

UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



Distr.  
GENERAL

A/AC.121/SR.13  
21 July 1965  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York  
on Monday, 14 June 1965, at 3.20 p.m.

PRESENT:Chairman:

Mr. QUAISON-SACKEY Ghana

Members:

Mr. PAZHWAQ Afghanistan

Mr. AZZOUTI Algeria

Mr. GARCIA del SOLAR Argentina

Mr. POCKOCK Australia

Mr. WALDHEIM Austria

Mr. SETTE CAMARA Brazil

Mr. TREMBLAY Canada

Mr. RIHA )  
Mr. HAJEK ) Czechoslovakia

Mr. LIEVANO El Salvador

Mr. GEBRE-EGZY Ethiopia

Mr. SEYDOUX France

Mr. CSATORDAY Hungary

Mr. CHAKRAVARTY India

Mr. PACHACHI Iraq

Mr. VINCI Italy

Mr. MATSUI Japan

Mr. BA Mauritania

Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO Mexico

Mr. POLDERMAN Netherlands

Mr. SANU Nigeria

Mr. Amjad ALI Pakistan

Mr. CZAJKOWSKI Poland

Mr. HASEGANU Romania

Mr. KAREFA-SMART Sierra Leone

Mr. de PINIES Spain

Mr. ASTROM Sweden

Mr. PANYARACHUN Thailand

Mr. FEDORENKO Union of Soviet Socialist  
Republics

PRESENT (continued):

<u>Members</u> (continued):	Mr. Ahmed Tawfik KHALIL	United Arab Republic
	Mr. HOPE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. FLIMPTON	United States of America
	Mr. SOSA-RODRIGUEZ	Venezuela
	Mr. LEKIC	Yugoslavia
<u>Secretariat</u> :	Mr. NARASIMHAN	Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs
	Mr. VELLODI	Secretary of the Committee

Mr. SEYDOUX (France) said that at the Committee's eleventh meeting the United States representative had quoted extracts from a statement made by the French representative to the Security Council's 903rd meeting in September 1960, in an attempt to demonstrate that at that time the French delegation had considered that the problem of financing ONUC was one which should be dealt with by the General Assembly. The United States representative had, however, quoted those extracts out of context, thus giving a distorted impression of what the French representative had meant. A reading of paragraphs 39, 40 and 41 in fine of the record of the meeting in question would show that the French representative had been referring essentially to the programme of financial assistance to the Congolese State, and not to the cost of maintaining ONUC.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation's position with regard to the problem before the Committee remained unchanged. That position was in line with the compromise plan put forward by the African and Asian countries on 30 December 1964, the major provision of which was that the question of the applicability of Article 19 of the Charter should not be raised. He noted in that connexion that the draft report as such (Conference Room Paper No. 1 of 14 June 1965) made no mention of that most important provision of the Afro-Asian plan. Yet it was clear, from the United States representative's most recent statement, that the latter's Government had not abandoned its intention to raise that issue again for provocative purposes and thus further disrupt the work of the General Assembly.

The reasons why the United States, having created artificially the so-called financial crisis, had deliberately prevented the normal functioning of the Assembly at its nineteenth session, and apparently intended to maintain that position, were clearly revealed by developments in Viet-Nam and the Dominican Republic. The aggressive designs of the ruling circles in the United States which were incompatible with the Charter and the normal functioning of the United Nations were the main reason for their negative position regarding a normalization of the work of the General Assembly. The Soviet delegation for its part would reject any proposal which was not in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Charter and basic provisions of the Afro-Asian plan.

Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America) said it was regrettable that the Soviet representative had seen fit to repeat baseless "cold war" propaganda instead of concentrating on the real business before the Committee. The only reason why the Assembly had been unable to function normally at its nineteenth session had been the refusal of the Soviet Union and certain other Members to pay their fair share of the two peace-keeping operations in question: UNEF, which had been referred to the General Assembly by the Security Council in a resolution supported by the Soviet delegation and had been authorized by the General Assembly without a single negative vote; and ONUC, authorized by the Security Council in no less than three decisions which the Soviet delegation, with its vote, had supported. When the nineteenth session had convened, it had been apparent that all Members had been anxious to avoid raising the issue and had accordingly wished to give the Soviet Union and the other countries concerned an opportunity to arrive at a compromise. If the Assembly had been unable to conduct its business in the normal way, that had been due solely and entirely to the attitude of the countries which had refused to pay what they owed.

With regard to the Afro-Asian plan, he would remind the Committee of two points. First, the period during which the plan had envisaged that the question of the applicability of Article 19 should not be raised had been limited to the nineteenth session. Secondly, the only reason why the plan had foundered was that the Soviet Union had refused to let even the Secretary-General know what it had had in mind in the way of a contribution. If the Soviet Government had been willing to disclose that figure in confidence to the Secretary-General, the problem could assuredly have been solved.

At the present late hour the Committee should be concentrating on the task of reaching agreement on recommendations to the General Assembly. If such agreement was not possible, the Committee should submit the draft report and then reconvene in order to continue its work in a more pronounced spirit of compromise.

The CHAIRMAN said that he thought the Committee's next step should be to submit, as an interim report, the draft which it now had before it and which reflected the agreement reached on certain issues. It could then plan to meet again some time before 1 September 1965 in an endeavour to solve the problem once and for all.

Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia), recalling the suggestion put forward at the eleventh meeting, said that if a small group were appointed to work with the Chairman on the draft report it might be possible to find a solution on the basis of the points made in the draft's paragraph 12.

The CHAIRMAN thought that, before such a working group met, it would be useful to hear the reactions of members of the Committee to paragraph 12.

Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) said that he would be in favour of setting up a working group to consider the draft report. The Soviet representative had observed that that text did not go into the question of the applicability of Article 19. His delegation agreed that Article 19 could not simply be ignored, since it was, after all, an existing provision of the Charter and the question of its applicability had been the cause of the situation prevailing during the Assembly's nineteenth session. The problem was how to include a mention of Article 19 but to do so in such a way as to avoid prejudging the position of any particular Member or, indeed, the provisions of the Charter itself. He therefore suggested that the text of the draft report might be expanded so as to include two paragraphs between what were now paragraphs 11 and 12. In the first, the Special Committee would note that the situation which had prevented the General Assembly from functioning normally had been the result of disagreement on the question of the applicability of Article 19; that was an incontrovertible statement of fact. In the second, the Committee, borrowing from the text of the Ethiopian draft resolution (A/AC.121/L.1/Rev.1), would note further that all Member States were agreed that in the interests of the Organization the question of the applicability of Article 19 should not be raised when the General Assembly reconvened so that a recurrence of the situation which had paralysed the nineteenth session, and a confrontation on the issue, could be avoided. The word "however", in paragraph 12, would accordingly be replaced by "therefore". The members who were dissatisfied with the text of the draft report should be appointed to the working group, in order that they might iron out their differences.

Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) said that it was not too late for a small group of representatives to reconcile the differences of opinion on the wording of the draft report. His delegation believed that the words "general concern" and

(Mr. Gebre-Egzy, Ethiopia)

"substantial support", in paragraph 12, did not adequately reflect the unanimous feelings of Member States. He suggested that the beginning of sub-paragraph (a) should be amended to read: "There is agreement among all Members of the Organization..." and the beginning of sub-paragraph (b) to read: "There is agreement among all Members to solve the financial difficulties of the Organization only by voluntary contributions..."; the unanimous agreement that Member States which were highly developed would make substantial contributions should also be mentioned. So far as the vexatious problem of Article 19 of the Charter was concerned, the form of words used in the report was immaterial, for he believed that no one could raise the question at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly and hope to have Article 19 applied. Nevertheless, he appreciated the concern of some delegations on that score; and it should be possible to include, in either paragraph 11 or paragraph 12 of the draft report, a reference acceptable to all.

If the Committee failed to reach an agreement of any kind, the effect on public opinion would be disastrous to the United Nations; and he reserved the right to request a vote on his delegation's revised draft resolution (A/AC.121/L.1/Rev.1) at any time, should he consider it necessary to do so.

Mr. SETTE CAMARA (Brazil) said that his delegation was in agreement with the draft report, which was excellently formulated. As some disagreement still existed, however, he supported the Ethiopian suggestion, in the hope that the differences might be resolved through a redrafting of the text. His only suggestion was that the word "entire", in paragraph 12 (b), should be deleted; contributions would not be truly voluntary if all Members were expected to pay them, and the existing wording excluded the possibility that a Member State which had paid its contributions in the normal way might not wish to make a further payment.

Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) agreed that yet another effort should be made to find a wording acceptable to all members of the Committee - a task which should present no great difficulty if all were agreed on the objectives of ensuring the normal functioning of the General Assembly and of solving the financial crisis through voluntary contributions. In view of the deadline facing the Committee, however,

/...

(Mr. Pachachi, Iraq)

the proposed working group should consider whether, in the event of failure to agree on a wording, the two draft resolutions submitted (A/AC.121/L.1/Rev.1 and A/AC.121/L.2) should be put to the vote, and, if not, what form the report to the General Assembly was to take. If it was decided to postpone a substantive decision until later meetings, it might be better not to give the impression that the Committee's final views on the two specific issues mentioned in paragraph 12 of the draft report were in the terms of sub-paragraphs (a) and (b). His delegation could agree to the texts suggested by the representatives of Afghanistan and Ethiopia, and it could also support the earlier Afghan proposal that the Secretary-General should be asked to transmit to all Member States, for their comments, the general guidelines enumerated in document A/AC.121/4.

At the current meeting, the representatives of two great Powers had accused each other of responsibility for the abnormal functioning of the General Assembly at its nineteenth session. In fact, the smaller countries, including his own, had been responsible for that situation, because they had wished to spare the great Powers the necessity of a confrontation which would have wrecked the United Nations.

Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria) said that the draft report was a well-formulated and balanced paper; while he would have wished that the Committee might be able to report an agreed solution of the problem referred to it, the text as it stood reflected the wide range of views expressed and emphasized the two specific issues on which there was substantial agreement. Since, however, the draft report was not unanimously acceptable, he fully supported the Ethiopian suggestion for the establishment of a small working group; if the latter failed to produce a generally acceptable text, the Committee should present to the Assembly an interim report which might, for instance, simply take note of the report of the Secretary-General and the President of the Assembly (A/AC.121/4). The Afghan proposal that the guidelines for future peace-keeping operations should be forwarded to all Member States for comment deserved full attention, for he believed that the views of all Members should be taken into account by the Committee in its final report to the Assembly.

Mr. SOSA-RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) welcomed the draft report as a clear, concise and skilful account of the work done by the Committee under its terms of

/...



(Mr. Sosa-Rodriguez, Venezuela)

reference; if no agreement was reached on the substance of the problem, that text should be submitted as the Committee's report to the General Assembly. The dispute on the substance could have been settled only by an emphatic declaration to the effect either that States which were unwilling to contribute to the expenses incurred in the Middle East and Congo operations should be required to do so, or that Article 19 of the Charter did not apply to those expenses; but neither of those alternatives was feasible. As there had been no agreement on the two compromise proposals put forward by Ethiopia and Mexico, the only course was to submit a factual report to the Assembly.

Mr. ASTROM (Sweden) considered that the Committee, with so little time remaining to it, had three possibilities. In the first place, it might present a purely factual report, enumerating the number of meetings and attaching the report of the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly (A/AC.121/4) together with the summary records. Secondly, it might add to the factual report some conclusions of a tentative and general character, as set out in the draft report now under consideration, but without taking a final position; the two objections to that type of compromise text were that some delegations might have difficulty in agreeing to an expression of substantial support for only some of the ideas discussed in the Committee, and that the announcement of substantial agreement on two specific issues, which in fact covered only a small part of the area in dispute, might raise unjustified hopes among the public. Thirdly, attempts to reach some agreement on the substance might be continued; negotiations were always worth while, however short the time available. Nevertheless, the difficulties were enormous, and no one should delude himself that the only problem remaining was to find a wording for paragraph 12 of the draft report. If no agreement was possible on the applicability of Article 19 of the Charter, which had been the cause of the abnormal functioning of the Assembly at its nineteenth session, it might be better to opt for a purely factual report; even so, the time remaining should be used in an attempt to reach agreement, which in any event might have some influence on later discussions up to the date when the Assembly resumed its session.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), commenting on the Ethiopian suggestion, said that the question of resolving the present financial difficulties of the Organization should be settled in strict accordance with the

/...

(Mr. Fedorenko, USSR)

Afro-Asian proposals of 30 December 1964. His country insisted that the recommendation of the suggested group of representatives should clearly provide that the question of the applicability of Article 19 should not be raised. It was clear that in this case the question of the applicability of Article 19 was being raised for provocative purposes. The Soviet Union had never denied the existence of Article 19 of the Charter but it applied only to those countries which were in arrears in their payments to the regular budget for two years, and there were no countries in that category at the present time. Consequently, if the Charter was to be the guide, there was no reason for raising the question of the applicability of Article 19. It was incorrect, therefore, to give the impression that the main point at issue was voluntary contributions and that there was general agreement on the making of such contributions independently of other considerations. His country had agreed to a resolving of the present financial difficulties on the basis of voluntary contributions only as part of the Afro-Asian plan. That condition must not be overlooked.

The United States representative, in his statement, had attempted to tell the USSR how and when to make a voluntary contribution. But the USSR, in accepting the Afro-Asian proposals, had agreed to make a voluntary contribution only on the condition of complete normalization of the work of the General Assembly and firm guarantees against any provocations with regard to Article 19. Determination of the amount and ultimate purpose of such a contribution was, of course, exclusively within the competence of the Soviet Government.

The United States representative had failed to mention the fact that the United States, by its rejection of the Afro-Asian proposals, had nullified the attempts to find a solution to the financial difficulties and disrupted the work of the nineteenth session. But it was futile for the United States representative to seek to shift the blame for those failures. In the light of that representative's most recent statement, he wondered whether the United States had revised its position of opposition to the Afro-Asian plan. The Committee would welcome a clear statement on that point. If, however, the United States continued to try to exploit the situation for its own selfish ends, the USSR would be obliged to revert to its initial position and would not consider itself bound by any commitments arising from the Afro-Asian plan.

Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America) agreed with the USSR representative that the issue was whether or not there were arrears. That issue was the very question dealt with by the International Court of Justice, in an opinion which had been accepted by the General Assembly and which - he believed - had received the affirmative vote of every Asian and African State. As the representative of Afghanistan had pointed out, an Article of the Charter could not be set aside without amendment to the Charter. The proposals of 30 December 1964 had simply recommended that the question of the applicability of Article 19 should not be raised during the nineteenth session of the General Assembly. The Committee would therefore do better to concentrate on a point regarding which there was agreement - namely, that the nineteenth and twentieth sessions of the General Assembly should be conducted in accordance with normal procedures. The draft report before the Committee seemed to be a balanced and fair compromise and was acceptable to his delegation. While his delegation would be glad to co-operate with any working group which the Chairman might appoint, he thought that there might be difficulty in securing agreement to changes in the draft report. If the USSR representative wished to include in the report a reference to Article 19, the factual statement of the different views on that Article contained in document A/AC.121/4, paragraph 41, might be incorporated in the report.

Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India) said that the deliberations of the Committee had made it clear, first that the long-term issue of the respective powers of the General Assembly and the Security Council with respect to peace-keeping operations would require some time for solution, and secondly that there was an overwhelming desire that the present financial difficulties should be solved and normality restored to the nineteenth and twentieth sessions of the General Assembly. The issues on which there was disagreement were how to ensure that result and how to word the report. At the present stage, the Committee should do nothing to make attitudes more rigid or to cause a worsening of the situation.

It was certainly true that the situation created in the earlier part of the nineteenth session was the result of a disagreement concerning the applicability of Article 19; his delegation could therefore accept the insertion of new paragraphs before paragraph 12 of the draft report, as suggested by the Afghan delegation, if that was acceptable to other members. The same idea might be

(Mr. Chakravarty, India)

expressed more concisely, however, by inserting in sub-paragraph 12 (a), between the words "that" and "prevented", the words "was created as a result of the disagreement on the question of the applicability of Article 19 of the Charter and that". With such an addition, the draft report would not give the public a false impression by drawing too bright a picture of the situation. If agreement could not be reached on some such wording, it might be best to delete paragraph 12 entirely.

Mr. MATSUI (Japan) found the draft report quite satisfactory. It represented the most and the best that the Committee could do under existing circumstances. His delegation supported the Afghan delegation's earlier proposal for the addition of a new paragraph which would provide an opportunity for all Members of the United Nations to comment on the guidelines contained in document A/AC.121/4. That addition would follow logically from General Assembly resolution 2006 (XIX), operative paragraph 1, which implied that consultations should extend to the whole membership of the Organization. The Afghan proposal, therefore, did not change the substance of the draft report and should be adopted. He pointed out that the USSR delegation's views were made part of the report through the Memorandum of 10 July 1964, to which it referred, and the summary records of the Committee's meetings. By direction of the General Assembly in resolution 2006 (XIX), the Committee must submit a report not later than 15 June 1965. His delegation did not object to the Ethiopian proposal for the appointment of a working group, provided that the group would not raise controversial issues but would discuss the presentation of factual matters.

The CHAIRMAN noted that there was substantial agreement to the appointment of the working group. He regretted that the representative of Afghanistan would be unable to serve as a member of the group, because of other commitments; and he announced that the working group would be composed of Ethiopia, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Mexico and Sweden.

Mr. ASTROM (Sweden) said it was his understanding that the delegations of the countries named would assist the Chairman and the Secretary in their work, but in no way to the exclusion of full consultations with other members of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN confirmed that understanding.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.