

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.121/SR.12
21 July 1965

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWELFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 14 June 1965, at 11.25 a.m.

PRESENT:

Chairman:

Members:

Mr. QWALSON-SACKLEY	Ghana
Mr. PAZHWAQ	Afghanistan
Mr. AZZOUT	Algeria
Mr. GARCIA del SOLAR	Argentina
Mr. POCOQK	Australia
Mr. WALDHEIM	Austria
Mr. SETTE CAMARA	Brazil
Mr. TREMBLAY	Canada
Mr. HAJEK	Czechoslovakia
Mr. ALVAREZ VIDAURRE	El Salvador
Mr. GEBRE-EGZY	Ethiopia
Mr. ARNAUD	France
Mr. CSATORDAY	Hungary
Mr. CHAKRAVARTY	India
Mr. PACHACHI)	
Mr. NOURI)	Iraq
Mr. VINCI	Italy
Mr. MATSUI	Japan
Mr. BA	Mauritania
Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO	Mexico
Mr. POLDERMAN	Netherlands
Mr. A.A. MOHAMMED	Nigeria
Mr. AHMED	Pakistan
Mr. LEWANDOWSKI	Poland
Mr. HASEGANU)	
Mr. NEAGU)	Romania
Mr. KAREFA-SMART	Sierra Leone
Mr. AZNAR	Spain
Mr. ASTROM	Sweden
Mr. PANYARACHUN	Thailand
Mr. FEDORENKO	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. A.T. KHALIL	United Arab Republic

PRESENT (continued):

<u>Members</u> (continued):	Lord CARADON	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. PLIMPTON	United States of America
	Mr. ALVARADO	Venezuela
	Mr. LEKIC	Yugoslavia
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. NARASIMHAN	Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs and Chef de Cabinet
	Mr. VELLODI	Secretary of the Committee

The CHAIRMAN said that he and the Secretary-General, in accordance with a proposal by the representative of Afghanistan which appeared to have had the general agreement of members of the Committee at the previous meeting, had produced a draft report for the Committee's consideration. To that text, which was almost entirely factual, he and the Secretary-General had suggested annexing the report which they had submitted to the Committee in document A/AC.121/4 and the summary records of the Committee's meetings. Regrettably, they had been unable to include complete recommendations to the General Assembly in the draft report, as requested by the representative of Afghanistan, as they had been forced to concede that no agreement had been reached among the members of the Committee on such recommendations. Two points only were indicated in paragraph 12 on which there appeared to have been substantial agreement in the Committee. After all, the Committee was only at the first stage of its work, and would clearly need more time and another series of meetings before September to be able to draw up a final report to the General Assembly.

Mr. AZNAR (Spain) stressed that the Committee's work had been very thorough and that constructive ideas had been expressed by various speakers that would perhaps make it possible to solve the serious problem which threatened the very existence of the United Nations, for if that problem was not solved the United Nations might well become futile, because it would be unable to fulfil its essential purpose, which was to maintain international peace and security.

Nevertheless the fact that the Committee had not yet been able to find a formula for the future structure of so-called peace-keeping operations - and even on that notion there was no unanimity - the Committee's position was that its report could include only a summary of the views expressed by the different delegations, an account of those very few points on which there was agreement, and an expression of hope that a solution would finally be found. Whether the peace-keeping operations had been well- or ill-conceived, it had to be acknowledged that because no agreement could be reached on ways of financing them, they had brought about the financial crisis with which the United Nations was struggling.

Leaving aside the arguments that the Security Council was the only, or at least the principal, body responsible for peace-keeping operations, it had to be

(Mr. Aznar, Spain)

recognized that the majority of countries had accepted in good faith, particularly after the International Court of Justice had handed down its advisory opinion, the view that it was for the General Assembly to apportion the costs of peace-keeping operations.

It was equally clear that other countries had upheld their position that because the provisions of the Charter had not been respected, the United Nations had resorted to a method of financing which they could in no way accept. Thus the United Nations had reached a point where the General Assembly had been completely paralysed.

The Special Committee now had three proposals before it: the plan put forward by the representative of Afghanistan, and the Ethiopian and Mexican proposals. The first two of those proposals took up the idea that the application of Article 19 should be temporarily suspended, without in any way affecting the positions of the various delegations, while the Mexican representative proposed that contributions already paid should be considered as voluntary contributions. The aim of those three proposals was to solve the present financial crisis by means of voluntary contributions and to avoid any confrontation. But it was obvious that they did not satisfy the permanent members of the Security Council; moreover, while they could even so command substantial support, equally substantial support had been given to the resolutions providing for the apportionment of the costs of peace-keeping operations among all Member States.

As the Afghan representative had rightly said, it was not a question of putting one or other draft resolution to the vote, but of contriving to reconcile the various points of view so as to reach an agreement enabling the present deadlock to be broken. The Committee could not follow in the footsteps of the General Assembly, which had brought about the present crisis through its failure to achieve unanimity among its members, and it must obviously avoid a confrontation with all its dangers and possible consequences. The reason that such a confrontation had not taken place on 1 December was surely that all States had wanted to find a formula whereby they could break that dangerous deadlock.

(Mr. Aznar, Spain)

Members of the Committee were evidently all agreed at least on one point, that it was not possible to find a formula for the future structure of peace-keeping operations by 15 June.

Summing up the position, he stressed that the many Member States which had agreed to implement the General Assembly resolutions and to pay their contributions to the special accounts were bound to oppose the idea of considering those contributions as voluntary; furthermore, it was the lack of unanimity on the implementation of those resolutions which had provoked conflicts in important sectors of the United Nations and created the present financial crisis; lastly, the present deficit amounted to \$108 million.

He then recalled that at the plenary meeting on 21 April at its fifteenth session, the General Assembly had initially rejected the draft resolution providing for the apportionment among Member States of the costs of peace-keeping operations as expenses of the United Nations in accordance with the scale of assessment for the regular budget subject to certain reductions. At its next meeting, however, after long negotiations, the General Assembly had revoked that decision and approved an amendment raising the reductions for some Member States from 75 to 80 per cent.

From that succession of events the following conclusions could evidently be drawn: clearly, if the General Assembly had adopted a decision which seriously jeopardized the United Nations, that decision must be revoked; such revocation, however, must not be prejudicial to those countries which had paid their contributions in good faith.

He therefore proposed that contributions already paid in to the special accounts should be considered as advances, since the apportionment of expenses by the General Assembly must be considered provisional until the basic problem, which was that of the future structure of peace-keeping operations, had been solved and the method of financing such operations had been decided.

That proposal did not of course solve the problem but at least it would have the merit of restoring the situation to normality. The first step to take was to reconstitute the fund of \$108 million which the Secretary-General had referred to, and the second was to examine the question of the future structure of peace-keeping

(Mr. Aznar, Spain)

operations. By considering contributions already paid as advances, the problem of the applicability of Article 19 would be avoided, because no one could logically demand the application of sanctions with respect to measures taken on a provisional basis for the financing of peace-keeping operations. When the question of the structure of future peace-keeping operations had been settled, the necessary accounting adjustments could be made with respect to such advances as had been or would be paid and were not voluntary contributions.

If members of the Special Committee could accept that arrangement, they might submit such a plan to the General Assembly on 1 September next, in the form of a declaration, a resolution or even an amendment to the plan drawn up by the Mexican representative.

Mr. ALVAREZ VIDAURRE (El Salvador) considered that the Spanish representative's suggestion that contributions already made should be regarded as advances might help the Special Committee to break the present deadlock and should be incorporated, in the form of an addendum or an amendment, in the proposal submitted by the representative of Mexico.

Mr. VINCI (Italy) extended his warmest congratulations to the Chairman, Mr. Quaison-Sackey, upon his appointment to the high office of Foreign Minister of Ghana, and said he was gratified to see him continuing to preside over the Committee's deliberations. He was convinced that the valuable report of the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly (A/AC.121/4) would prove extremely useful for the discussions to be held subsequently in the Committee, the General Assembly or any other body that might be established for the conduct of future negotiations on the subject of United Nations peace-keeping operations. The report, which did not - and could not - propose any ready-made solution to the complicated and vital problem entrusted to the Committee by the General Assembly, had the twofold merit of presenting clearly the issues and the views expressed during the Committee's meetings and of indicating some fundamental elements and broad guidelines on which a certain measure of consensus had been reached.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

While reserving his right to comment later on the proposal made at the previous meeting by the representative of Afghanistan, he could say at once that in his view the proposed report would be more useful and constructive if it placed the ideas and proposals of Member States in their true perspective by giving greater prominence to those supported by the majority, without, however, minimizing the views held by the minority. It would perhaps be useful to group under the same heading the various proposals which, although differing in details, expressed a similar philosophy, so that the two schools of thought would be clearly distinguishable. It would also be clearer if, in deciding what method of financing would be more appropriate to any particular operation, compulsory assessment, which was based on the principle of collective responsibility, were given first choice as far as possible. In his delegation's opinion, it was of the greatest importance that the principle of collective responsibility, which was one of the main pillars on which the Organization rested, should not in any way be weakened. If it should ever be admitted that the United Nations was unable to unite in the maintenance of peace, that would be tantamount to admitting that the United Nations was unable to fulfil the main task for which it had been founded. The recognition of that principle did not in any way diminish the responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council nor that of the greater contributors to all activities of the United Nations.

He subscribed to the observation made by the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly in their report (A/AC.121/4) that "Much of the controversy seems to be at times academic in nature and one is led to wonder if there are in fact such serious differences in interpreting the Charter." An examination of the practical developments of the past years showed, indeed, that in spite of difficulties, a common ground had always been found, and the right solution had almost invariably emerged. There were in fact many outstanding examples of close and useful co-operation between the principal bodies of the United Nations towards the same end. Even when a peace-keeping operation had been established by a resolution of the General Assembly, as in the case of UNEF, the Assembly had been convened by an almost unanimous request from the Security Council. UNEF had proved to be one of the most effective operations of the United Nations and if the Organization had been forced to renounce any initiative

/...

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

in November 1956 because the Security Council was paralysed and if the General Assembly had not been convened, world peace would have been in jeopardy. In other words, experience had shown that the spirit of the Charter, assigning to the Security Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, had constantly been respected and that the General Assembly had acted with utmost restraint and responsibility in very exceptional circumstances. That was why his delegation was convinced that the gap between the various positions was not as wide as it appeared to be.

The Italian delegation shared the views expressed by many delegations that the Committee did not have sufficient time to make a comprehensive report on the various aspects of future peace-keeping operations by 15 June, and that it could not do much more than agree on some very broad guidelines, such as those indicated in the conclusions of the report of the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly (A/AC.121/4). The Committee must therefore apply itself to the twofold task, in which it could not afford to fail, of ensuring the solvency of the Organization and the normalization of the work of the General Assembly. In that connexion, the Italian delegation felt that paragraph 50 of the report defined the problem in terms which should be acceptable to all the members of the Committee. While paying a tribute to the sponsors of the two draft resolutions before the Committee, he thought, like almost all members, that the Committee should redouble its efforts in order to find, without undue haste, as he had already suggested in his opening statement, a formula acceptable to all. There appeared to be general agreement that the only way to solve the Organization's financial difficulties was through voluntary contributions and that the highly developed countries should make substantial contributions, it being understood that that arrangement should not be construed as changing in any way the basic position of any Member State. He appealed urgently to all the members of the Committee to agree to the principle that solvency should be achieved through pledges of payments to be made before the opening of the twentieth session of the General Assembly. Should the Committee be unable to reach an agreement before the dead-line of 15 June, the consultations provided for in General Assembly resolution 2006 (XIX) should be intensified and should be focused mainly on the financial difficulties of the Organization and the normalization of the work of

/...

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

the Assembly. Recalling the statement made by the Chairman of the Italian delegation at the 1321st meeting of the General Assembly on 25 January 1965, he said that the choice, essentially a political one, remained the same - either liquidate the \$150 million deficit or witness the end of the United Nations - but that the urgency of a solution had become even greater. That was why he wholeheartedly subscribed to the appeal made by the representative of Pakistan at the previous meeting. If the Committee did nothing to solve the problems before it before September, that failure might deal a serious blow to the United Nations, and world public opinion would conclude that the maintenance of peace and security no longer rested upon the principles and purposes of the United Nations but depended upon the imperfect and dangerous machinery of the international balance of power.

Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) thanked the Secretary-General, the Chairman and the Secretary of the Committee for having prepared a draft report (Conference Room Paper No. 1) on the basis of the suggestions he had made at the previous meeting. He would like to see the report also mention that the members of the Committee had agreed - or at least that one member had suggested - that the guidelines and proposals for future peace-keeping operations, as contained in the report of the President and the Secretary-General, should be submitted to all Member States and that the Secretary-General should request those States to inform him of their views before the resumption of the Committee's work, so that it could have a clear picture of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN thanked his colleagues for the congratulations they had extended him on his appointment as Foreign Minister of Ghana and assured them that he would continue to serve the Committee until a final solution was found to the problem under consideration. In view of the fact that there seemed to be substantial agreement that the solvency of the Organization should be restored by voluntary contributions, there was no call for despair.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.