



Friday, 22 February 1957,  
at 11 a.m.

New York

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 66:	
Question considered by the first emergency special session of the General Assembly from 1 to 10 November 1956 ( <i>continued</i> )	
Administrative and financial arrangements for the United Nations Emergency Force ( <i>continued</i> )	
Report of the Committee set up by the General Assembly at its 632nd plenary meeting, 21 December 1956 .....	349
Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly .....	351

**Chairman: Mr. Omar LOUTFI (Egypt).**

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Calogeropoulos-Stratis (Greece), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEM 66\***

**Question considered by the first emergency special session of the General Assembly from 1 to 10 November 1956 (A/C.5/707, A/C.5/L.427) (*continued*)\*\***

***Administrative and financial arrangements for the United Nations Emergency Force (continued)\*\****

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE SET UP BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS 632ND PLENARY MEETING, 21 DECEMBER 1956 (A/C.5/707)

1. Mr. JARRING (Sweden), speaking as Chairman of the Committee, introduced the report of the Committee set up by the General Assembly at its 632nd plenary meeting (A/C.5/707) and pointed out that the figure in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution appearing in the report should read "\$10 million" and not "\$16.5 million".

2. Mr. JONES (United States of America) recalled the Fifth Committee's recommendation to the General Assembly in the draft resolution which it had referred to the Assembly at its 560th meeting (A/C.5/L.427) concerning the initial sum of \$10 million to cover the preliminary expenses of the United Nations Emergency Force. The United States of America felt that the establishment of the Emergency Force would be a milestone in history. The strength of the Emergency Force lay in its association with the United Nations as a whole. Since all the Member States were responsible for the Force, it was obvious that all Governments should be prepared to defray a fair share of the relevant costs. In accordance with that principle, set forth in the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its 632nd plenary meeting (A/RES/448), the United

\* Considered by the Fifth Committee in accordance with paragraph 4 of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its 596th plenary meeting on 26 November 1956.

\*\* Resumed from 560th meeting.

States of America took the view that expenditure on the Emergency Force should be apportioned among Member States in the same manner as other United Nations expenditure. After deciding by an overwhelming majority to set up the Emergency Force, Member States had agreed that the initial costs of \$10 dollars should be shared by all. In addition, substantial voluntary contributions had been made to the Emergency Force. The free transport by the United States Government of 3,500 men and of equipment represented a contribution equivalent to \$2 million. Other countries had also provided transport, services and supplies. Maintenance of the Emergency Force was truly a joint project.

3. Although convinced of the fundamental character of the principles he had just reiterated, the United States delegation nevertheless acknowledged that the initial decision of the General Assembly had imposed on many Member States a financial sacrifice which was in itself considerable and which might become even greater if certain States persisted in their attitude and refused to pay the contribution set. Since the principle of collective responsibility had been established, the United States of America was prepared to agree that the additional expenses for the Emergency Force foreseen in the Secretary-General's report (A/AC.89/R.2)—which might reach an estimated \$6.5 million—should be met as far as possible by voluntary contributions.

4. He recalled the principal provisions of the draft resolution contained in the Committee's report (A/C.5/707) and hoped that the Member States would respond generously to the request which had been made to them. While the United States delegation was not yet able to make a firm commitment, it was nevertheless authorized to inform the Committee that the United States Government, subject to its normal constitutional processes, intended to contribute up to half the amount necessary, provided other Governments contributed the other half.

5. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) said that the Canadian Government, which was contributing actively to the maintenance of the Emergency Force, was firmly wedded to the principle of collective responsibility where United Nations decisions were concerned. However, since Member States as a whole had to bear a heavy financial burden and were already contributing to the financing of expenditure up to \$10 million, the Canadian Government had not insisted that the Committee should reach a decision at its eleventh session on the problem of financing additional expenditure. He agreed with the commonly accepted view that Governments should be asked to make voluntary contributions in order to reduce the financial burden which Member States as a whole had to bear. Canada was prepared to agree to the draft resolution submitted by the Committee (A/C.5/707), on the understanding that at its twelfth session the General Assembly would consider

the manner of financial expenditure over and above the voluntary contributions and that the adoption of the draft resolution did not prejudice any decision which the General Assembly might then take.

6. Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union's attitude towards the financing of the Emergency Force had not changed. The reasons which he had given at the 555th meeting of the Committee on 18 December 1956 were still valid.

7. Mr. CLOUGH (United Kingdom) said that in his Government's view the cost of the Emergency Force and of any other force that might be set up in future in similar circumstances should be accepted as the collective responsibility of all Member States and should be shared like all other expenses. That was the only fair principle and it implied that all the Member States should accept the responsibilities of the Organization to which they belonged. However, the United Kingdom Government acknowledged that the Member States would have a very heavy burden to bear in 1957. In those exceptional circumstances, he was therefore prepared to agree to the resolution submitted by the Committee. But he would like the meaning of operative paragraph 1 to be made more specific by the addition of the following words at the end: "... in respect of the period to 31 December 1957".

8. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) felt that expenditure connected with the Emergency Force was the responsibility of all Member States and should be fairly allotted. The draft resolution took account of the difficulties encountered by the Committee; it should be acceptable to all Members, and the Spanish delegation would vote in its favour.

9. Mr. DIEGUEZ (Guatemala) said that his delegation, true to the principle of collective responsibility, was prepared to support the draft resolution. In the light of the conflicting views expressed during the debate on the financing of the Emergency Force and considering the effects which such expenditure might have on the budgets and economies of the under-developed countries, the Guatemalan delegation had felt that, while the principle of collective responsibility must be recognized, it was necessary to find a new formula for resolving that particular problem. He was therefore gratified to note that the draft resolution submitted by the Committee in fact embodied such a new formula. At the twelfth session of the General Assembly the Guatemalan delegation would support again the argument that, for special expenses of that kind, the United Nations could and should work out a scale different from that which was applied to ordinary expenses.

10. Mr. PEACHEY (Australia), Mr. KEATING (Ireland) and Mr. DAVIN (New Zealand) expressed the view that, in accordance with the principle of collective responsibility, expenditure connected with the Emergency Force devolved upon the United Nations and should be apportioned fairly among all Member States. However, since the financial burdens of Member States as a whole for 1957 were already very heavy, they were prepared to vote in favour of the draft submitted by the Committee.

11. Their respective Governments, however, had not yet reached any decisions in regard to voluntary contributions and their vote consequently would be without prejudice to any decision which those Governments might subsequently take in the matter.

12. Mr. CERULLI IRELLI (Italy) supported the draft resolution of the Committee without reservation.

13. Mr. JARRING (Sweden) also supported the principle of collective responsibility and regretted a situation in which the large majority of the Members had decided upon a certain course of action and then later had hesitated to face the financial responsibility. As the Committee had been unable to reach an agreement on that question of principle, and having regard to the fact that the Secretary-General had to be provided with the necessary funds to ensure the proper functioning of the United Nations Emergency Force, Sweden would vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the nine-Power Committee.

14. He pointed out that almost all the costs incurred by Sweden on behalf of its battalion in the Emergency Force were extraordinary, and he hoped that the United Nations would share some of those costs. Regardless of the outcome of the negotiations which Sweden looked forward to conducting with the Secretary-General on the matter, he expected Sweden's expenses to be heavier than if it had not sent a contingent and had merely paid its share of the Organization's expenses. He hoped that other Member States would understand the difficulties which Sweden would face if it had to contribute over and above what it was contributing at present.

15. Mr. TUOVINEN (Finland) shared the views of the Swedish representative.

16. Mr. Y. W. LIU (China) felt that the Member States were under a duty, by virtue of the principle of collective responsibility, to share in financing the Emergency Force. If the United Nations was to be spared the fate of the League of Nations, it was essential that all Member States, large and small, should fulfill the obligations resulting from the very principles of the Charter.

17. Although it was considered as one of the five great Powers, China was at present very poor. It would, nevertheless, meet its obligations and the Chinese delegation would therefore support the draft resolution submitted by the Committee.

*The draft resolution (A/C.5/707 para. 10) as amended by the representative of the United Kingdom, was adopted by 42 votes to 7, with 5 abstentions.*

18. Mr. GANEM (France) said that the expenses of the Emergency Force were the responsibility of the United Nations and should be apportioned fairly among all the Member States. He was therefore unable to agree with the principle of voluntary contributions, and the provisions of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution had compelled him to abstain from voting.

19. The United Nations Emergency Force, which had been established as a result of the welcome initiative of Mr. Lester Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, corresponded neither to the armed forces provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter nor to the international army which French statesmen had been advocating for nearly forty years. It was not sufficiently large, its integration had not proceeded far enough and even its legal basis was subject to dispute. On the other hand, it was the most welcome outcome of all the crises occurring in the Middle East and it was essential to prolong the Emergency Force's existence by providing it with a stable financial foundation. For that reason France had warmly supported the resolution

(A/RES/448) providing that expenditure on the Emergency Force up to \$10 million should be apportioned among the Member States in accordance with the scale of assessments for 1957.

20. He appreciated the difficulties which the nine-Power Committee had had to surmount and he wished to pay a tribute to the generosity of all the countries which were contributing to the financing of the Emergency Force. Particular thanks were due to the United States Government, which hoped to be able to make a voluntary contribution amounting to nearly 50 per cent of the additional sum deemed necessary to meet the expense of the Force.

21. Mr. RAEYMAECKERS (Belgium) had voted in favour of the draft resolution, in accordance with the position defined by his delegation at the 545th meeting of the Committee.

22. Mr. THERON (Union of South Africa) had abstained, in accordance with the stand taken by his delegation with regard to all the political and financial aspects of the Emergency Force question.

23. Mr. MARGAIN (Cambodia) considered that it was very unfortunate for the future of the Organization that delegations sometimes hesitated to speak the truth, in the hope that they would thereby reach compromise solutions. Without approving all its provisions, he had voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by

the nine-Power Committee because it did not place any obligations on the Cambodian Government in respect of the additional \$6.5 million considered necessary for meeting the expenses of the Emergency Force.

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE TO THE  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY (A/C.5/L.427)

24. Mr. FORTEZA (Uruguay), Rapporteur, recalled the circumstances in which the Committee had decided, at its 560th meeting, to forward to the General Assembly the draft resolution appearing in paragraph 46 of the draft report (A/C.5/L.427) and to postpone further consideration of the draft report. He pointed out that the wording of several paragraphs would be amended in order to take account of the observations made by certain delegations concerning the manner in which their views had been reported and drew particular attention to the final text of paragraph 25 which had been drafted after lengthy consultations with the delegations concerned. He hoped that all the members of the Committee would be able to accept the draft report incorporating those changes.

25. The CHAIRMAN thanked the Rapporteur for having spared no effort in an attempt to arrive at a compromise formula.

*The draft report (A/C.5/L.427), as amended, was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 12.5 p.m.