

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records*



UN LIBRARY

DEC 21 1983

COPY
FOR REFERENCE
ONLY - DO NOT
CIRCULATE

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE

48th meeting

held on

Friday, 9 December 1983

at 3 p.m.

New York

UN/SA COLLECTION

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 48th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RODRIGUEZ MEDINA (Colombia)

later: Mr. STARČEVIĆ (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 71: COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE WHOLE QUESTION OF PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS IN ALL THEIR ASPECTS: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 69: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued)

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL

A/SPC/38/SR.48

19 December 1983

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 71: COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE WHOLE QUESTION OF PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS IN ALL THEIR ASPECTS: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS (continued) (A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1

1. Mr. SHEHATA said that his delegation and the sponsors of the draft resolution had held further informal consultations not only among themselves but also with representatives of the Arab States and a number of countries from the Group of 77, particularly those countries which were members of the working group of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, in order to produce a better version of the text; that text now enjoyed broader support and eliminated some of the difficulties raised by draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48.
2. He invited the Committee to take a decision on the draft, which gave concrete expression to the constructive efforts of the Group during the consultations.
3. Mr. ABOUCHAER (Syrian Arab Republic) proposed that the seventh preambular paragraph should be counterbalanced by the insertion after it of a new preambular paragraph, to read: "Convinced that the victim of any act of aggression, as defined in General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), should not be held responsible for costs incurred in connection with peace-keeping operations and that the aggressor should bear the whole financial burden of those operations".
4. He also requested that a separate vote be taken on the seventh preambular paragraph.
5. Mr. MARIN-BOSCH (Mexico) said that he could see no objection to having a separate vote on the seventh preambular paragraph but, given the late hour, it would be difficult to reach agreement on any amendment. Since, according to the representative of Egypt, the draft resolution as it stood enjoyed broad support, he requested the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to consider the possibility of withdrawing his amendment.
6. The CHAIRMAN endorsed the request of the representative of Mexico.
7. Mr. ABOUCHAER (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, in proposing his oral amendment, his delegation had wanted to reaffirm his country's position of principle on the important question before the Committee. However, in order not to hold up the Committee's work, it agreed to withdraw its amendment but hoped that delegations would bear in mind its thrust.
8. The CHAIRMAN announced that, at the request of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, a separate vote would be held on the seventh preambular paragraph. He gave the floor to delegations wishing to explain their vote before the vote.

/...

9. Mr. MAHMOOD (Pakistan) said that his country attached great importance to United Nations peace-keeping operations and supported any measure aimed at improving the capacity and effectiveness of such operations and ensuring that they had a solid financial base; Pakistan had been a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48, which ran along those lines. The draft resolution before the Committee, revised to take account of the concerns of certain delegations, had totally modified the spirit of the initial draft by including provisions which his Government could not accept. He was referring in particular to paragraph 1, which made peace-keeping operations dependent on the consent of the host country. That consent was of course very important, but it could not have more weight than the implementation of Security Council decisions regarding the maintenance of peace.

10. His delegation believed that no modification could be made to the mandate, character or duration of peace-keeping operations authorized by the Security Council unless as a result of a specific decision of the Council. Since that requirement was not reflected in the revised draft resolution, his delegation had withdrawn from the list of sponsors and would abstain in the vote. His delegation also requested that a roll-call vote be taken on the draft resolution.

11. Mr. BAALI (Algeria) said it was to be regretted that there had not been any real discussion of the very important question before the Committee and that the consultations among members of the Committee had not begun soon enough to produce a text which was acceptable to everyone and which would enable the Committee of 33 to make some headway in carrying out its mandate.

12. He welcomed the useful contacts which had been established among the sponsors of the draft resolution and delegations interested in the question, but he had serious reservations concerning the appropriateness of the seventh preambular paragraph, the wording of which was imprecise and which represented a bold interpretation of the provisions of the Charter, especially Article 43.

13. Some parts of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1, in particular the seventh preambular paragraph, had been taken from General Assembly resolution 33/114, and in 1978 his country had abstained during the vote on that resolution. As a result, while supporting the draft resolution as a whole, his country would abstain during the vote on the seventh preambular paragraph.

14. Mr. Starčević (Yugoslavia) took the chair.

15. Mr. LOGOGLU (Turkey) said that he would vote against draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1. That did not mean, however, that Turkey questioned the importance of United Nations peace-keeping operations, the usefulness of which was beyond dispute.

16. Firstly, however, delegations had not been adequately consulted during the preparation of the draft resolution; on any given issue, it was indispensable to seek the views of those Member States with a direct interest in that issue. Moreover, delegations had been given very little time to examine the draft properly. On the substance of the issue, the draft resolution was premature and could even do

(Mr. Logoglu, Turkey)

a disservice to peace-keeping operations in general. The Special Committee had itself been stopped by very real difficulties, and it was unreasonable to expect the Special Political Committee to be able to resolve those difficulties at one fell swoop by adopting a resolution which did not cover all aspects of the question and could not be a substitute for the guidelines which would eventually have to be drawn up to govern peace-keeping operations.

17. Some provisions in particular raised significant problems. According to the fourth preambular paragraph, peace-keeping forces would be called upon to support decisions of the Security Council; in fact, peace-keeping forces had a very precise and specific mandate; the role of providing support for Council decisions depended on the particular features of the situation and the position of the parties concerned on those decisions. The seventh preambular paragraph raised certain problems. The eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs were vague and involved sweeping judgements about the efficiency and effectiveness of peace-keeping forces. With regard to operative paragraph 1, it was by no means certain that the prerequisites laid down were in all cases the most appropriate or the only ones; it was worth emphasizing once again that strict impartiality in the assessment of the situation on the part of States contributing troops or personnel was also an essential condition, and that should have been reflected in the text of the draft resolution. In addition, paragraph 1 did not cover all existing or possible situations; for example, it ignored the existence of some peace-keeping operations which had been initiated in accordance with particular provisions of Security Council decisions. Finally, paragraph 5 referred to the Charter of the United Nations, whereas the Charter contained no provisions about such operations.

18. The text of the draft resolution had been submitted hastily, conceived prematurely and drafted without the necessary rigour; it did not clearly bring out the meaning or intention of certain provisions, and in terms of substance it singled out certain elements without taking account of all possible cases. It could not, therefore, be approved.

19. Mr. SILWAL (Nepal) said that his country supported peace-keeping operations and had on more than one occasion invited countries which had not yet done so to contribute to the financing of those operations. There was no doubt that Member States had the collective responsibility to share equitably the financial burden of peace-keeping operations duly authorized by the United Nations. Draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1 placed that whole question in a proper perspective, and his delegation would therefore vote for the draft resolution as a whole, including the seventh preambular paragraph.

20. Mr. MARIN-BOSCH (Mexico) said it would have been better if the consultations held for the purpose of drafting the resolution had been conducted in a more regular and efficient manner; however, in view of the important changes made as a result of the most recent efforts, Mexico would be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

21. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not been consulted by the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1. He would vote against it, since the sponsors had introduced many provisions which did not conform to the Charter and by which they deliberately sought to prevent, either currently or in the future, any agreement being reached on United Nations peace-keeping operations that would enable the Special Committee entrusted with that question to carry out constructive work. The sponsors evidently wished to thwart the work on the guidelines which should govern peace-keeping operations, since those guidelines would enable the Security Council to maintain the security of States, particularly small States.

22. That act of sabotage had but one aim: to deprive those States of an effective means of protecting their sovereignty and independence against attempts at aggression. The purpose was to leave the way open for intervention, for which means of action already existed in the form of rapid deployment forces and multinational forces. Furthermore, it was no accident that the sponsors were countries which participated in the operations of multinational forces, or countries which hosted such forces.

23. The sponsors invoked, inter alia, General Assembly resolution 33/114. Yet the adoption of that resolution had caused the work of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to be interrupted. With the new text, a further attempt was being made to bring matters to a complete impasse in that body. The USSR rejected any attempts that certain States might make to impose their will unilaterally for that purpose. A concerted decision was needed, but only through strict respect for the Charter would it be possible to arrive at such a decision. That would guarantee that the interests of States which requested United Nations forces would be preserved, and would ensure that those forces would not serve purposes other than the general interest. Experience had shown that any attempts to review the Charter provisions on the use of force while taking refuge in the United Nations would inevitably have dangerous consequences both for States which requested the assistance and for the Organization itself. By reaching agreement on guidelines governing peace-keeping operations, progress would be made towards collective security, one of the purposes of the Charter. First of all, however, attempts to undermine the Special Committee's work must be abandoned.

24. Mr. XHAFI (Albania) said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1. His country's position concerning the role, financing and dispatch of peace-keeping forces to various parts of the world had been clearly stated in the plenary Assembly and the Fifth Committee, and was based on political considerations. Albania opposed the establishment and dispatch of United Nations forces to various countries or regions of the world, since experience showed that those forces had not served and could not serve to defend peoples' freedom and independence or international peace and security. The events of the past year merely confirmed that position.

25. Mr. BRATTESTA (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1. Peace-keeping operations, including their financing, constituted the collective responsibility of

(Mr. Brattesta, Norway)

all Member States in accordance with the Charter. The Nordic countries noted with satisfaction that that idea was stressed in the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution; however, they would have preferred it if that obligation had also been mentioned in the operative part. The success of peace-keeping operations depended on several basic prerequisites, namely, a mandate that was clearly defined and capable of being fulfilled, unconditional commitment and support from the Security Council throughout the period of the operations, supplementary activities at the political level, in which the Secretary-General would play a major role, and the co-operation of all States parties to the conflict.

26. Mr. LESSIR (Tunisia) said that, because of their importance, his country had participated in all efforts to finance peace-keeping operations. He hoped that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations would reach some conclusions and would arrive at solutions that would help the United Nations to conduct such operations satisfactorily. However, it was imperative to define the respective responsibilities of the parties. His delegation had intended to submit an amendment to the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1, but in view of the delicate balance achieved in that regard within the Committee, it simply wished to point out that it was inadmissible to place the aggressor, the victim and States not parties to the conflict all on an equal footing. The responsibility rested with the aggressor, who should bear the financial burden of peace-keeping operations, or at least the major portion of the costs incurred, and must not evade responsibility. His delegation trusted that the contents of the seventh preambular paragraph would be borne in mind at the thirty-ninth session, so that a more satisfactory formulation could be devised. In view of its reservations about that paragraph, his delegation would abstain from voting on it but would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

27. Mr. HAYES (Ireland) said that his country had for many years been providing contingents for all United Nations observer and peace-keeping operations. It had always considered that the financing of those operations was an essential element of their success and that the financial burden should be shared fairly among all Member States. His delegation was pleased to note that that idea was embodied in the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1, and would therefore vote in favour of retaining that paragraph. It also favoured the general idea expressed in the draft resolution as a whole and would vote in favour of it as currently worded.

28. Mr. NOWAK (Poland) said that his country had contributed since 1973 to United Nations peace-keeping operations. However, certain negative trends were discernible in that field: for some time, attempts had been made to replace United Nations peace-keeping forces with multinational forces. His delegation would therefore have preferred a draft resolution based on respect for the Charter and aimed at strengthening United Nations peace-keeping operations. It could not support draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1: first, the text had not been the subject of broad consultations; second, delegations had had insufficient time to consult; and third, it prejudged the results of the work of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations and distorted the provisions of the Charter. His

/...

(Mr. Nowak, Poland)

delegation deplored the fact that the sponsors had not chosen the path of consensus to settle that important question. It could not regard draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1, as currently worded, as anything other than a partisan attempt to impose an approach that was alien to the Charter. His delegation could not accept the fourth and seventh preambular paragraphs or paragraph 1. It also had serious difficulties with other paragraphs and would therefore vote against the draft resolution as a whole. Nevertheless, its negative vote did not mean that it questioned the appropriateness of peace-keeping operations conducted in accordance with the Charter, or the usefulness of its contribution to those operations.

29. Mr. Rodriguez Medina (Colombia) resumed the Chair.

30. Mr. MAJALI (Jordan) noted that there was some confusion about the seventh preambular paragraph. Many delegations apparently intended to abstain or vote against that paragraph when a vote was taken on it. After consulting some of the sponsors, his delegation noted that they drew a distinction between the words "equitably" and "on an equal footing". Yet some delegations had declared that they would vote against that paragraph, which they interpreted as placing the aggressor and the victim on an equal footing, whereas others intended to vote in favour of that same paragraph, since they felt that the two expressions he had mentioned did not have the same meaning. His delegation therefore hoped that the sponsors would clarify that question. It considered that General Assembly resolution 1874 (S-IV), cited in the first preambular paragraph, should in general be respected.

31. Mr. SCHOENHERR (German Democratic Republic) said that he took note of the text of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1 with great regret. In introducing that draft resolution, the sponsors had informed the Committee that it represented the lowest common denominator of the views of those delegations participating in the consultations. It was, however, apparent that a basis for general agreement had not been found and that those consultations had not been as broadly based as they ought to have been considering that the question was one of such importance. His country for example, which was a member of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, had not been consulted. It therefore had serious reservations with regard to the draft resolution, which seemed to prejudge an agreement on guidelines yet to be negotiated. Its adoption would, moreover, seriously compromise the effectiveness of the Special Committee, which might find itself completely paralysed. His delegation was prepared to continue to co-operate, within the Special Committee, in the implementation of the provisions of the Charter.

32. Experience had shown that, in the sensitive area of peace-keeping operations, it was imperative to show patience, persistence and respect for the Charter. There was no reason to abandon that method of work or the practice of proceeding by consensus, which alone was capable of advancing the work of the Special Committee. For that reason, his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1.

/...

33. Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan) said he would vote in favour of the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1 and in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. He nevertheless wished the summary record to indicate that his affirmative vote should not be interpreted as placing aggressor and victim on the same footing.

34. Mr. MIKUS (Hungary) said it was regrettable that his delegation, like many others, had had very little time to study draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1, during the formulation of which broadly-based consultations would have been desirable since it was obvious that the points of view of the various delegations differed appreciably. Because its formulation had not been preceded by the necessary consultations, it did not reflect the positions of all Member States and was therefore not acceptable to his and many other delegations. He attached great importance to the question under consideration, which involved the principles of the Charter relating to the international situation. Since the maintenance of peace was the most important task of the United Nations, a resolution on that subject should be adopted by consensus, in accordance with established practice. His delegation felt that, in spite of the considerable divergence of views and the little time available, it would not be impossible to formulate a draft resolution which would reflect the views of all Member States, which would be the product of adequate consultations and which could therefore be adopted by consensus. At the current session, the Committee should adopt a draft resolution of a procedural character which would meet the aforementioned criteria and which would renew the mandate of the Special Committee.

35. Mr. SHEHATA (Egypt), replying, on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, to the question asked by the representative of Jordan, said that the sponsors understood the seventh preambular paragraph in the context of all the other preambular paragraphs, which were interrelated in an organic, integrated and harmonious manner. For the first time, resolution 1874 (S-IV), which mentioned the situation of Member States which were victims of aggression, had been cited in a resolution on peace-keeping operations. With regard to the interpretation to be given to the expressions "share equitably" and "on an equal footing", his delegation did not feel able to offer any better explanations from the legal or the linguistic point of view. The text of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1 was a single unit the elements of which were well integrated.

36. He read out paragraph 1 (e) of resolution 1874 (S-IV), which was in keeping with the sense of the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1.

37. Mr. ABOUASSI (Lebanon) said that his country had been the victim of aggression for eight years and could not place aggressor and victim on the same footing. Nevertheless, the seventh preambular paragraph derived from a general principle, that of the collective security of States, to which it subscribed. That paragraph, then, was an integral part of an overall text.

(Mr. Abouassi, Lebanon)

38. Lebanon had always sought to have the United Nations and the peace-keeping forces of the Organization play an important and constructive role in the search for a peaceful solution to Lebanon's problems, which threatened the peace and security of that country and of the entire region. His delegation regretted that the United Nations, for reasons that were well known, had not been able to fulfil that role.

39. At the request of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, a vote was taken by roll-call on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1.

40. The Solomon Islands, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Bahrain, Burma, Democratic Yemen, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Yemen.

41. The seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1 was adopted by 76 votes to 14, with 21 abstentions.

42. A roll-call vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1 as a whole.

43. Botswana, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

/...

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Democratic Yemen, Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen.

44. Draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 96 votes to 14, with 4 abstentions.

45. Mr. LINDAHL (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1 because the text highlighted two aspects of the situation of United Nations peace-keeping forces which deserved attention: on the one hand the financial crisis due to the default of certain States which refused to assume their responsibilities; and, on the other, the need to improve the capability and effectiveness of those forces. On the second point in particular, paragraph 1 of the text adopted contained a number of points for consideration which might usefully be taken up. Those points were not, indeed, essential to the functioning of the peace-keeping forces, but it would, nevertheless, be as well if they were studied by a United Nations body at the same time as practical steps to be taken to improve the effectiveness of those forces. The question of the so-called guidelines was a non-issue. It had been solved from the practical point of view in 1973. All the attempts to resurrect it had only one aim, to distract the General Assembly from the real and pressing problems, namely the financing of the forces and the practical organizational measures to be taken with regard to them.

46. Mr. GREGORIADIS (Greece) said he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1 and of the seventh preambular paragraph, voted on separately, because his country supported United Nations peace-keeping operations, which had been and remained one of the most useful tools available to the international community.

(Mr. Gregoriadis, Greece)

47. The text prior to its revision (A/SPC/38/L.46) had been preferable but his delegation, appreciating the difficulties encountered by the sponsors of the present text, had wished to show a spirit of accommodation. The text which had just been adopted, and in particular its operative part, laid down the basic principles to be respected, the factors to be taken into consideration and the conditions to be fulfilled for the better conduct of operations. In that regard, the Secretary-

General should be commended for the manner in which he had carried out his task of overall responsibility for peace-keeping operations.

48. Mr. BARRINGTON (United Kingdom) congratulated the Egyptian delegation for taking the initiative of introducing draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1. The United Kingdom had participated in the drafting of that text in order to indicate clearly its full support for peace-keeping operations, to which it had long contributed with men and money. Those operations played a more important role than ever in the present troubled times and it was likely, unfortunately, that they would have to be maintained for some time to come.

49. In the current international situation, it would have been wrong to submit to the General Assembly a mere procedural resolution, which might have been attributed to a lack of interest and a lack of conviction on the part of Member States. In adopting a substantive text, the Committee had re-affirmed its attachment to peace-keeping operations and shown that it wished to establish them on sound bases. The compromise text reflected the views of many countries.

50. One of the points to which the sponsors of the draft resolution wished to draw attention was the seriousness of the financial situation. The total deficit for the peace-keeping forces (including the Force in Cyprus) came to nearly \$400 million and was increasing at a rate of more than \$2,500,000 a month (A/38/489). It was the troop-contributing countries, whose number included several developing countries, that had to bear the burden for others. It was impossible to argue that point. The Secretary-General himself had expressed his deep concern (report on UNIFIL, S/16036; report on the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus, S/16192) over this situation, which imposed on certain countries, particularly the less wealthy ones, an unfair and increasingly heavy burden. The text submitted to the Committee reflected that concern and stressed the collective responsibility of Member States under the Charter to share equitably in the financing of forces. They were therefore urged not to refuse to engage in dialogue.

51. Of course it was not always easy to maintain troops of different nationalities in countries where the political situation was tense and security precarious. That required a considerable organizational effort on the part of the United Nations, as well as the active willingness of all parties, both the participating countries and the host countries. The forces played an extremely important role, however, in defusing and limiting the problems. It was in the interest of all Member States that those forces should exist, and they formed an integral part of the peace mission of the United Nations.

/...

52. Mr. ELHOFARI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said he had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1, as well as in the separate vote on the seventh preambular paragraph. A number of proposals throughout the text presented difficulties. With respect to the seventh preambular paragraph in particular, his country considered that, as a matter of principle, the aggressor should pay the price of his aggression, and therefore, bear the entire cost of the peace-keeping operations which his behaviour had made necessary. It was unfortunate that lack of time had prevented the sponsors from holding enough consultations to draft a text which could have been adopted by consensus.

53. Mr. IBRAHIM (Iraq) said he had abstained in the separate vote on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1, because the perpetrator of an act of aggression should not be placed on an equal footing with the victim. It was the aggressor State which must assume the entire cost of the peace-keeping operations which its aggression had necessitated, because it must bear all the consequences of its act. The Charter prohibited States from resorting to force to settle their disputes and did not excuse aggression.

54. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution L.48/Rev.1 as a whole, however, because United Nations peace-keeping forces played a major role in implementing the decisions taken by the Security Council in the discharge of its primary responsibility under the Charter.

55. Mr. VIKIS (Cyprus) said he would have preferred the adoption by consensus of the text concerning United Nations peace-keeping operations. He had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1, for reasons which his delegation had already explained in the Committee during the general discussion of agenda item 71.

56. He had also voted in favour of the seventh preambular paragraph of the text but would still have preferred a provision along the lines of the amendment submitted by Syria, namely, to the effect that the aggressor should bear the entire burden of financing the peace-keeping operations which his acts had made necessary, because the victim of an aggression should in no way be placed in the same category as his aggressor. That idea should have been reflected in the proposed text.

57. Mr. RAPIN (France), whose delegation was one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1, recalled that international peace-keeping and security was one of the major goals of the United Nations. For that reason, France had always attached the greatest importance to United Nations peace-keeping operations. It had always felt it desirable to enhance the effectiveness of those means of action through thorough preparation. Accordingly, it had therefore taken an active part in the work of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations since its establishment and had also taken part in the establishment of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). It was therefore regrettable that substantive differences had prevented the Special Committee from making headway in its work and, a fortiori, from accomplishing its task. France itself had submitted a number of constructive proposals and had supported the proposals of other countries when they did not derogate from the Charter.

(Mr. Rapin, France)

58. As the Secretary-General had brought out in the reports on the work of the Organization which he had submitted in 1982 and 1983 (A/37/1 and A/38/1), the Organization had not fulfilled its peace-keeping obligations in an entirely satisfactory way. There was all the more reason, therefore, to welcome the fact that the Committee had produced, in the form of draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.48/Rev.1, a text which was not merely a procedural one. The text, which was in keeping with the provisions of the Charter and which renewed the mandate of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, was extremely important in as much as it called for the proposal of solutions to the current difficult situation. It was therefore surprising that some delegations, while pretending to regret that the United Nations was unable to face its responsibilities, had voted against a text which called precisely for the submission of proposals to remedy the difficulty.

59. It was extremely desirable that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations should be able to assume its responsibilities and discharge its task in the coming year.

60. The CHAIRMAN announced that the consideration of agenda item 71 had been completed.

AGENDA ITEM 69: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued)

61. The CHAIRMAN suggested, after consultations with the Egyptian, Israeli, Jordanian and Syrian delegations, which he thanked for their spirit of compromise, that, if no delegation objected and on the understanding that there would be no financial implications, the text of the statements made under agenda item 69 should be reproduced in extenso.

62. It was so decided.

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

63. After an exchange of courtesies The CHAIRMAN declared that the Special Committee had completed its work for the thirty-eighth session.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.