

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 461st  
MEETING



Friday, 19 November 1965,  
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 101:</i>	
<i>Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>Report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations;</i>	
(b) <i>The authorization and financing of future peace-keeping operations . . . . .</i>	1
<i>Organization of the Committee's work (continued) . . . . .</i>	4

*Chairman:* Mr. Carlet R. AUGUSTE (Haiti).

## AGENDA ITEM 101

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects (continued) (A/SPC/L.117 and Add.1):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations (A/5915 and Add.1, A/5916 and Add.1, A/5972, A/6026)
- (b) The authorization and financing of future peace-keeping operations (A/5966/Rev.2)

1. Mr. BEAULIEU (Canada) said that his country had participated in peace-keeping operations since the early years of the United Nations and that more than 2,000 Canadian servicemen were now engaged in that task. While Canada was not directly implicated in the disputes which had resulted in those operations, it considered that the interests of Canada, in the broad sense of that term, were best served by its participation in collective arrangements to maintain peace and security.

2. Canada agreed that the Security Council must continue to exercise its primary responsibility for maintaining peace, but it could not accept a situation in which, owing to the absence of agreement between members of the Council, the United Nations was prevented from recommending appropriate measures, the initiative for which belonged to the membership as a whole. Some feared that the Assembly might be tempted to make recommendations which were inapplicable and irresponsible. The history of the United Nations demonstrated, on the contrary, that the Assembly could act, when necessary, with moderation and dispatch.

3. The present system whereby the Secretary-General retained administrative supervision of peace-keeping, under the political control of the Security Council, had worked well. Nevertheless, Canada

would be prepared to examine any detailed proposals that would enable the Council, either through the Military Staff Committee or in some other way, to exercise that function, provided that the efficient running of the operations, which was of overriding importance, was assured. Any change in the present arrangements should not however, interfere with advance planning for peace-keeping, but on the contrary should facilitate such planning. For that purpose, the United Nations should strengthen staff arrangements at Headquarters. Planning by Governments on their own could have only limited results as long as appropriate central co-ordination remained inadequate.

4. Canada felt that the sharing of the financial burden among Member States was essential; the apportionment of expenses by the General Assembly, taking into account the guide-lines adopted at the fourth special session, was undoubtedly the best solution, particularly in the case of operations authorized by the Security Council. If it was right and proper for the Security Council to have primary responsibility for decisions concerning peace-keeping operations, it was equally to be expected that its members, and especially the permanent members, should pay an appropriate share of the cost. Alternative methods of financing would of course remain open for recommendation by the Council, including payment of the costs by the parties directly concerned and voluntary contributions from all Member States. Voluntary contributions, however, were not a satisfactory solution, as the Secretary-General had pointed out and as had been shown in the case of Cyprus, unless such contributions were considered by all Members to be a general obligation. At the present time Member States had an opportunity to discharge their responsibilities by making a voluntary contribution to restore the United Nations to solvency. Whether or not a pledging conference took place, as proposed by Canada, all delegations should make an appropriate contribution towards liquidating the debts accumulated in the past, so that agreements could be reached on an adequate system for financing the obligations of the future.

5. Canada was increasingly concerned about arrangements whereby States which were not permanent members of the Security Council could play an appropriate part in initiating, financing and supervising peace-keeping operations. His Government had noted with interest the proposals in paragraph 36 of the report of the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly (A/5915/Add.1, annex II). In any case, it was important that a solution should be found to a problem which would become increasingly urgent, if major contributors were to retain their

confidence in and support for future United Nations efforts in that field.

6. His delegation considered that, in accordance with Article 33 of the Charter, the peaceful settlement of disputes must take precedence over arrangements to prevent hostilities or to restore conditions of order and security. If, however, peace-keeping operations were decided upon the Governments concerned were under an obligation to strive to settle their differences. The Canadian Government, for its part, would find it increasingly difficult to participate in peace-keeping operations, especially those financed voluntarily, if it was not convinced that efforts to negotiate a peaceful settlement were being vigorously pursued.

7. While it was true, as the President of the nineteenth session of the General Assembly had stated on 1 September 1965 (1331st plenary meeting), that there was general agreement on the need to complete the work covered by General Assembly resolution 2006 (XIX), the fact remained that the major part of the work entrusted to the Special Committee under that resolution had yet to be done. At its present session the General Assembly should invite the Special Committee to continue its work and to report to the twenty-first session. There should be just one change made in the Committee's terms of reference: the Committee should select its officers from amongst its members. Canada would be glad to initiate or support a resolution to that effect. Upon resuming its work, the Committee might wish to examine the report of the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly (A/5915/Add.1, annex II), in particular paragraph 52, as also the comments made by Members on the guide-lines set forth in that paragraph (A/6026). Those guide-lines might be taken as a basis for the discussion of rules to govern the authorization and financing of future operations. Canada urged that the Committee should also examine the question of the control and administration of peace-keeping operations, including such problems as advance planning by Member States and arrangements for co-ordinating such plans.

8. With regard to the authorization and financing of future peace-keeping operations, he welcomed the bold proposals put forward by the Government of Ireland and fully agreed with the two major principles enunciated: first, that the General Assembly had a residual responsibility for the authorization of peace-keeping operations and that such authorization must be based on wide support among Member States and secondly, that a reliable system of financing peace-keeping operations, which took into account the capacity of Member States to pay, was necessary and urgent.

9. Mr. AIKEN (Ireland) agreed with the representative of Canada that the Security Council should continue to exercise primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, that the United Nations should not be prevented by lack of agreement among members of the Security Council from recommending measures to maintain or restore peace, and that consequently the membership as a whole should be able to recommend appropriate measures.

10. Introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.117 and Add.1, he pointed out that, following consultations with many delegations, the text had been amended in certain respects.

11. Two new paragraphs had been added to the preamble. The first drew attention to the recommendation of the nineteenth session of the General Assembly that the Special Committee should be asked to continue its work, while the second expressed the Assembly's wish to have at its disposal, should the need arise, agreed procedures for authorizing and financing peace-keeping operations.

12. In the three sub-paragraphs of operative paragraph 1, the references to part A of resolution 377 (V), entitled "Uniting for Peace", had been deleted and replaced by the phrase "a proposal to initiate a peace-keeping operation". The effect of that amendment was to provide that, whenever the General Assembly was voting upon a recommendation for a peace-keeping operation, whether the proposal was related to resolution 377 (V) or not, the quorum and the voting procedures would be as set out in sub-paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of operative paragraph 1.

13. Operative paragraph 2 (a) (iii) had been amended in two respects. First, the reference to a peace-keeping operation recommended by the General Assembly in accordance with resolution 377 (V) had been deleted, so that the provisions of the sub-paragraph would apply to the permanent members of the Security Council whether the operation was initiated by the Council or by the General Assembly. It would thus be clear that operations decided upon by the Security Council with the consent but not the positive votes of all the permanent members would be covered by the provisions in question. Secondly, in order to take into account the comments made by the representative of Ceylon at the 438th meeting, the following words had been added at the end of the sub-paragraph: "provided, however, that no member shall be assessed for more than 50 per cent of the net cost of the operation and that any unassessed balance shall be added to the sum apportioned on the group of members in sub-paragraph 2 (a) (ii)". It should be pointed out, in that connexion, that in no case would more than 20 per cent of the cost of a peace-keeping operation be added to the amount apportioned to the economically developed countries and that the sum would naturally be less if more than one of the permanent members voted for the operation. Even if each member of that group had to pay its share of a 20 per cent short-fall, the obligation would be well within its financial capabilities. Ireland, for its part, was ready to accept such an obligation and felt that the peoples of the economically developed countries would be willing to assume their share of the expenses in order that a small conflict could be prevented from developing into a war in which the great Powers might become involved.

14. The sponsors of the draft resolution felt that it was in the interests of all that the Security Council should become accustomed to co-operating in peace-keeping activities. The financing provisions in operative paragraph 2 would make it easier for the Security Council to arrive at agreement when one or more of the five permanent members were not pre-

pared to vote for a peace-keeping operation but did not wish to veto it.

15. Some delegations had wondered why the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.117 and Add.1 proposed that, at its present session, the Assembly should take interim decisions on the questions of authorization and financing rather than leave the matter to the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations and postpone the necessary decisions until some future session of the Assembly. The reason was that any committee asked to undertake a comprehensive review should know how the Assembly stood on certain fundamental issues. Was the Assembly prepared to assert its residual right to recommend a peace-keeping operation when the Council had rejected an appeal for help from a small State? If so, by what majority should it decide on such a recommendation? Again, was the Assembly prepared to adopt, for the future, the system of mandatory assessments set out in draft resolution A/SPC/L.117 and Add.1 pending the conclusion of what might well be very prolonged negotiations in the Special Committee and the adoption by the Assembly of some other system of mandatory assessments? Those were questions which only the Assembly could answer.

16. Delegations had also wondered why it was proposed that a permanent member of the Council should have the right not to share in paying for an operation when it had not voted for it, why those of the five permanent members which had voted for an operation should be assessed for the share of those which had voted against or abstained, and why, in any event, each of the other 112 Members of the Assembly should always be obliged to pay its assessment. The only justification which could be offered was that the Assembly was not prepared, at the present time, to make assessments for future peace-keeping operations mandatory under Article 17 paragraph 2 of the Charter on individual permanent members of the Council. The only solution therefore was to assess those members as a group and to provide that those of them which voted for the operation should share 70 per cent of the cost between them, on the understanding that no permanent member would be asked to pay more than 50 per cent of the net cost. The obligation which would thus be voluntarily assumed by those permanent members which voted for an operation would be accompanied by the privilege, accorded to no other Member of the General Assembly, of not paying anything when they voted against or abstained. The sponsors of the draft resolution could not conceive of the possibility of a permanent member refusing to pay any sum which, of its own free will, it had assumed responsibility to pay when it had voted for a peace-keeping operation. If a permanent member did not want to pay anything towards such an operation, it had only to abstain. Once having voted in favour, however, it could be expected to pay its share, particularly in view of the moral and political pressure that could be exerted by the other Members of the Assembly which were unable to exercise the same option and had to pay for every operation.

17. Turning to another aspect of the question, he said that there was no reason why the developing countries should be exempted from contributing towards

peace-keeping expenses. In fact no developing country had ever claimed inability to pay an assessment; moreover, there was provision in the Charter for payments to be postponed if financial difficulties were proved. Again, no developing country would be required to pay the shares of permanent members of the Security Council which had voted against an operation or abstained, or indeed to pay any more than 40 per cent of the amount they would be required to pay under the scale of assessments for the regular budget.

18. The system of assessment proposed by the sponsors represented a reasonable compromise which would enable the United Nations to perform its functions until more satisfactory arrangements were adopted. The provisional system would safeguard the principle of mandatory assessments not only for peace-keeping operations but in fact for all other United Nations activities. Although the formula envisaged did not exclude voluntary contributions, the Organization could not rely exclusively on such contributions.

19. The time for decision had come. He felt certain that, if the Assembly surrendered its right in the present circumstances, the day would surely come when its right to make mandatory assessments for any purpose, and not only for peace-keeping, would be challenged.

20. In the draft resolution, the sponsors asked nothing of the permanent members of the Security Council but recognition of the rights conferred on the Assembly by the Charter. He appealed to all members of the Committee to defend those rights. In that way it would be possible to preserve the full vigour of the Organization, which was the best hope for peoples still oppressed, the best guarantee of the independence and progress of small States, and the only means of ensuring the evolution of a stable and peaceful world order.

21. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal) said that the General Assembly had been concerned with the question of the authorization and financing of future peace-keeping operations since 1956, but that, instead of making progress, it had found itself paralysed at its nineteenth session; if the United States had not decided to withdraw its demand for the invocation of the provisions of Article 19 of the Charter, the present session could not have taken place. His delegation wished to thank the United States Government for the wise decision which it had taken, because the question was not whether a particular Article of the Charter should be invoked but how to ensure the effective operation of the Organization with a view to maintaining peace in the world.

22. His delegation also paid a tribute to the members of the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations for their untiring efforts, which could be a valuable contribution to a comprehensive review of the question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects, including ways of overcoming the Organization's present financial difficulties. There was good reason to be satisfied with the past achievements of the United Nations in the field of peace-keeping operations. Had the United Nations not intervened to maintain peace

in Kashmir, Gaza, the Congo and other areas, the conflicts there might have escalated into major wars. In Asia and Africa especially, the United Nations had played a useful role in preserving peace during the last twenty years. In view of the present crisis, however, the United Nations could be successful in containing local conflicts and restoring peace only if arrangements for financing future peace-keeping operations were approved by the General Assembly at the present session. In the interests of peace in general and of smaller countries in particular, the peace-keeping capability of the United Nations should be strengthened by a means acceptable to all delegations. The first concrete suggestions to that end had been put forward by the Irish delegation, whose objective approach was to be commended. Together with Ireland, Nepal was one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.117 and Add.1.

23. Past experience had shown that certain peace-keeping operations of the United Nations had been challenged by some major Powers as having been carried out in contravention of the Charter and in circumvention of the Security Council. The draft resolution took such possible objections into consideration and presented a set of principles which could be applied to all future peace-keeping operations recommended by the General Assembly. Those recommendations would be made only when the Security Council failed to carry out its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace. The draft resolution did not bind any permanent member of the Security Council to pay its assessed share of the expenses of a peace-keeping operation recommended by the General Assembly if it had voted against the operation or abstained from voting; on the other hand, by suggesting a very reasonable distribution of the costs of a peace-keeping operation, it provided a sound basis for financing such operations.

24. In order to ensure the effectiveness of the decision of the General Assembly, the sponsors were suggesting appropriate amendments to rules 69, 88 and 89 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Under those amendments, recommendations of the General Assembly for the establishment of a peace-keeping operation could not be adopted, first, if more than one quarter of the total membership did not participate in the vote or, secondly, if the recommendation was not supported by the favourable vote of at least one half of the total membership of the General Assembly.

25. The draft resolution took into full consideration the necessity of enforcing Article 17, paragraph 2 of the Charter, so as to ensure a firm basis for the authorization and financing of future peace-keeping operations. The permanent members of the Security Council which voted against the Assembly recommendation or abstained on it would be excluded from any financial participation. At the same time, in fixing the percentage to be paid by permanent members which voted in favour of an operation, the draft resolution took into consideration the special responsibilities of those members. The 70 per cent share imposed on them could not be regarded as too high a price for maintaining peace.

26. It was clear that, because of the failure to establish an international security force as envisaged in Article 43 of the Charter, some other arrangements, even if temporary, had to be considered in order to increase the Organization's means of action in the interests of world peace and security. So long as the Military Staff Committee could not function in the manner envisaged in the Charter and so long as the agreements prescribed in Article 43 were not concluded, the Security Council would not be in a position to maintain effective peace. Nepal would contribute its mite for the active application of Article 43.

27. The problem which the United Nations was facing was of a practical nature. It was not a question of transferring the competence of one organ of the United Nations to another, or of discussing residual responsibility, but, as the sponsors of the draft resolution were trying to do, of arriving at a formula for maintaining peace in the event of the Security Council failing to fulfil its primary responsibility, as could happen, for example, if one of the great Powers was involved in a violation of the peace. In such cases, the General Assembly should have a certain authority to act to restore peace.

28. The draft resolution before the Committee would provide an interim arrangement whereby the General Assembly would be equipped to carry out its residual responsibility pending the outcome of further deliberations on the matter.

29. The guide-lines for future peace-keeping operations suggested by the Secretary-General and the President of the nineteenth session of the General Assembly (A/5915/Add.1, annex II) were also intended to make the United Nations an effective instrument of peace in all circumstances. They clearly stated that, although the Members of the United Nations had conferred on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the General Assembly, too, bore responsibility in that sphere. The Nepalese delegation did not think that anyone would dispute the contention that the functions and powers of the Security Council and of the General Assembly should be regarded as complementary and not contradictory.

30. Mr. RICHARDSON (Jamaica) recalled that his Government had submitted detailed proposals on the subject of peace-keeping operations. He ventured to draw the Committee's attention to that fact because he had gained the impression that many delegations were not aware of those proposals, which appeared in annex I of document A/6026.

#### Organization of the Committee's work (continued)

31. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, at the previous meeting, the representative of Afghanistan had requested verbatim records of the Committee's debates. He wished to repeat the statement he had made on the subject at the 440th meeting, which he read out. The Committee could decide that verbatim records should be circulated, but in English and French only; the summary records, however, would remain the only official records of the meetings. The additional work involved would, of course, entail expenses and delays.

32. Mr. AZIZ (Afghanistan) pointed out that the question before the Committee was perhaps the most important one of the current session, or even, perhaps, of future sessions. Whether the Assembly established a new committee to examine the question, or whether it requested the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to continue its work, it would be useful for the committee concerned to possess verbatim records of the debates in the Special Political Committee. He could not say, without consulting the other members of the Committee, whether the solution suggested by the Chairman would be satisfactory in the circumstances.

33. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would consider that the Committee, in adopting the Afghanistan proposal, was requesting the Secretariat to provide verbatim records of all meetings on the subject of peace-keeping operations.

*It was so decided.*

34. Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) asked how soon after a meeting the verbatim record would appear. If it took too long to prepare such records, much of their usefulness to the members of the Committee themselves would be impaired.

35. Mr. BUNCHE (Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs) said that he was unfortunately unable to give any specific period of time. He wished nevertheless to assure the representative of Venezuela that his request would be fully taken into account. Many committees met at the same time as the Assembly in plenary meeting and the Security Council, and it was not possible, in those circumstances, to ensure that there would be no delay.

36. Mr. NEKROUF (Morocco) pointed out, with regard to the summary records, that the Committee had only just received, on Friday, 19 November, the record of the 457th meeting, held on Tuesday, 16 November.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that he would request the Secretariat to ensure that the summary records appeared as early as possible.

38. Mr. JUARBE Y JUARBE (Cuba) pointed out that the last summary record in Spanish to be circulated to the Committee, at the time of its afternoon meeting on Friday, 19 November, was that of the 455th meeting, held in the morning of 15 November. It was thus difficult for a Spanish-speaking delegation to take part in the discussions as it would wish to do, especially when the consideration of a question lasted for one week only.

39. The Cuban delegation's remarks were not intended as a criticism of the Secretariat; it had felt obliged to make them, however, in view of the particular importance of the question which the Committee had just begun to consider.

40. Mr. REDONDO (Costa Rica) associated himself with the remarks which had been made concerning the verbatim and the summary records. He pointed out, in particular, that a delay of more than two days in regard to verbatim records robbed them of most of their value.

41. The CHAIRMAN remarked that the summary record would not be of such immediate importance provided that the verbatim record was available to delegations the following day, at least in typescript. At the same time, it appeared from what the Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs had said that any delay was purely temporary.

42. He reminded representatives that they should enter their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible if they wished to speak on the question of peace-keeping operations. He did not wish to close the list on 22 November, as had been contemplated, but the list should be closed not much later than that date.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.