

UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



Distr.  
GENERAL

A/AC.121/SR.16  
27 August 1965  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

---

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 20 August 1965, at 3 p.m.

PRESENT:Acting Chairman:Members:

Mr. HAJEK	(Czechoslovakia)
Mr. PAZFWAK	Afghanistan
Mr. BOUATTOURA)	Algeria
Mr. BEN KACI )	
Mr. GARCIA DEL SOLAR	Argentina
Mr. SHAW	Australia
Mr. BACKES	Austria
Mr. SETTE CAMARA	Brazil
Mr. TREMBLAY	Canada
Mr. PRUSA	Czechoslovakia
Mr. GEERE-EGZY	Ethiopia
Mr. TINE	France
Mr. CSATORDAY	Hungary
Mr. PARTHASARTHY	India
Mr. PACHACHI	Iraq
Mr. TORNETTA	Italy
Mr. MATSUI	Japan
Mr. BA	Mauritania
Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO	Mexico
Mr. GUARLES VAN UFFORD	Netherlands
Mr. ADEBO	Nigeria
Mr. Amjad ALI	Pakistan
Mr. LEWANDCWSKI	Poland
Mr. MORARU	Romania
Mrs. COLLIER	Sierra Leone
Mr. de PINIES	Spain
Mr. HEDIN	Sweden
Mr. PACHARIYANGKUN	Thailand
Mr. MOROZOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. HIIMY II	United Arab Republic
Lord CARADON	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

/...

PRESENT (continued):

Members (continued): Mr. GOLDBERG  
Mr. ALVARADO  
Mr. CVOROVIC  
Secretariat: U THANT  
Mr. NARASIMAN

United States of America  
Venezuela  
Yugoslavia  
Secretary-General  
Under-Secretary for  
General Assembly Affairs

Mr. ADEBO (Nigeria) associated himself with the expressions of welcome which had been addressed to the new Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations. The statement made by Mr. Goldberg at the preceding meeting was a good omen for the future. While forcefully restating the United States position, he had shown a spirit of conciliation which had evoked a sympathetic response from all. However, he had done less than justice to those countries which had realized earlier than the United States that the application of the sanctions provided for in Article 19 of the Charter to Member States which did not pay their assessments in respect of peace-keeping operations might lead the United Nations to disaster. Nigeria had been one of the first countries to become aware of that danger. Faithful to the principle of collective responsibility for peace-keeping, his country had always honoured its financial obligations to the United Nations but it had done everything it could to prevent a confrontation with regard to the application of the sanctions provided for in Article 19 to those States which did not share its point of view. It had done so not because it was less dedicated than any other country to the principle of collective responsibility or the principle of the rule of law, but because it did not feel that those principles would be best advanced by following a course likely to destroy the most effective, if not the only, instrument available for ensuring the application of those principles in the future.

His delegation was grateful to the United States Government for its decision to go along with the consensus in favour of a compromise solution in spite of its doubts on that score. To a member of the Press who had asked him at the end of the preceding meeting if he did not think that "this surrender by the United States" might have a harmful effect on the prestige of that country, he had replied that in the course of the discussion all the Member States had been called upon to relent, in one way or another, in respect of convictions to which they were strongly attached. For example, certain States which had sworn that they would contribute nothing to help settle the United Nations financial crisis were now saying that they were ready to make payment in certain circumstances. Countries like Nigeria, which had paid all their peace-keeping assessments, were now expected to make a further contribution. For the Nigerian Government at least, when a country, great or small, made that sort of "surrender" its prestige, far from diminishing, only increased.

(Mr. Adebo, Nigeria)

He regretted that the United States should have felt it necessary to reserve the right to make exceptions to the principle of collective responsibility. It was to be hoped that, once the Committee had succeeded in defining more clearly the obligations of Member States, there would be no further question of reservations. The immediate task, therefore, was to solve the present financial crisis by means of voluntary contributions, after which the Committee should continue with the task which it had undertaken, i.e. to work out arrangements in respect of future peace-keeping which would clearly define the obligations of Member States so that no new controversy would arise.

He wished to pay a tribute to the countries which had taken the initiative in that connexion by announcing the contributions they were prepared to make. That example would doubtless have been followed more quickly but for the feeling on the part of a number of Member States that the basic problem would not be disposed of by those contributions alone, without a public undertaking by all Member States, and particularly the great Powers, to ensure that the work of the Assembly would proceed henceforth in the normal fashion. As the consensus, with which the United States had associated itself, was that the Assembly's future sessions should proceed normally, he wished to announce that his Government was prepared to make an unconditional voluntary contribution of \$20,000 to help solve the Organization's financial difficulties.

With regard to the future, his delegation had made a comprehensive statement of its views at the Committee's fifth meeting and, in its reply to the Secretary-General's communication, it had supported the guidelines for future peace-keeping operations suggested in paragraph 52 of the report of the Secretary-General and the President of the Assembly (A/AC.121/4). He agreed with the representative of Afghanistan that it would be best to wait until replies from other Member States had been received before continuing the discussion of that question.

His delegation shared the hope that agreement would be reached on future peace-keeping operations. He believed, however, that it would be folly to act too hastily. Some still feared that the proposed compromise solution with regard to assessments for past operations did not augur well for the future of the United Nations but in the opinion of his delegation that future would depend rather on the arrangements that were agreed upon for future peace-keeping operations and those arrangements, in turn, would depend on the patience and spirit of accommodation shown by the Committee in examining the question.

/...

Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) said that when the Committee had met in April Canada had hoped that informal negotiations would make it possible to solve the problem of arrears and lead to an agreement concerning the authorization and financing of future peace-keeping operations. As no progress had been made, Canada, together with the United Kingdom, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Iceland, had announced on 21 June the decision to make voluntary unconditional contributions, which in Canada's case would amount to \$4 million, to help the United Nations solve its financial difficulties. Jamaica had recently joined that group of countries and made a generous contribution and he thanked the Government of Nigeria for the decision which it had just taken in that connexion.

When announcing the decision of the Canadian Government on 21 June the Secretary of State for External Affairs had made it clear that the pledge was made without prejudice to that Government's support of the principle of collective financial responsibility for duly authorized peace-keeping operations. He had added that the time had come for as many States as possible to make a joint effort to restore the solvency of the United Nations, to create conditions which would make it possible for the Assembly to meet normally in the following September, and to preserve the capacity of the United Nations to continue to perform its essential functions in the maintenance of international peace and security. Canada's hope that the largest possible number of States would participate in that voluntary effort had been strengthened by the statements made at the preceding meeting by the representatives of three permanent members of the Security Council. In that connexion he thanked the representative of the United States for the very significant statement which he had made to the Committee.

The position taken by the United States should clear the way for all Member States to give their support, and it was on them that the success of the voluntary campaign to restore the financial position of the United Nations depended. His delegation believed that an appeal for funds should be launched as soon as possible. In order to underline the urgency of that appeal, one or two pledging conferences might perhaps be arranged, perhaps in September or October. Naturally, that would not prevent Member States from announcing their contributions before the first conference. Similar conferences in the past had proved fruitful and

(Mr. Tremblay, Canada)

there was no reason why they should be less fruitful in the present instance. If the General Assembly were to convene such a conference, he proposed that it should urge all Member States to make generous contributions within a reasonable period.

His country had recently stated that it would not insist on the application of Article 19 in respect of decisions taken by the General Assembly concerning assessment of contributions for UNEF and ONJIC. Canada took that position, however, without prejudice to the future application of Article 19 with regard to the regular budget. Indeed, it would be desirable for all Governments to affirm their intention to maintain the integrity of the regular budget. Furthermore, while it recognized that the most urgent problem was to restore the United Nations to solvency, his delegation would consider the financial problem of the United Nations only partially solved if a formula acceptable to all Member States could not be found for the payment of interest and amortization charges on United Nations bonds.

The present situation in no way affected his delegation's view that collective financial responsibility remained the best principle for the financing of peace-keeping operations and that UNEF in particular should continue to be financed on the basis of that principle. It was to be hoped that there would be agreement on the need for an urgent study of the future financing of the Emergency Force, which played a vital part in the maintenance of peace and security and accordingly imposed a moral obligation on all Member States to share the costs involved. Some might assert that the maintenance of peace and security in the Middle East was not a matter of collective interest and that consequently there was no collective responsibility involved. Such a view overlooked the fact that the situation in the Middle East always carried with it the risk of a conflict which might spread to the whole world with fatal results.

He stressed that point because Canada had believed for many years that peace-keeping was a collective responsibility, and based its policies on that principle. It now agreed that a relevant Article of the Charter should not be invoked against certain Governments which had not accepted what it regarded as financial obligations. Canada would support any authorized scheme of voluntary payments to settle the United Nations' debts. However, if, as a consequence, the

(Mr. Tremblay, Canada)

cost of UNEF was to be shouldered by an ever smaller group of States, while others refused to pay their contributions, his country would consider that a serious cause for concern.

With regard to future peace-keeping operations, his country welcomed the guidelines drawn up by the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly. However, there were three major principles which his delegation wished to stress. First, Canada considered that the apportionment of peace-keeping costs between all Member States, in accordance with the principles adopted by the General Assembly at its fourth special session, was the best method of financing peace-keeping operations authorized by the Security Council. However, the Council might recommend alternative methods if it was found after study that the collective contribution method was not acceptable. If the Council's recommendation favoured a system of collective or partial contributions, the General Assembly would apportion the costs. Secondly, all proposals for peace-keeping operations involving the use of military force would be first considered by the Security Council. If the Council were unable to act, the General Assembly might consider the question and make recommendations either to the Council, or to Member States. Lastly, the Secretary-General must retain the authority to administer peace-keeping operations, on the understanding that the Council might if necessary make periodic reviews unless there was general agreement that some other body, such as the Military Staff Committee, should perform that function.

Mr. MATSUI (Japan) said that the statement made by the United States representative at the preceding meeting and the decision announced by him that the United States would no longer press for the application of Article 19 had deeply impressed his delegation. The United States had taken a realistic stand without, however, giving way on the fundamental legal principles or seeking to evade its heavy international responsibilities.

He recalled that in December 1964 the Committee of Twelve, of which his delegation had been a member, had drawn up what had been called the "Afro-Asian proposal". Since the suspension of the nineteenth session, his delegation, as a member of the Committee of Thirty-Three, had continued with the Afro-Asian delegations to seek a solution acceptable to all. It had carefully studied the



(Mr. Matsui, Japan)

statement by the representative of the United States and had come to the conclusion that the position taken by that country was virtually identical in substance, if not in form, to the one advocated particularly by the nations in the Afro-Asian group. In some vital respects the new United States position even went beyond the Afro-Asian proposal of 30 December, which would have been inconceivable only a short time ago. He did not look upon that as a "concession", since there was no question of bargaining but simply of recognizing a factual situation. By so acting, the United States had certainly accommodated itself to the fullest possible extent to the Afro-Asian position, and indeed to that of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations.

It was encouraging to know that the General Assembly would thus be able to resume its work normally. If the fact was that the General Assembly was unable to see that Article 19 was applied in the present case, it was equally important to recognize that the United Nations still suffered from an agonizing financial crisis and desperately needed help. The normal functioning of the General Assembly was the first prerequisite, but the United Nations could not be expected to be strengthened without the full financial support of its Members. It was therefore to be hoped that voluntary contributions, which were undoubtedly the only possible solution to the problem, would soon be forthcoming. His delegation had taken careful note of the concern of certain Member States, expressed, inter alia, by the USSR representative at the preceding meeting, that firm guarantees should be given regarding the non-application of Article 19 and that a link should be established between the question of voluntary contributions and the application of that Article. Without wishing to go into detail, he would like to appeal to those Member States from which substantial voluntary contributions could be expected to accommodate themselves to realities and join in the common effort to resolve the present difficulties of the United Nations. The generosity of those States would certainly encourage others to follow their example.

He considered that the Committee should conclude its discussion on the question, with the understanding that it would continue to study the future aspects of the entire question of peace-keeping operations. Experience had shown the difficulty of drawing up a precisely worded draft resolution acceptable to

(Mr. Matsui, Japan)

all. In the present favourable climate, it ought to be possible to agree fairly rapidly on a flexible text embodying the consensus achieved. For example, a statement by the Chairman of the Special Committee might be recorded in the verbatim record of its debate, or certain passages might be included in the Committee's final report to the General Assembly. The important thing was to secure the unanimous consent of all parties concerned and to avoid challenging the basic legal principles of any of the great Powers. In view of the short time left to it before the resumption of the nineteenth session of the General Assembly, the Committee should concentrate its efforts on bringing its present work to a satisfactory conclusion.

The Acting CHAIRMAN welcomed the new representative of India, Mr. Parthasarthy, who he was sure would make a most valuable contribution to the Committee's work. He also wished to thank his predecessor, Mr. Chakravarty, for the assistance which he had given to the Committee.

Mr. PARTHASARTHY (India) thanked the Acting Chairman for his words of welcome. He looked forward to working in close co-operation with the members of the Committee.

The Acting CHAIRMAN suggested that the next meeting of the Committee should be convened by the Chairman, in consultation with the Secretary-General, at a date which they considered suitable.

The meeting rose at 3.50 p.m.