



Twenty-first session
Agenda item 33

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE WHOLE QUESTION OF PEACE-KEEPING
OPERATIONS IN ALL THEIR ASPECTS

Third report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations

Rapporteur: Mr. Ahmed Tawfik KHALIL (United Arab Republic)

1. On 18 February 1965 the General Assembly, during its nineteenth regular session, adopted resolution 2006 (XIX), pursuant to which the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, composed of thirty-three members, was established for the purpose of undertaking "as soon as possible a comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects, including ways of overcoming the present financial difficulties of the Organization".
2. In the course of its work in 1965 the Special Committee adopted, for submission to the General Assembly, two reports, the first on 15 June 1965^{1/} and the second on 31 August 1965.^{2/} The second report contained the following consensus of the Committee:

"(a) That the General Assembly will carry on its work normally in accordance with its rules of procedure;

"(b) That the question of the applicability of Article 19 of the Charter will not be raised with regard to the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Operation in the Congo;

"(c) That the financial difficulties of the Organization should be solved through voluntary contributions by Member States, with the highly developed countries making substantial contributions."

1/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Annexes, Annex No. 21, documents A/5915 and Add.1.

2/ Ibid., documents A/5916 and Add.1.

3. The two reports of the Special Committee were adopted by the General Assembly at its resumed nineteenth session on 1 September 1965.
4. At its twentieth session the General Assembly had an item on its agenda entitled "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects". On 15 December 1965, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2053 (XX) by which it requested the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations "to continue and complete as soon as possible the work assigned to it by the General Assembly in paragraph 3 of its resolution 2006 (XIX) and to report to the Assembly at its twenty-first session".
5. At its 19th meeting, on 4 February 1966, its first meeting after the conclusion of the twentieth session of the General Assembly, the Special Committee unanimously elected the following officers: Mr. Francisco Cuevas Cancino (Mexico), Chairman; Mr. Paul Tremblay (Canada), Vice-Chairman; Mr. Milan Klusak (Czechoslovakia), Vice-Chairman; and Mr. Ahmed Tawfik Khalil (United Arab Republic), Rapporteur.
6. The Special Committee had before it the following documents:
 - (a) Letter dated 9 February 1966 (A/AC.121/6) from the Secretary-General to the Chairman of the Special Committee, pursuant to resolution 2053 (XX), transmitting the records of the debates during the discussion at the twentieth session of the General Assembly of the item "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects" as well as the text of a draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Ceylon, Costa Rica, Ghana, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Nepal, Philippines and Somalia;
 - (b) Note by the Secretary-General (A/AC.121/5/Add.3) incorporating the substance of replies received from Member States after 31 August 1965 to the communication sent by the Secretary-General in 1965, as desired by the Special Committee, asking for views with regard to the guidelines indicated in paragraph 52 of the report dated 31 May 1965^{3/} submitted to the Special Committee by the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General.
7. The Special Committee held four meetings between 4 February and 13 September 1966.

^{3/} Ibid., document A/5915/Add.1, annex II. Also issued under the symbol A/AC.121/4.

8. At its 20th meeting, on 29 April 1966, the Special Committee decided to constitute itself as a Working Group. The Working Group held three meetings between 10 May and 14 June 1966.

9. The records of the meetings of the Special Committee are reproduced as annex I and those of the Working Group as annex II.

ANNEX I

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE NINETEENTH TO TWENTY-SECOND MEETINGS
OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.121/SR.19
17 February 1966

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE NINETEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 4 February 1966, at 10.55 a.m.

CONTENTS

Statement by the Secretary-General

Election of officers

PRESENT:

<u>Acting Chairman:</u>	U THANT	Secretary-General
<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO	(Mexico)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. PAZHWAQ	Afghanistan
	Mr. BOUATTOURA	Algeria
	Mr. RUDA	Argentina
	Mr. SHAW	Australia
	Mr. WALDHEIM	Austria
	Mr. SETTE CAMARA	Brazil
	Mr. TREMBLAY	Canada
	Mr. MUZIK	Czechoslovakia
	Mr. VEGA-GOMEZ	El Salvador
	Mr. GEBRE-EGZY	Ethiopia
	Mr. SEYDOUX	France
	Mr. CSATORDAY	Hungary
	Mr. MISHRA	India
	Mr. ALJUBOURI	Iraq
	Mr. VINCI	Italy
	Mr. MATSUI	Japan
	Mr. MISKE)	Mauritania
	Mr. BA)	
	Miss AGUIRRE	Mexico
	Mr. de BEUS)	Netherlands
	Mr. Von GORKOM)	
	Mr. ADEBO)	Nigeria
	Mr. IYALLA)	
	Mr. Ahmed ALI	Pakistan
	Mr. WYZNER	Poland
	Mr. HASEGANU	Romania
	Mr. D.A.O. WILLIAMS	Sierra Leone
	Mr. AZNAR	Spain
	Mr. ASTROM	Sweden
	Mr. PACHARIYANGKUN	Thailand
	Mr. FEDORENKO	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. EL-KONY	United Arab Republic

PRESENT (continued):

<u>Members</u> (continued):	Lord CARADON)	United Kingdom of Great Britain
	Sir Roger JACKLING)	and Northern Ireland
	Mr. GOLDBERG	United States of America
	Mr. ALVARADO	Venezuela
	Mr. LEKIC	Yugoslavia
<u>Secretariat:</u>	U THANT	Secretary-General
	Mr. VELLODI	Secretary of the Committee

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

The SECRETARY-GENERAL, opening the meeting, paid a tribute to the former Chariman of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, Mr. Quaison-Sackey, who had been appointed Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ghana since the previous meeting, and expressed his appreciation of Mr. Quaison-Sackey's valuable contribution to the work of the Committee both at its meetings and during informal consultations.

At its eighteenth meeting, the Committee had been able, with the co-operation and understanding of members, to adopt a report (A/5916) expressing a consensus of views on the problem of the applicability of Article 19 which had so seriously impeded the normal functioning of the General Assembly at its nineteenth session. As a result, the twentieth session of the General Assembly had not only been able to function normally but had been one of the most productive sessions in the life of the United Nations. At the same time, the Special Committee had not devoted sufficient attention, either in the formal meetings or during informal consultations, to the main issue covered by its mandate under the terms of General Assembly resolution 2006 (XIX), namely to undertake a comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects. The Committee itself had indicated in its first report to the General Assembly (A/5915) that more time was required to complete its work.

Following the adoption of the Special Committee's report by the General Assembly at its resumed nineteenth session, Members had had an opportunity to discuss the problem at the twentieth session of the General Assembly, largely thanks to the initiative of the Irish delegation which had inscribed a separate item on the agenda. He expressed his appreciation to the Minister for External Affairs of Ireland for his personal interest in the matter and for the determination and perseverance with which he had pursued his objective of putting the financial aspects of peace-keeping operations on a firmer basis. Unfortunately, the General Assembly had not taken a positive position on the issue, although the debate in the Special Political Committee had been extremely useful. Under resolution 2053 (XX), part A, operative paragraph 2, and the operative paragraph of part B, the records of the debates and the draft resolution submitted

(The Secretary-General)

by Ireland and eight other delegations had been referred to the Special Committee and they would shortly be issued as documents of the Committee.

The Committee would have to work hard in order to complete its work as soon as possible, in accordance with operative paragraph 1 of resolution 2053 (XX). The problem of peace-keeping was one of the most vital and urgent issues facing the United Nations and upon the Committee's success in finding acceptable guidelines to govern the conduct of peace-keeping operations depended in large measure the ability of the United Nations to help maintain international peace and security.

The financial difficulties of the United Nations were still serious. At the resumed nineteenth session of the General Assembly, the Members had agreed that the Organization's financial difficulties should be solved through voluntary contributions by Member States, with the highly developed countries making substantial contributions. He expressed his deep gratitude to those Governments which had made generous contributions, but regretted that the response to his repeated appeals for contributions which had been endorsed by the General Assembly at its twentieth session had been far from encouraging. He reiterated that appeal and hoped that those Governments which had not yet done so would come forward with voluntary contributions and enable the United Nations to solve its financial difficulties.

He felt sure that he would be reflecting the sentiments of all the members of the Committee in expressing condolences to the Japanese Government on the airline disaster which had occurred that morning near Tokyo, and in offering congratulations to the Soviet Government and people on the successful landing of Luna 9 on the moon, an event which would contribute to the welfare of the whole human community.

Mr. MISHRA (India), Mr. SEYDOUX (France), Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary), Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria), Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia), Lord CARADON (United Kingdom), Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia), Mr. LEKIC (Yugoslavia), Mr. VINCI (Italy), Mr. D.A.O. WILLIAMS (Sierra Leone) and Mr. HASEGANU (Romania) extended their sympathy to the Japanese delegation in connexion with the airline disaster that had occurred in Tokyo and congratulated the USSR on its achievement in landing an unmanned space station on the moon.

Mr. MATSUI (Japan) thanked the Secretary-General and the members of the Committee, particularly the Indian representative, for their condolences, which he would convey to his Government.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Secretary-General and the members of the Committee for the congratulations they had extended to his country on its most recent achievement in outer space, which would have far-reaching consequences and constitute an invaluable contribution to man's peaceful conquest and use of outer space. He also extended his condolences to the Japanese delegation on the occasion of the recent tragic air crash.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. ADEBO (Nigeria) nominated Mr. Cuevas Cancino (Mexico) for the office of Chairman of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations.

Mr. RUDA (Argentina), Mr. MISHRA (India) and Mr. SEYDOUX (France) supported the nomination of Mr. Cuevas Cancino.

Mr. Cuevas Cancino (Mexico) was elected Chairman by acclamation.

Mr. Cuevas Cancino (Mexico) took the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the members of the Committee for the honour done to him. The question of peace-keeping operations was one of the most vital problems facing the United Nations. If it were ignored, the work of the General Assembly would be constantly threatened with paralysis and the effectiveness of the Organization with ultimate destruction. If it were solved, the United Nations would be strengthened as a bulwark in international affairs. The issues involved affected the vital interests of Governments and the co-operation of members was essential if unanimous decisions on such difficult problems was to be achieved. He pledged himself to work closely with the members of the Committee and, in accordance with operative paragraph 3 of resolution 2053 (XX), he hoped that the Committee would continue to enjoy the counsel of the President of the General Assembly and the close collaboration of the Secretary-General. He paid a tribute to Mr. Quaison-Sackey for the diplomacy and patience he had shown as Chairman of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN called for nominations for the two posts of Vice-Chairman.

Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) nominated Mr. Klusak (Czechoslovakia).

Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) and Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria) supported the nomination of Mr. Klusak.

Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) nominated Mr. Tremblay (Canada).

Mr. SETTE CAMARA (Brazil) and Lord CARADON (United Kingdom) supported the nomination of Mr. Tremblay.

Mr. Klusak (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. Tremblay (Canada) were elected Vice-Chairmen by acclamation.

The CHAIRMAN called for nominations for the post of Rapporteur.

Mr. LEKIC (Yugoslavia) nominated Mr. Khalil (United Arab Republic).

Mr. VINCI (Italy), Mr. D.A.O. WILLIAMS (Sierra Leone) and Mr. HASEGANU (Romania) supported the nomination.

Mr. Khalil (United Arab Republic) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.121/SR.20
2 June 1966

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 29 April 1966, at 3.25 p.m.

CONTENTS

Organization of work

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO	(Mexico)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. PAZHAK	Afghanistan
	Mr. BOUATTOURA	Algeria
	Mr. RUDA	Argentina
	Mr. SHAW	Australia
	Mr. WALDHEIM	Austria
	Mr. RIO BRANCO	Brazil
	Mr. TREMBLAY	Canada
	Mr. KLUSAK	Czechoslovakia
	Mr. MISCO FISCHNALER	El Salvador
	Miss SINEGIORGIS	Ethiopia
	Mr. TINE	France
	Mr. PRANDLER	Hungary
	Mr. PARTHASARATHI	India
	Mr. KHALAF	Iraq
	Mr. FRANZI	Italy
	Mr. MATSUI	Japan
	Mr. MISKE	Mauritania
	Miss AGUIRRE	Mexico
	Mr. de BEUS	Netherlands
	Mr. IYALLA	Nigeria
	Mr. Ahmed ALI	Pakistan
	Mr. LEWANDOWSKI	Poland
	Mr. MORARU	Romania
	Mr. COLLIER	Sierra Leone
	Mr. AZNAR	Spain
	Mr. ASTROM	Sweden
	Mr. PANYARACHUN	Thailand
	Mr. MOROZOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. EL-KONY	United Arab Republic
	Sir Keith UNWIN	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. GOLDBERG	United States of America

PRESENT (continued):

Members (continued):

Mr. ZULOAGA

Venezuela

Mr. LEKIC

Yugoslavia

Secretariat:

Mr. VELLODI

Secretary of the Committee

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Secretary-General's letter of 9 February 1966 (A/AC.121/6) transmitting the records of the debates held by the General Assembly during its twentieth session on agenda item 101, "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects", and to the additional replies (A/AC.121/5/Add.3) received from Member States to the Secretary-General's communication of 23 June and 17 August 1965.

The Committee had not met since 4 February 1966. On that occasion, its agenda had been restricted to the election of officers. In the interval, however, the Chairman and the other officers had engaged in extensive and fruitful consultations with all members of the Committee on the best way of tackling the problem of peace-keeping. There seemed to be a general awareness of the terms of General Assembly resolution 2053 A (XX), particularly its operative paragraph 3, and a general hope that the Committee, avoiding repetitions of previously stated views, would approach its task in a businesslike manner which would yield positive results. Everyone hoped that the discussions would be constructive and that specific proposals would be received during the next few days.

In particular, there appeared to be general agreement that, after an initial period in which members might wish to make formal statements, the Special Committee should constitute itself into a working group which would be able to consider more effectively constructive proposals on the various aspects of peace-keeping operations.

In reply to a question by Mr. KHALAF (Iraq), the CHAIRMAN confirmed that the proposed working group would hold official or semi-official meetings, without records, rather than private consultations.

In reply to a question by Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria), the CHAIRMAN explained that in the next few days the Special Committee would hear any general statements members wished to make, after which the working group would begin its discussions as soon as possible.

Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) proposed that the Committee should approve the Chairman's statement concerning the organization of work.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 3.50 p.m.

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.121/SR.21
2 June 1966

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 10 May 1966, at 11 a.m.

CONTENTS

Organization of work

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO	(Mexico)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. KHALIL	(United Arab Republic)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. PAZHWAK	Afghanistan
	Mr. AZZOUT	Algeria
	Mr. QUIJANO	Argentina
	Mr. SHAW	Australia
	Mr. WALDHEIM	Austria
	Mr. SETTE CAMARA	Brazil
	Mr. TREMBLAY	Canada
	Mr. KLUSUK	Czechoslovakia
	Miss SINEGIORGIS	Ethiopia
	Mr. SEYDOUX	France
	Mr. PRANDLER	Hungary
	Mr. MISHRA	India
	Mr. KHALAF	Iraq
	Mr. VINCI	Italy
	Mr. MATSUI	Japan
	Mrs. MISKE	Mauritania
	Miss AGUIRRE	Mexico
	Mr. QUARLES Van UFFORD	Netherlands
	Mr. IYALLA	Nigeria
	Mr. Ahmed ALI	Pakistan
	Mr. CZAJKOWSKI	Poland
	Mr. MORARU	Romania
	Mr. D. WILLIAMS	Sierra Leone
	Mr. de PINIES	Spain
	Mr. ASTRÖM	Sweden
	Mr. PANYARACHUN	Thailand
	Mr. MOROZOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. EL KONY	United Arab Republic
	Lord CARADON	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. FINGER	United States of America

PRESENT (continued):

Members (continued): Mr. ZULOAGA

Venezuela

Mr. LEKIC

Yugoslavia

Also present:

U THANT

The Secretary-General

Secretariat:

Mr. VELLODI

Secretary of the Committee

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN welcomed the Secretary-General and said that his presence indicated the importance attached to the Committee's task.

He recalled the decision adopted by the Committee at its twentieth meeting to constitute itself as a Working Group and suggested that, as agreed in consultations held with all members, the offices of the Committee should continue to function as the offices of the Working Group. When the Working Group held formal meetings, the proceedings would be recorded in the same manner as the formal meetings of the Committee.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.5 a.m.

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.121/SR.22
29 September 1966
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 13 September 1966, at 11 a.m.

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO	(Mexico)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. KHALIL	(United Arab Republic)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. WAZIRI	Afghanistan
	Mr. BOUATTOURA	Algeria
	Mr. QUIJANO	Argentina
	Mr. SHAW	Australia
	Mr. WALDHEIM	Austria
	Mr. SETTE CAMARA	Brazil
	Mr. IGNATIEFF	Canada
	Mr. KLUSAK	Czechoslovakia
	Mr. VEGA-GOMEZ	El Salvador
	Mr. DERESSA	Ethiopia
	Mr. SEYDOUX	France
	Mr. CSATORDAY	Hungary
	Mr. MISHRA	India
	Mr. KHALAF)	Iraq
	Mr. SALEEM)	
	Mr. VINCI	Italy
	Mr. MATSUI	Japan
	Mrs. CABRERA	Mexico
	Mr. de BEUS	Netherlands
	Mr. Ahmed ALI	Pakistan
	Mr. WYZNER	Poland
	Mr. MORARU	Romania
	Mr. D. WILLIAMS	Sierra Leone
	Mr. AZNAR)	Spain
	Mr. de PINIES)	
	Mr. ASTROM	Sweden
	Mr. FEDORENKO	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. EL KONY	United Arab Republic
	Sir Roger JACKLING	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

PRESENT (continued):

Members (continued):

Mr. GOLDBERG

United States of America

Mr. ZULOAGA

Venezuela

Mr. DUHACEK

Yugoslavia

Secretariat:

Mr. VELLODI

Secretary of the Committee

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Special Committee that the solution of the problem with which it was dealing was vitally important to the United Nations, even though the urgency which had led to the establishment of the Committee at the nineteenth session of the General Assembly had receded. Although the Committee had worked at a more leisurely pace during the past year, negotiations had continued with the aim of reconciling views which were still divergent. The Committee now had before it a strictly objective draft report on the official meetings it had held and a draft declaration by the Chairman which referred to the informal negotiations and which, if the Committee had no objection, might be included, with any necessary modifications, in the record. The two documents indicated that the negotiations conducted by the officers of the Committee during the past few months have not yet led to the finding of a definitive formula. Nevertheless, both the great and the small Powers had had an opportunity to study the problem at leisure, and the informal proceedings would at least have served to prepare the way for an agreement. He wished to thank delegations, on behalf of the other officers of the Committee and himself, for the goodwill and support accorded to them during the negotiations.

Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada) said that, while he regretted that the specific suggestions made by the representative of Canada at the second meeting of the Working Group of the Committee (A/AC.121/WG/SR.2) had not been followed up, he hoped that what had not been accomplished in the Committee might be accomplished elsewhere. The Canadian Government would certainly give the greatest attention to the question what further steps could usefully be taken, and it was to be hoped that the issues raised by his delegation and other delegations in the Committee would continue to be studied by all countries interested in the maintenance of peace by the United Nations. Canada would continue to be guided by the three aims which it had had in mind from the beginning of the Committee's work: first, to restore the United Nations to solvency and to prevent the possibility of a recurrence of the constitutional and financial crisis; secondly, to preserve and, if possible, to enhance the capacity of the United Nations to play its rightful part in the maintenance of international peace and security; and thirdly, to accomplish those objectives in a manner which would ensure that peace-keeping in

(Mr. Ignatieff, Canada)

future could be carried out on a firm financial and political basis. Whatever difficulties might lie in the path of establishing a wide measure of agreement, nothing prevented individual countries from making their own preparations, as Canada had already done, so that they could, if requested, provide the United Nations with assistance in a peace-keeping operation. As a matter of interest, the Canadian authorities had drawn up a paper on the organization and training of Canadian military forces available for United Nations service, although such a paper did not, of course, in any way prejudice the decision which the Canadian Government might take in response to any request from the United Nations. It was not the intention of his Government to issue the paper as a formal document, but it would make it available to any country which might ask for it.

Sir Roger JACKLING (United Kingdom) expressed his appreciation of the Chairman's patience, persistence and skill. Since the Committee had been set up, there had been two positive results from its deliberations. The first was the valuable report submitted to the Committee in 1965 by the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly (A/AC.121/4), which had contained broad guidelines that had strongly influenced the subsequent work of the Committee and, more important still, the thinking on peace-keeping matters. Those guidelines had been supported by an overwhelming majority of the members of the Committee. The second positive result was the consensus which had been reached in the Committee in 1965 and which had enabled the twentieth session of the General Assembly to proceed normally, on the understanding that the financial difficulties of the Organization should be solved through voluntary contributions. He trusted that other substantial voluntary contributions would now be forthcoming, sufficient, in the words of the Secretary-General, to "place the Organization on a basis of complete solvency, so that it can face the great tasks ahead with confidence" (A/6400). The Committee would then have discharged one part of its mandate.

It was also worth recalling that peace-keeping operations had never been interrupted, as the decisive action by the Security Council over Kashmir and over Cyprus had demonstrated.

When the Committee's mandate had been renewed by the General Assembly in 1965, his delegation had hoped that the Committee would be able to submit to the

(Sir Roger Jackling, United Kingdom)

General Assembly, at its twenty-first session, recommendations which would put the peace-keeping capacity of the United Nations on a stronger basis for the future. His delegation had thought that an inter-sessional committee would give more time for consideration of the complexities and for the informal discussion which their resolution seemed to require. It was regrettable that it had been impossible, despite all the efforts that had been made, to develop any proposal which could gain unanimous support and be regarded as a constructive and useful contribution to the solution of the problems upon which the Committee was charged to make recommendations.

His delegation remained faithful to the views which it had constantly advocated, namely, belief in the primary responsibility of the Security Council and in complementary functions of the Council and the General Assembly in the preservation of peace, in the collective responsibility of all Member States for peace-keeping expenses, and in the need for greater efficiency in the command, control, training and logistic supply of peace-keeping troops, and support for the authority of the Secretary-General. In short, the United Kingdom continued firm in its adherence to the Charter.

Some new ideas and useful proposals had emerged from the discussions in the Working Group. He invited the Committee's attention, in particular, to the statements made by the representatives of Sweden, Canada, the Netherlands and Japan (A/AC.121/WG/SR.1, 2 and 3). Thus, constructive proposals had not been lacking, and the fact that the Committee was not at present in a position to submit any recommendations was due to a lack of readiness by some of its members to examine those proposals. However, if there were no recommendations, the records of the Committee's proceedings contained much that was constructive. The United Kingdom strongly hoped that all the suggestions which had been made, including the proposals by the Minister for External Affairs of Ireland, would be considered at the forthcoming session of the Assembly.

The Secretary-General, in his letter making known his intention not to seek a second term of office, had pointed out the serious consequences to all Member States of a lack of new ideas and fresh initiatives and a weakening of the will to find means of strengthening and expanding genuine international co-operation. To his delegation, when certain Member States hindered efforts to improve means

(Sir Roger Jackling. United Kingdom)

of preserving the peace, those Members put in doubt their readiness to pay more than lip-service to the principles of the Charter. The fundamental purpose of the Organization was the preservation of international peace and security, without which the fruits of international co-operation could not be harvested. He trusted that, at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, means to make progress towards the solution of those problems would be found and that the Assembly as a whole would not permit that progress to be continually frustrated.

Mr. SEYDOUX (France) said that he had no objections to the draft report of the Committee. He could not fail to note that at least one member had expressed regret that the Committee had been unable to make progress in its work. His delegation shared that regret. However, it was not surprising that the constitutional crisis which had arisen out of the dispute over Article 19 of the Charter could not be resolved overnight. A number of obstacles which prevented a serious and objective approach to the problem must first be removed, as had been done in 1965 when the General Assembly had decided to resume its normal functioning without imposing any special conditions. It was with those considerations in mind that the French Government, at the twentieth session of the General Assembly, had requested that a study should be made of the finances of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, in the belief that the results to be achieved by the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts on the question would have repercussions on the work of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations.

His delegation was particularly appreciative of the Chairman's efforts to arrive at a number of conclusions which would have reflected the common desire of members of the Committee to seek an agreement within the framework of the Charter. It sincerely regretted that the formulae which he had twice suggested and which had had the merit of being non-controversial, while at the same time indicating what progress had been made and what remained to be done, had not been acceptable to other delegations.

Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America) said that his delegation had refrained from speaking earlier for two reasons: first, the United States position had been set forth on 24 November 1965 in the Special Political Committee

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

and, secondly, the United States had wanted to give those countries which were not permanent members of the Security Council an opportunity to express their views first. Although the Committee had not been able to agree on recommendations to strengthen peace-keeping machinery and ensure a satisfactory system of financing, very useful private consultations had been held and it could be hoped that constructive action would be taken at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly.

The United States had studied with great interest the proposals made by Sweden and Canada, which would presumably be transmitted to the General Assembly. His delegation had likewise considered the proposal submitted to the General Assembly in 1965 by Ceylon, Costa Rica, Ghana, Ireland, the Ivory Coast, Liberia, Nepal, the Philippines and Somalia, which had been transmitted to the Committee (A/AC.121/6). The General Assembly would also have before it the guidelines proposed by the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly at its nineteenth session (A/AC.121/4). The United States itself had made certain suggestions to the Working Group of Twenty-one in September 1964, and the representative of France had set forth some very useful ideas, in the same Working Group, on the authorization and financing of peace-keeping operations.

It was important to note that, in spite of the divergencies of views, the activities of the United Nations organs which were responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security had continued without interruption. Peace-keeping operations were going on in Cyprus, Kashmir and the Middle East. That fact was encouraging.

The first two elements of the consensus reached by the Special Committee on 31 August 1965 had been put into effect; however, the third element, the restoration of the solvency of the United Nations through voluntary contributions, had not been carried out to the desired extent. Certain countries which had not contributed to particular peace-keeping operations had stated that they would make substantial voluntary contributions once the other elements of the consensus had been put into effect. That had now been done, and the United States hoped that substantial voluntary contributions would soon be forthcoming.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the results achieved with respect to peace-keeping operations were not satisfactory. That failure was due to the negative attitude of the Western Powers; it was the attitude taken by the United States and the United Kingdom which had made it impossible for the Special Committee to adopt a genuine report to the General Assembly. In contrast, a number of other countries, including the Soviet Union, had evinced a spirit of co-operation and had shown willingness to reach agreement. It was significant that the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom had just reiterated their position, which was contrary to the Charter, thus giving a distorted picture of the situation in the Special Committee on the eve of the twenty-first session of the General Assembly.

The Soviet Union was fully prepared to contribute to enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of peace and security. As the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. Kosygin, had stated in the Supreme Soviet, the Soviet Union attached great importance to the United Nations as an instrument for the maintenance of peace and security. If the United Nations was to be capable of ensuring peace, strict observance of the letter and the spirit of the Charter was essential. Experience had shown that violation of the provisions of the Charter could have the gravest consequences. The use of force in the name of the United Nations was an extreme measure which the Organization should contemplate with the greatest circumspection. That was why United Nations action in that field was spelt out so precisely in the Charter, which laid particular stress on the unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council. The Charter was the key document of the United Nations, and all States Members had undertaken to respect it and to apply its provisions; thus, it followed that the only way to strengthen the United Nations was on the basis of strict observance of the provisions of the Charter.

On 10 July 1964, the Soviet Government had proposed a complete programme for strengthening the United Nations on that basis (A/AC.121/2). The effectiveness of the United Nations in the safeguarding of international peace and security could be enhanced if Member States adhered to provisions of the Charter which had not hitherto been fully implemented. The principal provisions

(Mr. Fedorenko, USSR)

of the Charter contained all that was needed for an agreement among Member States. All matters relating to peace-keeping measures were within the exclusive competence of the Security Council, and no other United Nations organ or official had the power to take decisions concerning the use of armed forces. The General Assembly had, of course, certain rights in that field, but they were strictly limited by the terms of the Charter. The Assembly could discuss questions relating to the maintenance of peace and make recommendations. However, the Charter provided that any problem on which action was necessary should be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly. The Soviet Union wished once again to stress that any proposal designed to bypass or violate that provision would be illegal and unconstitutional. That was the main criticism to be levelled against the Irish proposal, which contradicted certain key provisions of the Charter. The Soviet Union was also opposed to the proposal of Sweden and Canada, which was designed to ensure that the divergence of views among the Members of the United Nations did not prevent the Organization from functioning in the field of peace-keeping. That was tantamount to saying that not only the Security Council, but also the General Assembly, could take decisions to begin an action. The purpose of the proposal was clear: it sought to legalize the practice of undertaking United Nations operations and resorting to the use of force in circumvention of the provisions of the Charter. Any such attempt was doomed to failure, and the Soviet Union would oppose it in all circumstances. The Soviet Union was ready, on the other hand, to associate itself with those Members of the United Nations which were desirous of really strengthening the Organization and enabling it to contribute more effectively to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Soviet Union welcomed the positive reaction of the delegations of Nigeria, Argentina, Austria, Pakistan and other countries to the proposals and the constructive programme presented by the Soviet Government in its memorandum of 10 July 1964. In the view of his delegation, it was important, if the Member States were to reach an agreement for enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations in the safeguarding of international peace and security, that the Special Committee should create a proper atmosphere in which to do its work by

(Mr. Fedorenko, USSR)

showing that it was prepared to base its efforts on the principal provisions of the Charter. The Soviet Union, for its part, would adhere to those provisions; it was on that basis that it was resolved to contribute to strengthening the effectiveness of the United Nations as an important instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security.

ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE (A/AC.121/L.3)

The draft report of the Special Committee was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that his draft statement, which had been circulated to members of the Special Committee, should be amended to read as follows:

"During the debates that took place in the resumed session, various new ideas and proposals on different aspects of peace-keeping operations were advanced. Negotiations took place among members of the Committee, with the co-operation of the Chairman and other members of the Bureau. It was found, in the course of the resumed session, that certain differences of opinion on the part of Member States continued to exist on the subject. The Chairman has endeavoured to reconcile the different views held by Member States, but it was not possible to achieve this."
It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking for himself and on behalf of the other officers of the Committee, thanked the members for their co-operation. He declared the session of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations closed.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

ANNEX II

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE FIRST TO THIRD MEETINGS OF THE WORKING GROUP

Distr.

GENERAL

A/AC.121/WG/SR.1

26 July 1966

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS

WORKING GROUP

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 10 May 1966, at 11.5 a.m.

PRESENT:

<u>Chairmen:</u>	Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO	(Mexico)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. KHALIL	(United Arab Republic)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. PAZHWAQ	Afghanistan
	Mr. AZZOUT	Algeria
	Mr. QULJANO	Argentina
	Mr. SHAW	Australia
	Mr. WALDHEIM	Austria
	Mr. SETTE CAMARA	Brazil
	Mr. TREMBLAY	Canada
	Mr. KLUSAK	Czechoslovakia
	Miss SINEGIORGIS	Ethiopia
	Mr. SEYDOUX	France
	Mr. PRANDLER	Hungary
	Mr. PARNHASARATHI	India
	Mr. KHALAF	Iraq
	Mr. VINCI	Italy
	Mr. MATSUI	Japan
	Mrs. MISKE	Mauritania
	Miss AGUIRRE	Mexico
	Mr. de BEUS) Netherlands
	Mr. QUARLES van UFFORD	
	Mr. IYALLA	Nigeria
	Mr. Amjad ALI	Pakistan
	Mr. CZAJKOWSKI	Poland
	Mr. MORARU	Romania
	Mr. D. WILLIAMS	Sierra Leone
	Mr. de PINIES	Spain
	Mr. ASTROM	Sweden
	Mr. PANYARACHUN	Thailand
	Mr. MOROZOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. EL-KONY	United Arab Republic
	Lord CARADON	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. FINGER	United States of America
	Mr. ZULOAGA	Venezuela
	Mr. LEKIC	Yugoslavia
<u>Also present:</u>	U THANT	The Secretary-General
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. VELLODI	Secretary of the Working Group

Mr. ASTROM (Sweden) said that in 1965 the Special Committee had served as a useful vehicle for conducting a comprehensive discussion of the Article 19 crisis and for bringing about a solution of the serious immediate problem facing the United Nations. It was on the recommendation of the Special Committee that the General Assembly, on 1 September 1965, had adopted the consensus which had enabled it to work normally at its twentieth session. The consensus had also been designed to help solve the Organization's financial difficulties by means of voluntary contributions. In that respect it had been carried into effect only partially, but if Member States that had not yet done so would take appropriate action, the Special Committee would be able to note that its mandate, in so far as it concerned the past, had been essentially exhausted. While no progress had been made on the other aspects of the Special Committee's mandate, it would be an exaggeration to say that its work had been a failure in that regard; an exchange of views had taken place which had served to clarify the issues, and to indicate the basic positions of Member States and the limits within which a realistic solution might be sought.

Repetition of the general debate now would be superfluous and possibly harmful. The Working Group should now tackle some concrete aspects of the problem, on the basis of known attitudes of Members and groups of Members. In the selection of those aspects, two questions might be asked: first, whether progress in a particular field was of importance for preserving the Organization's peace-keeping effectiveness; second, whether there was reasonable hope of making such progress. Applying that double test of desirability and feasibility, his delegation felt that the Working Group would be well advised to put aside for the time being the problem of the relative competence of the Security Council and the General Assembly to authorize peace-keeping operations, for there was no reason to believe that the differing views on that subject could be reconciled in the Special Committee. Furthermore, little purpose would be served by laying down in advance more precise rules governing the problems of competence. As experience had shown, there was need for the organs of the United Nations, when called upon to adopt measures for the preservation of peace, to take into consideration the particular requirements

(Mr. Astrom, Sweden)

of the political situation then prevailing. They were likely to continue to interpret the Charter in the way that was peculiar to sovereign political bodies, namely, through action.

For those reasons, his Government had concluded that no useful purpose would be served by pursuing the fundamental constitutional problems. Such a conclusion need not be a cause for despondency. During the recent years of financial crisis, the United Nations had shown its vitality by acting in defence of peace and justice in such delicate situations as those of Cyprus, Kashmir and southern Africa. The Special Committee, taking cognizance of those developments, might recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of a joint statement confirming the willingness of Member States to use the United Nations as a forum for harmonizing their national interests, for the peaceful solution of international conflicts, and for action to restore and maintain peace. As a reaffirmation of Charter obligations, such a declaration would be a valuable assurance to smaller countries, which had a particular stake in the ability of the United Nations to afford protection against aggression, that the Organization's peace-keeping capacity had at least not been reduced by the controversies of the past two years. Such a declaration might take as its starting point the Special Committee's statement, in its report of 15 June 1965, that "The members... agreed that the United Nations should be strengthened through a co-operative effort..." (A/5915, para. 11).

He turned next to another aspect of the Special Committee's mandate, the question of administration and control of peace-keeping operations, and the related problem of preparations for such operations. On many occasions the Security Council and the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to carry out certain functions in connexion with peace-keeping operations. Sometimes those instructions had been vague, and the Secretary-General had inevitably had to use his own discretion in interpreting and implementing them. In certain instances Member States had criticized the way in which that discretion had been exercised, alleging that the Secretary-General had acted against the letter or spirit of a given mandate, or even of the Charter. It was therefore natural that the question had arisen whether anything could be done to lay down rules for the administration and control of peace-keeping operations and, in particular, to define the role of the Secretary-General. It was his delegation's view that such an attempt would be neither

(Mr. Astrom, Sweden)

necessary nor realistic. The Security Council and the General Assembly would take their decisions in the future, as they had done in the past, in the light of the circumstances of the moment and basing themselves on the Charter and on past practice. There was little the Special Committee could do to compel those organs to make their decisions precise and unequivocal as to the mode of implementation. Likewise, if the Committee were to try to establish general guidelines for the way the Secretary-General should act in such cases, it would encounter insuperable difficulties of juridical interpretation and political judgement. The Secretary-General must of necessity have a certain latitude in carrying out his duties in the service of the Organization. When exercising that responsibility, he was expected to consult at every stage with the organs and Member States concerned. His willingness to do so served to justify and constantly to renew Members' confidence in him as the chief international official. His delegation paid a tribute to the statesmanship displayed by the Secretary-General in that regard, rightfully earning him the continued trust of Member countries.

As to the question of preparations for peace-keeping operations, the Secretary-General had referred in 1964 to the action taken by some countries to prepare standby forces to be available when an acceptable demand was made by the United Nations, and he had suggested that it might be useful to authorize a comprehensive study of the question of preparations for such operations. No such study had yet been undertaken by any organ of the United Nations, although much valuable work had been done through the initiative of individual Member States. The need for some study, however, was no smaller today than it had been two years before. It was not least felt by those countries which had contributed, and continued to contribute, personnel on a large scale to United Nations peace-keeping activities. There was no doubt that the Special Committee was competent to carry out such a study. However, in view of the complicated and largely technical character of the problem involved, it might consider entrusting the task to a new body. When suggesting the directives to be given to such a body, the Committee should keep in mind the desirability of analysing and systematizing, for possible use in the future, the experience acquired during the many years of peace-keeping operations in the past. Account should also be taken of the suggestions made in the Committee for the negotiation of arrangements under Article 43 of the Charter.

(Mr. Astrom, Sweden)

The double test of desirability and feasibility might also be applied to the financing of future peace-keeping operations. Some progress in that field was certainly desirable. If the United Nations was again called upon to take measures to ensure peace in some part of the world, such an important undertaking should not be unnecessarily hampered by financial difficulties. Yet if no progress was made in the Special Committee, it might in practice prove difficult to use any other mode of financing than the uncertain and unreliable one of voluntary contributions. If the Committee was unable to devise some guidelines for the equitable sharing of costs according to some other formula, future operations would be immeasurably more difficult and politically desirable operations might not be undertaken at all. The peace-keeping capacity of the United Nations would be diminished and the usefulness of the Organization to Member States would be seriously reduced. Everything possible should be done, in the interest of all Member States, particularly the smaller States, to avoid such a development, and the Secretary-General's repeated warnings in that respect should be heeded.

His delegation believed that progress in that field was not only desirable but also feasible, since it would seem possible to take some steps forward without suggesting any change in the well-known positions of principle adopted by various Member States.

There were two main aspects of the problem of financing. One concerned the procedures and principles applicable to the collective defrayal of peace-keeping expenses, when that mode of financing was decided upon. In his Government's view, the principle of collective financial responsibility was best in accord with the basic ideas of the Charter and should be applied as often and as far as possible. The other aspect concerned the question of competence as between the Security Council and the General Assembly.

All members of the Committee seemed to be agreed that cases could occur in which the principle of collective responsibility for peace-keeping expenditure should apply in one form or another, notwithstanding deep and enduring differences of opinion as to which organ should undertake the assessment or apportionment.

(Mr. Astrom, Sweden)

All countries had expressed willingness, in principle, to take part in the defrayal of expenditure for operations which they considered legal under the Charter. If that much were agreed, there also seemed to be sufficient basis for attempts to establish some special scale of assessment or apportionment which might be applied if the competent organ did not decide on any other mode of financing.

That was something that could be realistically discussed in the Working Group. It should be a sliding scale, reflecting the relative capacity to pay and, in particular, providing for much reduced contributions from the less developed countries. Special consideration should also be given to the situation of Member States which were victims of, or were otherwise involved in, the events or actions leading to a peace-keeping operation. Finally, the special responsibilities of the permanent members of the Security Council should be borne in mind in connexion with their contributions. Arrangements should be made for a detailed study, as soon as possible, of such a special scale of assessments.

The value of such a scale would not be reduced by the fact that it would not be binding on the organs of the United Nations, but would serve only as a prearranged model which might or might not be applied, with or without amendments, in a given situation. The very existence of such a model would facilitate substantive decisions by the organs of the United Nations on peace-keeping activities, and serve as an assurance to the smaller countries that their share of the burden would not be inequitable. It could not conceivably be contrary to the legitimate national interests of any Member State.

The second problem concerned the authority of the Security Council and the General Assembly to decide on financing, about which there were considerable differences of opinion. Some Members considered that it was the exclusive prerogative of the Security Council to determine the mode of financing, others that expenditures for peace-keeping operations undertaken outside the framework of enforcement action under Chapter VII should be assessed or apportioned by the General Assembly. Those opinions were based on principles which it would probably be impossible to change at present. It would, however, be worth trying to bridge

(Mr. Astrom, Sweden)

the gap in a practical manner. One such solution might be stated as follows. Those who advocated the exclusive prerogative of the Security Council to decide on financing did not maintain that the Council could adopt only one particular mode of financing. Some of the States concerned would prefer a system whereby the aggressors were made to cover the costs; all admitted that other methods could also be considered, including a system for collective assessment or apportionment - for which the Security Council would be responsible, should such a system be chosen. That meant that Member States both inside and outside the Council - presumably the vast majority - would be expected to make payments in pursuance of a decision taken by the relatively few States members of the Security Council. Non-members of the Council would have no influence on the decision. Such a system was not likely to seem attractive to the membership at large, particularly the smaller countries. His Government, for one, would not find it acceptable.

Accordingly, it seemed clear that if, in a given case, expenditures were to be defrayed on a collective basis, whether under the regular budget procedures or according to some special scale, it would be for the General Assembly to take the necessary decisions. At the same time, it would be unrealistic not to recognize the great responsibility of the Security Council in the matter of expenditure when it was the Council that had authorized the operation. As experience had shown, peace-keeping operations might involve such heavy expenditure that collaboration had to be sought from the economically developed countries represented in the Security Council, as well as a substantial number of such countries outside it. How the responsibility of the Security Council was to be exercised was a matter of proper concern to the Working Group. One possibility was for the Council, in authorizing an operation, to recommend to the General Assembly that it undertake the assessment or apportionment, possibly indicating a ceiling for the funds requested and, perhaps, pointing to the principles on which it would wish the Assembly's decision to be based. An arrangement of that kind might commend itself to all Members, irrespective of their basic legal positions. Further study might also be given to the creation of a special committee on financing, to include the largest prospective contributors, which would have an opportunity to pronounce on the proper mode of financing for a particular operation.

The Working Group would also have to consider how to prevent a recurrence of the crisis which had paralysed the General Assembly at its nineteenth session. All were presumably agreed that peace-keeping operations might involve such heavy expenditure, and be politically so controversial, that allowance must be made for some flexibility in the financial arrangements. In particular, an attempt should be made to forestall situations in which the sanction provided in Article 19 of the Charter would become applicable. One way of achieving that objective would be to recognize that a Member State voting against the authorization of a peace-keeping operation would be ipso facto exempt from participating in its financing. Furthermore, it might be expected that the General Assembly, when determining the mode of financing and the scale to be applied, would give due weight to any statement by a Member State that it had abstained in the voting and that active support of the operation would not be consistent with its national policy. Any such rules would, of course, have to be non-discriminatory. His Government, for one, would oppose giving special rights in that respect to the great Powers.

Summing up, he recalled that the general background against which he had spoken was that it would be useless, and possibly harmful, to request any country or group of countries to make concessions regarding its interpretation of the Charter. The approach, to be realistic, had to be practical and pragmatic. On that basis, limited but valuable advance might be made in three fields. First, since peace-keeping operations could involve very heavy expenditure, some extraordinary method should be applied whenever the expenditure was to be defrayed collectively; such a method would include a special scale of contributions placing the major burden on the economically developed countries, and the Security Council might, as appropriate, recommend that the General Assembly should undertake the assessment or the apportionment. Second, some further study should be made of the various preparatory measures, national and international, that were desirable if the United Nations was to act swiftly and effectively to preserve peace. Third, the willingness to strengthen the United Nations "through co-operative effort" should find renewed expression in a joint declaration that all Member States were determined to make full use of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and security.

(Mr. Astrom, Sweden)

If it was true that the world situation gave rise to deep anxiety, that was the more reason to do everything possible to protect and improve the only existing instrument, however fragile, for truly international action in the cause of peace, the United Nations.

Mr. FINGER (United States of America) inquired whether there would be verbatim records of the statements made.

The CHAIRMAN replied that exact statements would be circulated, as had been the practice in regard to the Special Committee itself.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.121/WG/SR.2
26 July 1966

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS

WORKING GROUP

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 13 May 1966, at 11 a.m.

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO	(Mexico)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. SAITMAH	Afghanistan
	Mr. QUIJANO	Argentina
	Mr. SHAW	Australia
	Mr. WALDHEIM	Austria
	Mr. SETTE CAMARA	Brazil
	Mr. TREMBLAY	Canada
	Mr. KLUSAK	Czechoslovakia
	Mr. TINE	France
	Mr. FRANDLER	Hungary
	Mr. PARTHASARATHI	India
	Mr. VINCI	Italy
	Mr. MATSUI	Japan
	Miss AGUIRRE	Mexico
	Mr. de BEUS	Netherlands
	Mr. IYALLA	Nigeria
	Mr. Amjad ALI	Pakistan
	Mr. LEWANDOWSKI	Poland
	Mr. MORARU	Romania
	Mr. D. WILLIAMS	Sierra Leone
	Mr. ASTROM	Sweden
	Mr. PANYARACHUN	Thailand
	Mr. MOROZOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. HILMY	United Arab Republic
	Mr. HOPE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. FINGER	United States of America
	Mr. ZULOAGA	Venezuela
	Mr. JEKIC	Yugoslavia
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. VELLODI	Secretary of the Working Group

Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) said that the Special Committee's decision to constitute itself into a Working Group was highly significant. As the Chairman had pointed out, it would encourage the Committee to concentrate on positive and constructive proposals. Nevertheless, in its more detailed approach, the Working Group should not lose sight of the guidelines set forth in paragraph 52 of the report prepared by the Secretary-General and the President of the nineteenth session of the General Assembly (A/AC.121/4). Although those guidelines were not considered entirely acceptable by all representatives, they provided an appropriate framework for the Working Group's discussions. If they could be improved in the light of comments by Member States, so much the better. His delegation hoped that some of the guidelines would help the Working Group to find an area of agreement while others might serve to indicate the fields in which further study was necessary. Undoubtedly, the aim should be to reach an agreement on specific recommendations to the General Assembly or the Security Council.

At the Working Group's first meeting, the representative of Sweden had already put forward guidelines to which all members of the Working Group could subscribe. As had been pointed out, the problems of peace-keeping were threefold: constitutional, financial and organizational. On the question of authorization of peace-keeping operations there was a clear disagreement of principle regarding the respective roles of the Security Council and the General Assembly. While believing that their roles were complementary and that therefore there was no contradiction or conflict between them, his delegation saw no point in further argument on that matter in the Working Group, if it would only serve to emphasize the present divergencies. In practice, that disagreement of principle had not prevented the United Nations from continuing to conduct peace-keeping operations. In that respect, the Swedish proposal that all Member States should declare their willingness to make full use of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and security was worthy of consideration.

There was one aspect of authorization which should command general agreement, namely, the importance of associating peace-keeping with peaceful settlement. In principle, no peace-keeping operation should be authorized unless recommendations were made at the same time concerning peaceful settlement, although, in practice, there were bound to be occasions when peace-keeping action

(Mr. Tremblay, Canada)

could not be delayed pending agreement on the procedures for peaceful settlement. Certain delegations would perhaps feel that greater use of the various peaceful methods of settling disputes would help to reduce the length of time during which the peace-keeping force would have to remain in operation. It could even affect the character of a peace-keeping operation and perhaps enable the United Nations to dispatch observers instead of the military forces which had been found necessary in the past. Peace-keeping operations were only a means to an end and not an end in themselves. The end was of course the peaceful settlement of the dispute which made the peace-keeping operation necessary.

In view of those considerations, his delegation believed that it would be most promising at the present time to seek progress in the areas of financing and organization. Certainly, the importance of financing had been brought to the fore by the current difficulties of the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Force in Cyprus.

When the Security Council authorized a peace-keeping operation there were three possibilities. The Council could recommend: (a) explicitly or implicitly, that all Members should assume responsibility for financing; (b) that only some Members should assume such responsibility; or (c) that the operation should be financed by voluntary contributions. In the second and third cases a special responsibility devolved on two categories of Members, namely, the parties to the dispute and the members of the Security Council, particularly the permanent members. Power and responsibility were intimately associated under the Charter. If those countries did not give the lead, peace-keeping operations were bound to suffer and the purposes of the Council in authorizing them could not be fully achieved. With regard to the third case, most delegations would certainly agree that financing by voluntary contributions was a highly unsatisfactory and uncertain method. When it was followed, however, operations should be subject to regular review by the Council so that political objectives and financial means could be kept in relation to each other. Indeed, such a regular review was clearly desirable, regardless of the method of financing used.

(Mr. Tremblay, Canada)

In any event, the principle of collective responsibility should offer the Working Group an opportunity to do useful work. His delegation assumed that, when the Council recommended collective responsibility, the General Assembly must be authorized to apportion the costs which would have to be borne by all Members of the Organization. It was difficult to see how any delegation could accept the principle of being required to contribute without having any say in the matter. It would thus be an important step forward if the Working Group were able to agree on a recommendation for an equitable cost-sharing formula for use in such circumstances. An agreement on such a formula, including a special scale for developing countries in the case of peace-keeping operations involving heavy expenditure, could help the United Nations in an emergency and would be extremely useful when there was no time to discuss and decide on such complex matters. His delegation was prepared to examine carefully any such formula, old or new, whether it had been used in the past or simply proposed for consideration. The Working Group of Twenty-One had made suggestions while more recently Ireland and Jamaica had put forward specific proposals. In studying any or all of those proposals on financing, his delegation would merely express doubts as to the desirability or feasibility of making exceptions for certain categories of Members.

The Canadian delegation was particularly interested in the practical problems of organizing peace-keeping operations. As the representative of Sweden had pointed out, the Secretary-General had requested authority in 1964 to study that question. It would be helpful if the Working Group recommended that he should be given such authority. But if that were not possible, Governments should consider informing the Secretary-General of the types of forces they could readily provide for peace-keeping operations and of any steps they were taking to prepare for possible participation in such operations. They should bear in mind that the United Nations might need observers just as much as troops. Such information was essential for appropriate advanced preparation and effective central co-ordination, a task which the Secretary-General should be able to perform and should be asked to perform. The United Nations should not improvise indefinitely but should prepare for the future by making use of past experience. For example, military personnel earmarked by Governments for United Nations duty

(Mr. Tremblay, Canada)

should be briefed. In 1964 Canada had organized a conference in Ottawa to consider the technical aspects of peace-keeping operations, out of the Canadian Government's desire to give countries interested and involved in United Nations peace-keeping operations an opportunity to exchange information based on the experience already acquired. The establishment of the Special Committee of Thirty-Three and of the Working Group had encouraged his delegation to hope that some progress in that field could be made within the United Nations. Any such progress did not in any way preclude action by other United Nations bodies. Canada would welcome any indication that the members of the Security Council were prepared, in accordance with Article 43 of the Charter, to undertake negotiations with other Members or groups of Members, since the resulting agreement was bound to have a beneficial effect on the Organization's ability to maintain peace and security.

The Canadian delegation approached the discussions in the Working Group with restrained optimism. Differences of opinion on principles should not obscure the main task, which was to preserve the ability of the United Nations to keep the peace. It was along those lines that the work of the Group should proceed.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.121/WG/SR.3
26 July 1966

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS

WORKING GROUP

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 14 June 1966, at 11 a.m.

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO	(Mexico)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. SAMMAH	Afghanistan
	Mr. AZZOUT	Algeria
	Mr. QUIJANO	Argentina
	Mr. SHAW	Australia
	Mr. WALDHEIM	Austria
	Mr. SETTE CAMARA	Brazil
	Mr. COX	Canada
	Mr. ZDENEK PLSK	Czechoslovakia
	Mr. VEGA-GOMEZ	El Salvador
	Miss SINEGIORGIS	Ethiopia
	Mr. SEYDOUX	France
	Mr. BORSANYI	Hungary
	Mr. PARTHASARATHI	India
	Mr. KHALAF	Iraq
	Mr. VINCI	Italy
	Mr. MATSUI	Japan
	Mr. TAYA	Mauritania
	Mr. CARRANCO AVILA	Mexico
	Mr. de BEUS	Netherlands
	Mr. IYALLA	Nigeria
	Mr. Amjad ALI	Pakistan
	Mr. LEWANDOWSKI)	
	Mr. WYZNER)	Poland
	Mr. NEDELEA	Romania
	Mr. AZNAR	Spain
	Mr. ASTROM	Sweden
	Mr. PANYARACHUN	Thailand
	Mr. MOROZOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. EL-KONY	United Arab Republic
	Mr. HOPE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. GOLDBERG)	
	Mr. FINGER)	United States of America
	Mr. ZULOAGA	Venezuela
	Mr. GASPARI	Yugoslavia
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. CHAI	Secretary of the Working Group

Mr. de BEUS (Netherlands) said that his delegation fully recognized the importance of the consensus which had been approved by the Special Committee on 31 August 1965 and which had enabled the Assembly to function normally at its twentieth session. Nevertheless, it did not believe that the serious crisis which had arisen in the autumn of 1964 had been fully resolved by the agreement not to apply a certain provision of the Charter. Nor did it believe that the mere resumption of normal activities by the General Assembly had in itself brought about a solution of either the constitutional or the financial problems faced by the Organization. In reality, the crisis was structural. It sprang from basically different concepts on certain aspects of the United Nations and also from the rapid increase in its membership.

The diverging views on the question of peace-keeping, which were fully set out in the report of the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly (A/AC.121/4), had so far prevented any conclusive result. His delegation, like those of Sweden and Canada, doubted whether it would be possible at the moment to establish a specific definition of "peace-keeping operations" or to delimit precisely the authority of the different United Nations organs dealing with such operations. Rather than lay down fixed doctrines, it would like to draw the Working Group's attention to certain recent developments, such as the rapid increase in the United Nations membership and the operation of its main organs.

One hundred and seventeen States were now Members of the United Nations and probably that number would be over 120 before the end of 1966. Encouraging as that growth towards universality might be, such a large membership had not been foreseen when the Charter had been drawn up. A body of 117 Members was very unwieldy, particularly when executive decisions were required, and it was not surprising that lately the question had arisen whether the functioning of the United Nations organs should not be reviewed. The increase in United Nations membership, welcome as it was, had led to a growing imbalance between numerical strength, on the one hand, and responsibility for carrying out Assembly recommendations, on the other.

(Mr. de Beus, Netherlands)

As a result, in recent years the Security Council had displayed a greater sense of realism than the General Assembly when it came to adopting practicable resolutions. In the General Assembly there had been an increasing tendency to adopt resolutions by sheer weight of numbers, sometimes with little regard for the possibility of carrying them out or for the opinion of those countries which would have to bear most of the burden. On the other hand, the Security Council had been operating better than it had before. Although sometimes it had failed to produce a basic solution, often it had showed itself capable of quick and drastic action and had showed a certain ingenuity in working out compromises acceptable to both sides in a conflict. Furthermore, since 1 January 1966, it had been expanded to give fair representation to all parts of the world and to the many new Members which had entered the United Nations since 1945.

All those factors supported the view, which had been expressed on many sides in the present Committee and in its predecessor, that the primary responsibility of the Security Council for international peace and security, as laid down in Article 24 of the Charter, should again be stressed. That was how the drafters of the Charter had intended the United Nations to work. Although the unanimity they had hoped for had often proved an illusion, nevertheless, the basic concept that the United Nations could only undertake major peace-keeping operations if the big Powers agreed, was sound. It had been the neglect of that truth which had led the United Nations to the crisis of 1964 and 1965 which was still latent. Accordingly, the interest of the United Nations would be best served by returning to the basically sound arrangement, established in the Charter, whereby the primary responsibility for international peace and security rested with the Security Council and no major peace-keeping operations could be undertaken without at least the tacit consent of its permanent members.

At the same time, the Netherlands delegation did not wish in any way to detract from the residual functions and powers of the General Assembly laid down in Articles 10-17 of the Charter. In applying those powers, however, the United Nations should strictly adhere to the limitations of Article 12, paragraph 1 and of Article 11, paragraph 2.

(Mr. de Bont, Netherlands)

Since the crisis was still unresolved, the greatest possible caution should be exercised. Attempts to force decisions on controversial subjects, however well intentioned, could bring the crisis into an acute stage again. Now, there was even less need to try to reach decisions at any price since experience had shown that peace-keeping operations could still be initiated when necessary; he had in mind the dispatch of United Nations observers to the areas of armed conflict between India and Pakistan in September 1965. To lay down hard and fast rules now, when there was still much controversy about the constitutional aspects, might do more harm than good.

The recent experience of the Security Council in the Indo-Pakistan conflict had revealed the existence of yet another problem, namely, the margin of authority which the Secretary-General possessed for carrying out that organ's decisions. The fact that that matter had been raised in the Council proved once more that, even in a case where there was apparent unanimity, basically different attitudes were lurking under the surface and might be brought into the open by extensive interpretation of the Charter.

His delegation still felt that collective financial responsibility should as a rule be the basis of peace-keeping operations because it was a logical consequence of the Organization's collective responsibility for the maintenance of peace. The Netherlands would not necessarily exclude all possibilities of financing by voluntary contributions, but, as the Secretary-General's report on the United Nations operation in Cyprus (S/7350) showed, that method had proved to be unsatisfactory in practice.

If an operation was to be financed by the entire membership, the assessment and apportioning of the costs could only be undertaken by the General Assembly according to Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter. That was all the more true since an individual Member State could not be expected to pay for a peace-keeping operation if it had not had a voice in the decision about the assessment. The principle of collective financial responsibility should also exclude the possibility for some Members to "opt out" of their financial obligations, particularly if that were to be a privilege limited to the permanent members of the Security Council.

(Mr. de Beus, Netherlands)

The principle of collective financial responsibility, however, did not exclude the application of a special scale which took into consideration the financial capability of Members. His delegation agreed with the Swedish proposal, already supported by Canada, that a start should be made on devising a special scale for the apportionment of the costs of peace-keeping operations involving heavy expenditure. Such a scale could, but need not necessarily, be applied when an operation was to be undertaken at the expense of the entire membership. Certain fundamental ideas on such a scale had already been approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 1874 (S-IV) and his delegation would be prepared to go forward along those lines. The Working Group might therefore now proceed with a discussion that could clarify and substantiate the concept of "capacity to contribute" laid down in that resolution.

In the present circumstances, a realistic, cautious and above all pragmatic approach to the problem should be recommended. It might damage the future of the United Nations if the Committee lost sight of reality and tried to enforce standard rules. In the interest of the Organization's survival, the basic facts of political life on which the Charter was based must be kept in mind. Such an approach might lead to a partial return on the road which the Organization had taken since the adoption of the Charter but, in returning to the basic tenets of that document, the United Nations could only gain the strength and support it needed to fulfil its important task in the field of peace-keeping operations.

Mr. MATSUI (Japan) said that the apparently slow progress of the Special Committee had given rise to certain feelings of anxiety and impatience. Nevertheless, the problems before the Committee were so complicated that a careful approach was required. Agreement in precise form, however desirable, could not be reached easily on such complex issues during the time remaining at the Committee's disposal before the twenty-first session of the Assembly.

It had been rightly pointed out that the financial crisis had not altogether prevented the Organization from acting in defence of peace and security. Furthermore, the very fact that the Committee was tenaciously continuing its work was an important

(Mr. Matsui, Japan)

psychological factor and a guarantee for the improvement of United Nations peace-keeping functions. While the reiteration of well-known views was unlikely to help much, fresh approaches and constructive proposals would certainly expedite the Committee's work. The Committee's decision to constitute itself as an informal Working Group had therefore been wise.

Although the crisis over Article 19 of the Charter had been avoided, the problems of the past still remained and must be overcome if the Organization was to look forward more hopefully to the future. He wondered whether the voluntary contributions from all Member States called for in operative paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 2053 A (XX) might soon be forthcoming. He hoped that the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies would soon provide the Special Committee with a comprehensive analysis of the Organization's financial position. Also, it appeared that certain important Member countries were taking a new look at the functions of the Organization. That was a very encouraging sign and he hoped that such developments would soon result in renewed collective efforts to strengthen the United Nations.

It should not be expected that a clear-cut solution could be found to such a grave problem as that of defining peace-keeping operations and deciding which body should authorize them. He doubted whether the debate on that topic in the Committee had advanced to the stage where it could be successfully crystallized in terms of formal decisions. To force such decisions was neither necessary nor desirable. A careful and patient approach to the problem, based on past experience, should certainly bear fruit in due course.

The report of the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly (A/AC.121/4) continued to be of great practical value. In particular, the guidelines set out in paragraph 52 provided a sound basis for detailed discussions in the Working Group. Although not all delegations would entirely agree with the substance of those guidelines, further consideration of them might well help to clarify areas of disagreement and of possible agreement.

The idea put forward by the Swedish representative (A/AC.121/WG/SR.1, page 4) for a joint declaration that all Member States were determined to make full use of

(Mr. Matsui, Japan)

the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and security deserved further study. Such a reaffirmation would be especially important for the many smaller Member States for which the United Nations must continue to stand as the principal bastion of their peace and security.

His delegation fully supported the proposal that a comprehensive study should be undertaken of the organizational problems of peace-keeping, particularly those relating to stand-by forces. The most appropriate course might be, as the Canadian representative had suggested (A/AC.121/WG/SR.2, page 5), for the Committee to recommend that the Secretary-General be authorized to undertake such a study. Alternatively, it might be entrusted to a special body set up for the purpose or some combination of the two ideas might be worked out. If it appeared difficult for the United Nations to take the initiative, individual Member States with experience in that field or with the capacity and intention to participate in future peace-keeping operations should be encouraged to provide the necessary information for the benefit of the Secretary-General and the other Member States. His delegation saw no reason why the possibility of developing such arrangements as might seem appropriate in the context of Article 43 of the Charter should not be fully explored.

The most urgent and serious attention must be given to the problem of financing. Clearly, there was a very grave divergence of view concerning the competence of the General Assembly and the Security Council to assess and apportion the expenses of peace-keeping operations. Pending the satisfactory solution of that problem, such operations had tended to be financed by voluntary contributions, but as his delegation had repeatedly stressed and as the Secretary-General had pointed out in his report on the United Nations operation in Cyprus (S/7350), the method of voluntary contributions afforded an inadequate, inequitable and insecure basis for financing peace-keeping operations.

Once a peace-keeping operation was authorized, it was within the competence of the General Assembly to deal with the financial aspects of it, except perhaps in those cases where the expenses were borne by the parties directly involved, through some special arrangement, or were met by voluntary contributions. The power to apportion such expenses among all Members belonged to the General Assembly and,

(Mr. Matsui, Japan)

once the Assembly exercised that power, all Member States were obliged to discharge the resulting financial responsibilities, in accordance with the principle of collective financial responsibility. When it authorized peace-keeping operations, the Security Council might make recommendations as to the appropriate methods of financing, including apportionment by the General Assembly. As a practical means of ensuring better co-operation between the Assembly and the Council on those financial matters, a standing committee, serving as a subsidiary and representative organ of the Assembly, might be established to examine the financial implications of peace-keeping operations with the power to give its consent on the Assembly's behalf. Such suggestions, together with other similar ones, had considerable merit and deserved to be re-examined thoroughly in the common search for a satisfactory and practical solution of the financial aspects of the peace-keeping problem.

It would also be useful if the Working Group studied a cost-sharing formula for the entire membership, including a special scale of assessments, in anticipation of a case in the future when the cost of an operation would be shared by all Members in accordance with the principle of collective responsibility. It might be argued that such a study would be futile, since no practical purpose would be served if the question of the competence to assess or to apportion the cost were put aside. However, agreement on a pre-arranged formula for cost-sharing might well smooth out the difference of view on the question of competence. For instance, it might be possible to work out an arrangement whereby the General Assembly, having once adopted a certain pre-arranged formula of assessment, would be understood in principle to have entrusted in advance to the Security Council, prior to each individual operation it might decide upon, recourse to that method of financing.

It had been pointed out by the Canadian representative and others that peace-keeping operations, by failing to eliminate the root causes of conflict, made it more difficult to reach peaceful settlements. He agreed with the Canadian representative that peace-keeping operations were only a means to an end and not an end in themselves. They should complement not replace the peaceful settlement of disputes. The need for unremitting attention to the processes of peaceful settlement must always be borne in mind when considering or implementing peace-keeping operations.

(Mr. Matsui, Japan)

The Japanese delegation would continue to study the problem in the hope that progress in the Working Group and the Special Committee would be sure and realistic, if not perhaps quite as rapid as everyone would like.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Working Group should postpone its meetings until the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies was available and that it should reconvene in early August.

It was so decided.

Mr. QUILJANO (Argentina) proposed that in the meantime the Secretariat should be asked to prepare a document showing what scales of assessment for peace-keeping operations had been adopted in the past by the United Nations.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the compilation of such a document might place the Secretariat in a difficult position. It would be preferable if delegations themselves obtained the necessary facts from existing documents.

Mr. QUILJANO (Argentina) said he had requested merely a factual report on what had already been done in the General Assembly but if the USSR representative objected to the proposal he would withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN said that the officers of the Committee would continue to hold informal consultations in the coming weeks with a view to clarifying the Committee's work, and, if the approval of all members could be obtained, including possibly the drafting of one or more working papers for submission to the Working Group at its next meeting. The proposal made by the Argentine representative would certainly be borne in mind.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.