized method of maintaining international peace and security, or we repeat the tragic failure of the League of Nations and once again plunge the world into another global holocaust.

29. Mr. BERARD (France) (translated from French): As the Secretary-General has emphasized in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization [A/6701/Add.1], developments in the year 1967 marked an important milestone with respect both to the theory and practice of United Nations peace-keeping operations.

30. Those operations had their beginning in Palestine; it is in that troubled part of the world that they have lasted the longest period of time and have been most intense and varied. As the Secretary-General recognized, the experience thus acquired made it possible to note the intrinsically fragile nature of those operations. The immediate disappearance of the United Nations Emergency Force at a crucial moment when the danger was increasing is bound to lead our Assembly to a more accurate evaluation of such undertakings, whose implementation and functioning over the years, we need hardly recall, have been the source of serious difficulties for the United Nations, and the cause of differences and disputes of such a nature that they almost led to the paralysis of our Organization.

31. Like the Secretary-General, we believe that the difficulties and divergencies opposing an improvement in United Nations actions for peace-keeping are primarily of a political and constitutional nature and that the military and financial aspects are only accessory. For that very reason, as the Chairman of the Committee of Thirty-Three said last May in that Committee, that the evolution of this question should

be conceived in the form of slow and careful progress and not in the form of sudden and violent developments. He also reminded us that it would be better for us to make progress gradually from ideas held in common and to avoid adopting simple-majority decisions which might be fraught with grave dangers.

32. This reasonable method was followed by the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations which, under wise guidance, carried out a task that, though not spectacular, was very considerable in nature, and we are sure that it will do further useful work if it is authorized to continue. Thanks to its debates, the views of all have been better understood and, to some degree, opinions on some points would seem to be drawing closer together. The French delegation was happy to play its part in the Committee and noted with satisfaction the attention its views received.

33. A reading of the Special Committee's report of 17 May 1967 shows that several representatives displayed interest in our ideas and emphasized that to some degree there ideas were close to theirs. That was particularly so in the case of the representative of India who recalled that the French and Indian delegations had similar though not identical views on certain aspects of peace-keeping operations but that there was little likelihood of making progress towards a solution of any aspect of a complicated problem as long as no effort was made to harmonize positions in such a way as to obtain unanimous support in favour of a practical, intermediate solution.^{3/} He added that the French idea offered possibilities for a solution on that aspect of the question and expressed the wish that our delegation would develop this view and provide the clarification which would make it possible to examine in depth the solutions that might emerge from such an approach. I could not fail to heed this invitation.

34. From our point of view, there can be no solution to the difficult problem confronting us other than a return to a strict interpretation of the United Nations Charter. To depart from this course can only lead to confusion and impotence. True, this treaty we have all signed is not without gaps and imperfections. But to quote the Minister of Foreign Affairs of France when he spoke in the general debate at this session: "... fundamentally, it establishes an appropriate balance among the principal organs and a realistic distribution of powers." [1571st plenary meeting, para. 27.] That balance, founded on the firm will of the drafters of the Charter, is expressed unequivocally in the provisions of Article 11, paragraph 2 of the Charter, which provides that "any such question [relating to the maintenance of international peace] on which action is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion." It follows therefore, in our view, that the Security Council should have exclusive competence for all peace-keeping operations which imply "action", that is to say, which would include the creation of a military force, even if that force intervened with the agreement of the State concerned and even if the use of arms was limited to

^{3/} Ibid. Fifth Special Session, Annexes, agenda item 8, document A/6654, para. 21.

exceptional cases. Accordingly, the competence of the Council cannot be restricted only to the enforcement action provided for under Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter. Moreover, in the introduction to his annual report, the Secretary-General states, in paragraph 28, that the enforcement action provided for in Chapter VII cannot be confused with peace-keeping proper. That is clearly a recognition that beyond the initiatives provided for in Articles 41 and 42, there is an area of peace-keeping in respect of which, pursuant to Article 11, paragraph 2, the decision lies only with the Security Council.

35. For the French Government, this area extends to any action in which the notion of constraint enters, even if this constraint applies not to a State, but to a province, an ethnic community or a political faction. It thus covers the vast field of aggressions carried out under cover of domestic unrest and civil wars for which, in the instability of the world of today, the burden of responsibility is certainly greater than in respect of what I would call "classical aggression", with the crossing of frontiers by regular armies and the invasion of territories. More specifically, the Security Council deals with any action implying the use of arms, whatever the limitations that may be imposed and even if it is intended that they must be used only for purposes of legitimate defence.

36. However, nothing in our opinion prohibits the General Assembly from undertaking operations relating to observation, supervision or investigation provided that those participating in such operations are not set up as duly constituted units under military command and required to provide for their own security. Moreover, Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter also invests the Assembly with the authority to discuss questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which may be put before it and to make recommendations with regard to any such questions. However, under the provisions of Article 12, when the Security Council is dealing with a matter for which peace-keeping operations have been proposed by the Assembly, the Assembly should make no recommendations unless the Council so requests.

37. At this stage, and since several delegations have touched on this point, I should like to make a brief reference to the Secretary-General. We shall certainly not be lowering the regard we have for the highest official of our Organization if we say that nothing in the Charter supports the view of those who, to use an expression we have heard in our debates, want to make of him a *deus ex machina* of peace-keeping operations, and if we add that past practices, to which certain speakers have referred, hardly seem to us to plead in favour of such an approach.

38. It seems logical to conclude from the foregoing that for reasons of principle, and also for considerations of a practical nature, the Security Council alone should decide on the method of financing the operations it has authorized. The constitutional and financial aspects of an operation are actually interdependent and cannot be dissociated. Moreover, to allow the Assembly to intervene in respect of the financing of peace-keeping operations would be tantamount to having the arrangements for such financing worked out by a

majority of Member countries whose participation in the costs could be less than 5 per cent, always provided that that majority did not decide to dispense those countries from making any contribution at all.

39. It is therefore most important, in this connexion, that this essential role of the Security Council should be recognized. The countries of the Third World would, we believe, benefit considerably, without undue burdens being imposed on other countries. In the apportionment of that burden, account should undoubtedly be taken of the economic potential of the developing countries. However, it would be inappropriate, as we see it, to bring in other criteria. In particular, we would reject any formula attributing a special responsibility to the permanent members of the Security Council who, for that matter, on the basis of the regular scale of assessments, would be bearing more than 60 per cent of the cost. We also reject the idea of an automatic exemption of the victims of an aggression, a matter which, in our opinion, should be left to the decision of the Council.

40. In the circumstances, it is obvious that the French delegation cannot acquiesce in draft resolution A/SPC/L.148, any more than it could in the previous resolution last year. It is true that this text no longer refers to Article 17 of the Charter and, by recognizing the need to work out a reliable system of financing future peace-keeping operations, it clearly implies that this system is bound to be different from that provided for the regular expenses of the Organization. We thought, from this fact, that the text represented an abandonment of a position to which, from the start, we were opposed. Unfortunately, the statements made in our Committee by the Minister for External Affairs of Ireland [570th meeting] lead us to fear that this abandonment is only provisional and, if we may say so, tactical, and that certain delegations have in no way given up the idea of rekindling a quarrel, the harmful effects of which are present in all our minds.

41. I would add that the operative part of the text, using the same terms as that which gained only thirty-three favourable votes^{4/} at the last session of the Special Political Committee does not seem any more likely to gain considerable support this year either, without which, as we said at the outset of our statement, there seems little hope of breaking the deadlock. I need hardly remind representatives that the Committee of Thirty-Three has acted by consensus. And it would certainly be vain for the General Assembly to try to impose on it directives which could not receive the support of many of its members. It would be vain, I say, and probably dangerous as well. From the beginning of our debates two speakers who, because of their functions, certainly have a full knowledge of the background, thought it necessary to warn us against such initiatives.

42. The representative of the United Arab Republic, the Rapporteur of the Committee of Thirty-Three, laid down as a first principle, and this principle later gained the support of the United States representative, "that any approach which may prejudice the constitu-

^{4/} Ibid, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 33, document A/6603, para. 19.

tional positions of various delegations should be avoided". He added that "our search should be centred seeking agreement among all concerned in spreading discord, from which our Organization had suffered in the past." [Ibid., para. 14.]

43. For his part, the representative of Mexico, who is Chairman of the Committee of Thirty-Three, referred to the claim "to impose obligations not specifically determined in the Charter, in the face of the clear opposition of a minority of States Members of the United Nations, including various permanent members of the Security Council" and declared that that would be "not a step towards uniting mankind, but a serious step backwards". [Ibid., para. 60.]

44. The French delegation has already had occasion to state the ways in which it thinks the difficult problem of the financing of peace-keeping operations could be solved, taking account both of the powers which in this respect devolve upon the Security Council, and of the legitimate desire of all States Members of the United Nations not be assessed without having had an opportunity to express themselves, and all due regard being paid to the concern of the countries of the Third World to being the contributions they might have to make into line with their capacity to pay.

45. We have in fact proposed firstly that the Council should engage in consultations before taking decisions of a financial nature. In accordance with Article 29 of the Charter, a special committee could be set up for this purpose, to include, in addition to members of the Security Council the parties concerned and States Members of the United Nations in sufficient numbers to ensure geographical balance. That Committee would make suggestions to the Council which would undoubtedly be given serious consideration.

46. Secondly, the Security Council could also take account of a recommendation that might be made to it by the General Assembly proposing that the total financial participation of the developing countries should be limited to 5 per cent of the total cost of peace-keeping operations. It may be worth pointing out that the total contributions of these countries, if no special scale were adopted, would reach 13.28 per cent of the total costs.

47. We would be happy if these proposals could be examined, with the aim of settling the problem of financing future peace-keeping operations, in a manner conforming both with the principles of the Charter and the wishes of all Member States. Previous operations, we must not forget, created a considerable deficit in the budget of the Organization. My delegation is of course prepared to participate in the efforts that might be made to eliminate this deficit. But it certainly feels that it should act in all freedom and, as the representative of the United States said in the Committee of Thirty-Three, take decisions that will be the result of its own conclusions.

48. In this connexion, I should like once again to recall that at the time of the "gentleman's agreement" of 1965, the French Government assumed no commitment, but confined itself to making it known that it considered that the difficulties of the Organization should first be assessed in a broader context and in harmony with the efforts that might be made by other

Powers. It could not, furthermore, consider that the payment of a voluntary contribution constituted some form of counterpart offer to those Member States that had considered the application of Article 19 of the Charter or the settlement of an alleged debt.

49. In the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization the Secretary-General stated that "The first reality of United Nations peace-keeping is its voluntary nature." [A/6701/Add.1, para. 28.] This was clearly the case particularly with the United Nations Emergency Force, which was based on a voluntary principle, illustrated by the automatic acceptance of the demand for the dissolution of that Force made by the United Arab Republic. It is clearly in accord with the same principle that the elimination of the deficit of that Force should be considered.

50. Just as it would seem dangerous to us to depart from the Charter in our efforts to establish on an absolute basis the forms of financing of future peace-keeping operations, so it would seem to us necessary to abide by the Charter when we examine the military aspect of such undertakings.

51. On 17 May 1965, in the Committee of Thirty-Three, the French delegation already stated that in this field there was no solution possible other than the application of Articles 43 and those following it.^{5/} Those Articles attribute exclusive responsibility to the Security Council, assisted by the Military Staff Committee. In respect of Article 47, which deals with the functions and composition of the Military Staff Committee, it would be appropriate, I feel, to interpret it in the light of the draft statute and rules of procedure of this body, which, while they have not yet been officially approved by the Security Council, nonetheless represent the principles whereby the Committee has operated, as indeed the Council has decided.

52. Having said this, the proposals in paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.150 seem to us to be in no way contradictory to the Charter. However, having heard, at the beginning of our debate, the warning of Mr. Cuevas Cancino, we do not feel altogether happy about the interest we take in the suggestions to make systematic what has so far been pragmatic. The Chairman of the Committee of Thirty-Three has said that it was doubtful whether the systematic progress could be introduced without destroying the very concept of peace-keeping operations [570th meeting, para. 82]. Peace-keeping operations vary in fact a great deal and should take into account factors that differ in each case and are very often impossible to foresee. The range of possibilities, from simple observation missions to what I would describe as: "interposed missions" such as those entrusted to the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Force in Cyprus respectively, is therefore vast indeed, and the first type hardly seems to have suffered from the lack of preparation.

53. In stating anew the position of the French Government and after listening to the declarations of previous speakers, I can only note once again how serious and complex is the problem before the Special Political Committee. As we see it, there is only one

^{5/} Ibid. Nineteenth Session, Annexes, annex no. 21, document 4/5815/Add.2, annex I, seventh meeting, para. 15.

way to solve the problem—the way laid down in the Charter. The Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations has already done useful work. We hope that it will continue to carry out its task in the same fashion.

54. The CHAIRMAN: There are no further speakers on my list who are prepared to speak this afternoon; but if any other member of the Committee is prepared to speak today I shall be very glad indeed to call on him, as we still have time to hear him this afternoon. It appears that nobody wishes to speak now. As is indicated in today's Journal, the Committee is scheduled to hold two meetings tomorrow. Therefore I should like to appeal to all members of the Committee who wish to speak to inscribe their names and be prepared to speak as soon as possible.

55. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon): I think this is a rather important point. As everyone knows, the subject we are discussing is an extremely important one and the statements which are made are important also because they reflect the policy positions of Governments, and they should be reproduced faithfully and as

extensively as possible in the summary records of this Committee. I know of the financial difficulties of the Organization and of the directive to save as much money as we can. I know, too—and the Committee has already been advised of this—that it has already been decided that some of the statements made here should be reproduced verbatim so as properly to reflect our deliberations. I will not go so far as to make a formal proposal, but I hope it will be agreed that the statements made yesterday and today are extremely important and that a decision can be taken now by this Committee to have them reproduced if not verbatim then as extensively as possible so that nothing at all of their basic substance is lost. I hope that my proposal will be approved unanimously.

56. The CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee approves the proposal and the Secretariat will make the necessary arrangements.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.