



Eighteenth session

ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY PROCEDURES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Report of the Secretary-General on his consultations concerning
the desirability and feasibility of establishing a peace fund

1. At its fourth special session, the General Assembly adopted, on 27 June 1963, resolution 1879 (S-IV) on the question of the establishment of a peace fund. The resolution reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Bearing in mind the purposes of the United Nations as set out in Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations,

"Realizing the need for prompt and effective action to prevent any threats to or breaches of international peace and security,

"Believing that inadequate financial resources can seriously delay or jeopardize the success of such action,

"Desiring to make sufficient funds readily available to the Secretary-General, thus enabling him to discharge, without undue delay, his responsibilities under the Charter in cases of breaches of the peace,

"Convinced that the establishment of a peace fund through voluntary contributions from Member States as well as organizations and individuals is worthy of study as a means of furthering this objective,

"1. Requests the Secretary-General to consult all Member States and interested organizations on the desirability and feasibility of establishing such a peace fund;

"2. Further requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its eighteenth session."

2. In pursuance of operative paragraph 1 of the above-quoted resolution, the Secretary-General, by a note verbale dated 17 July 1963, requested the Governments

of Member States to transmit to him by 15 August 1963 their observations on the desirability and feasibility of establishing such a peace fund, as well as their suggestions as to the "interested organizations" which could be consulted.

3. By 16 September 1963, the Governments of Argentina, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, India, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Liberia, Netherlands, Norway, Rwanda, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Venezuela had communicated their observations and these are reproduced in the annex to the present report. Any comments received after the publication of this report will be circulated as addenda.

4. While it would seem that the consultations with the Member Governments and interested organizations may not be completed in time for the General Assembly to pursue the matter at its eighteenth session, the General Assembly may wish to consider at that session a point of procedure which has been raised by the Governments of Canada, Italy and Sweden in their communications, i.e., that the study of the scope and purpose of a peace fund could most appropriately be conducted by the Working Group on the Examination of the Administrative and Budgetary Procedures of the United Nations, more particularly as such a study would come within the terms of reference of the Working Group as established by the General Assembly in resolution 1880 (S-IV). If the General Assembly agrees to such a procedure being observed, the Secretary-General will arrange for the supply of the relevant documents to the Working Group.

ANNEX

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Argentina	2
Canada	3
Ceylon	5
Chile	6
China	7
Colombia	8
Cyprus	9
Denmark	10
Dominican Republic	11
India	12
Italy	13
Jamaica	14
Japan	15
Kuwait	16
Liberia	17
Netherlands	18
Norway	19
Rwanda	20
Sudan	21
Sweden	22
Togo	23
Turkey	24
Uganda	25
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	26
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	27
Venezuela	31

ARGENTINA

[Original: Spanish]

The Argentine Government believes that the establishment of a "peace fund" would be both possible and advantageous. The Argentine delegation to the General Assembly has on various occasions expressed its support for this idea as one means of solving the problem of the heavy expenditure arising out of the operations undertaken by the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security. Argentina, which wishes, in fulfilment of its international obligations, to contribute to the peace-keeping activities of the United Nations, has found that the contributions asked for in such cases involve an extremely heavy burden for countries which as a prime necessity have to solve the problem of their economic and social development and for that purpose have need of all their resources and even the co-operation of international organizations. Accordingly, formulae which, while safeguarding the basic concept of collective responsibility, encourage the financing of peace-keeping operations through voluntary contributions, are highly satisfactory for Member States of small or moderate economic means, including the Argentine Republic.

The note under reply also asks for suggestions as to the "interested organizations" which could be consulted.

The Argentine Government believes that it is perfectly feasible to appeal to individual organizations or foundations which have resources enabling them to make substantial contributions to a fund such as that proposed; but since there are in Argentina no such bodies large enough for that purpose, it is not felt that any concrete proposals can properly be made. It is considered that such suggestions could more logically be put forward by those Member States in which such institutions exist.

CANADA

Original: English

The idea of establishing a peace fund was raised informally during the fifteenth regular session of the General Assembly. At that time, some Member States considered that such a fund would not constitute a reliable method of financing United Nations peace-keeping operations. Further, many States, including Canada, thought that the concept underlying a peace fund as envisaged at the time ran counter to their belief that the maintenance of peace and security is a collective responsibility which should not be placed on an optional or voluntary basis.

In its resolution 1879 (S-IV) asking the Secretary-General to consult all Member States and other interested organizations on the desirability and feasibility of establishing a peace fund, the General Assembly stated its desire to make sufficient funds available to the Secretary-General to enable him to discharge, without undue delay, his responsibilities under the Charter in cases of breaches of the peace. In this regard, it should be pointed out that the annual resolution which provides for unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the following fiscal year contains certain provisions enabling the Secretary-General to draw funds without delay to discharge the responsibilities which the Charter places on him. For instance, at its seventeenth session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 1862 (XVII) which

(a) authorizes the Secretary-General to enter into commitments not exceeding a total of \$US2 million, and without the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. For the maintenance of peace and security and

(b) "Decides that if, as a result of a decision of the Security Council, commitments relating to the maintenance of peace and security should arise in an estimated total exceeding \$US10 million before the eighteenth session of the General Assembly, a special session of the Assembly shall be convened by the Secretary-General to consider the matter".

It would seem, therefore, that the establishment of a peace fund for the purpose described above would be superfluous. Nevertheless, having regard to the support which resolution 1879 (S-IV) commanded at the recent special session of the Assembly, Canada is prepared, in co-operation with other Member States, to

/...

pursue its examination of the scope and purpose of a peace fund. This examination could most appropriately be conducted by the Working Group of Twenty-one on the examination of the administrative and budgetary procedures of the United Nations. It seems that such a study would come within the terms of reference of the Working Group as established by the General Assembly.

CEYLON

Original: English

The Government of Ceylon approves the establishment of a "Peace Fund" based on voluntary contributions as a supplementary source for financing Peace Keeping Operations. However, the Government of Ceylon wishes to make a reservation that these subscriptions should be collected in such a way so as to avoid a situation in which it would appear that Peace Keeping Operations are being financed by private companies with vested interests. Such a situation will detract from the impartiality of these operations. The Government of Ceylon therefore favours an arrangement by which contributions from private sources could be made to Member States concerned, who in turn will channel them to the Peace Fund.

CHILE

[Original: Spanish]

The Government of Chile is convinced that the establishment of a fund designed for the maintenance of peace, through voluntary contributions from Member States as well as organizations and individuals, should be studied very carefully so that the objective of resolution 1879 (S-IV) may shortly be attained.

CHINA

Original: English

The Government of China is agreeable to the establishment of such a peace fund entirely from voluntary contributions and deems it desirable, if the establishment of the fund is generally agreed upon among the Member States, to formulate appropriate measures or regulations to govern the administration of the fund and to define the relationship between the fund and the contributors.

COLOMBIA

[Original: Spanish]

The Government of Colombia fully shares the considerations set forth and is in agreement regarding the desirability of establishing such a fund as an effective measure for the prevention of any threats to international peace and security, but regrets that the present economic situation of the country does not allow it to offer its contribution to the fund in question; it hopes to be able to do so at a future date, as soon as economic conditions in the country allow of it.

CYPRUS

[Original: English]

The Government of Cyprus, who has been following with keen interest the operations of the United Nations in the Congo and in the Middle East has become, for sometime now, increasingly aware of the difficulties encountered by the Organization in meeting the expenditures of the two operations and of the implications of these financial difficulties to the efficacy of the United Nations in its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is apparent that the Organization has to be rid, once and for all, of these difficulties if it is desired to maintain its efficacy unhampered. It is the opinion of the Government of Cyprus that the most effective way to bring about this situation would be to provide for additional financial sources, supplementary to the present source established under paragraph 2 of Article 17, which can be readily drawn upon for the purposes of peace-keeping operations and other peace functions of the United Nations. The necessity of the establishment of such supplementary resources has gained greater validity in the light of deliberations of the fourth special session of the General Assembly. The Government of Cyprus, therefore, warmly supports the idea of the establishment of a United Nations peace fund and considers such a peace fund to be desirable.

As regards the connotation of the term "interested organizations", it is the view of the Government of Cyprus that this comprises major foundations and other private and philanthropic institutions that may exist in different Member States around the world.

DENMARK

[Original: English]

1. The Government of Denmark is of the opinion that the United Nations peace-keeping operations have to be financed by the Member States in accordance with their collective responsibility for the expenses of the organization and that as a general rule the ordinary scale for contribution has to be the norm for the apportionment of the expenses. In the opinion of the Government of Denmark a peace fund established through voluntary contributions as well as from Member States as from other sources may be of value since it will enable the Secretary-General to pay the expenses for the introductory steps when peace-keeping operations might be initiated in an acute situation.
2. It must be a condition for acceptance of any contributions to such a fund from governmental as from private sources that they are contributed without clauses of any kind. The fund has to have a universal nature and be dedicated to one of the main purposes of the United Nations.
3. Voluntary contributions should be accepted as well from private organizations as from individuals. Some Member States might possibly even prefer a voluntary contribution to such a general fund instead of contributions to specific operations.
4. The abovementioned does in no way imply the position of the Danish Government as to Danish voluntary contributions. However, it may be pointed out that Denmark has made and still is making voluntary contributions in several areas for the support of the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

[Original: Spanish]

The Government of the Dominican Republic considers advisable the establishment of a Peace Fund in accordance with the terms of resolution 1879 (S-IV). To that end it will give its moral and financial support within the scope of its possibilities, it being understood that in the current year it will not be able to make monetary contributions, as the funds provided under the appropriate head in the national budget are exhausted.

INDIA

[Original: English]

The Government of India subscribe to the idea of the establishment of a voluntary Peace-Keeping Fund. It was with this in view that the delegation of India had co-sponsored the Seven-Power Memorandum (A/AC.113/18) which had been submitted to the Working Group of Twenty-one. India also voted in favour of the draft resolution moved by Cyprus, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Nigeria and Pakistan in the fourth special session; which was subsequently adopted as resolution 1879 (S-IV) on 27 June 1963.

The Government of India believe that the Peace-Keeping Fund should be strictly voluntary, and that it should not in any way derogate from the principle of collective responsibility of all Member States to pay for peace-keeping operations. They also feel that as the permanent members of the Security Council have, under the Charter, the primary responsibility with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, and in view also of the fact that developed Member States are more capable, economically and financially, of meeting the expenses of peace-keeping operations involving heavy expenditures, they should bear a greater responsibility for peace-keeping expenditures, and as such, they should be requested to contribute generously towards the peace-keeping fund.

The Government of India would support in this behalf any proposal which does not go against the basic principles laid down in the Seven-Power Memorandum (A/AC.113/18) which had been submitted to the Working Group of Twenty-one.

ITALY

[Original: French]

At its fourth special session, the General Assembly had no opportunity to take up, even on a preliminary basis, the various problems which would arise from the possible establishment of a peace fund, to which General Assembly resolution 1879 (S-IV) refers. The establishment of such a body raises many questions of a very complex technical nature, including that of the procedure to be followed in authorizing the use of the resources available to the fund, the extent to which they could be used, the manner in which recourse might be had to the fund without derogating from the principle of collective responsibility. Apart from these questions of principle, some realistic consideration must be given to the actual possibilities of collecting the voluntary contributions necessary for the financing, even partially, of peace-keeping operations.

It seems to the Italian Government that it would be useful if the Assembly, before embarking on the consideration of these problems, were to entrust them to a small technical group for study. It might, for instance, be a good idea to request the Working Group of Twenty-one on the Administrative and Budgetary Procedures of the United Nations to study the question, which, it would appear, ought logically to be considered within the more general framework of the examination of the general principles of the financing of peace-keeping operations. The General Assembly and its Fifth Committee could then take the question up later, when they would have all the necessary technical data at their disposal.

JAMAICA

[Original: English]

The Government of Jamaica considers the establishment of such a fund to be both feasible and desirable.

Jamaica is of the view, however, that it would be essential to ensure that the creation of the Fund would not be regarded by Member States as a substitute for peace-keeping assessments which have proven to be such a problem in the United Nations finances up to the present time. For this reason the Fund should be supplied from purely voluntary contributions. These contributions could be sought from Governments, whether members of the United Nations or not, and also from private organizations within Member States. Possible private organizations are labour unions, public trusts and charitable foundations, mutual and provident funds and friendly societies and associations. International banking houses might also be asked to make voluntary contributions.

The Government of Jamaica recommends that the peace fund should be under the control of the Secretary-General and it would be necessary to identify the organ of the United Nations under whose authority payments would be made out of the fund. Such payments should be made on the authority of the General Assembly, not the Security Council.

Further, it would be equally important to define with precision the purposes for which the fund may be used, so as to avoid having it dissipated in a multiplicity of minor activities or in organizations in the cause of peace. Preferably, non-controversial purposes in the field of peace-keeping should be chosen, e.g., it might be provided that the funds should be used only to meet the cost of efforts at mediation by the United Nations and the cost of fact-finding and observation missions undertaken with a view to eliminating threats to international peace and security, or the restoration of peace.

Finally, the Government suggests that contributions to the peace fund should be accepted in any national currency whether such currency is freely convertible or otherwise.

JAPAN

[Original: English]

1. The Japanese Government regards the establishment of a peace fund as an interesting idea which merits careful study.
2. Inasmuch as the Working Group on the Examination of the Administrative and Budgetary Procedures of the United Nations has been requested under General Assembly resolution 1880, (S-IV), to make a comprehensive study on the matters relating to the financing of future peace-keeping operations and to report to the General Assembly not later than at its nineteenth session, the Japanese Government is of the opinion that the above idea of establishing a peace fund would most appropriately be examined upon the presentation of the report by the Working Group.

KUWAIT

[Original: English]

The establishment of the Peace Fund will be the subject of a statement to be made by the Chief of the Kuwait delegation to the eighteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly, at its meeting in New York next month.

LIBERIA

[Original: English]

The Government of Liberia supported resolution 1879 for the establishment of a peace fund and is of the view that such a peace fund would be of assistance in making funds readily available to the Secretary-General in enabling him to meet his responsibilities in matters affecting international peace.

The Liberian Government is of the view that among the interested organizations which could be consulted in this connexion is the World Federation of United Nations Associations which will be meeting at Headquarters of the United Nations on Monday, 9 September 1963.

NETHERLANDS

[Original: English]

Generally speaking the Netherlands Government continues to hold the view that the financing of United Nations peace-keeping operations is the collective responsibility of Member States. On the more specific matter of the desirability and feasibility of establishing a peace fund, the Netherlands Government is unable to take a definite position until a preliminary question has been decided. This question is whether the fund is envisaged to be a fund out of which the financing of peace-keeping operations can be fully covered, or whether the idea is rather to raise a working capital, to be replenished by afterwards apportioning the costs of each operation among the Member States.

The elucidation by the delegate of Ghana who introduced the draft of resolution 1879 (S-IV) in the fourth special session of the General Assembly, is not entirely clear in this respect. According to the summary records (A/C.5/SR.1002) he said: "The Fund would in no way conflict with the principle of the collective responsibility of Member States, which would have to meet their financial obligations by complying with any equitable scale of contributions that might be devised in the future". During the same meeting the Swedish delegate added to this the interpretation that "The Peace Fund would constitute an extension of the Working Capital Fund". As this interpretation went undisputed it is believed that the suggested peace fund tends to adopt the character of a working capital. In any case, the Netherlands Government would welcome an answer to this preliminary question to enable it to clarify its own views on this matter.

In anticipation of the position the Netherlands will finally hold, the Permanent Representative thinks it might be useful to recall a statement on principle made by the Netherlands delegate to the fourth special session of the General Assembly who said "... in general we believe it to be wrong that for the fulfilment of one of its primary tasks the United Nations should - at least partly - depend upon the willingness of Member States to pay voluntary contributions".

NORWAY

[Original: English]

The Norwegian Government is favourably disposed to the idea of a peace fund at the disposal of the Secretary-General. Such a fund might contribute to an easing of the financial difficulties which may arise during the implementation of peace-keeping tasks. It might also serve a useful purpose through affording an opportunity to private organizations and individuals to contribute directly to the peace-keeping efforts. It is the view of the Norwegian Government, however, that the United Nations peace-keeping actions primarily should be financed in accordance with the principle of the collective responsibility of the Member States for the expenses of the Organization, as established by the decisions of the fourth special session of the General Assembly.

The Norwegian Government is unable at the present time to discuss its attitude to the question of a possible Norwegian official contribution. It has at the moment no suggestions as to "interested organizations" which might be contacted.

RWANDA

[Original: French]

The Government of the Republic of Rwanda considers that it would be possible and advisable to set up a Peace Fund.

SUDAN

[Original: English]

While the Sudan Government is pleased to support the plan for establishing a Peace Fund to serve the purposes envisaged in General Assembly resolution 1879 (S-IV), it would venture to hope that the establishment of the Fund will in no way affect the size of the special or voluntary contributions by the developed countries for the financing of specific peace-keeping operations. The objective of the Fund should be to alleviate the financial burden on the developing countries, in the case of future threats to or breaches of international peace and security.

The Sudan Government wishes further to suggest that the Resident Representatives of the United Nations in Member States be instructed to co-operate with Governments of these States in the launching of campaigns to raise money for the Fund from organizations and individuals.

SWEDEN

[Original: English]

Basically the Swedish Government is of the opinion that costs incurred for peace-keeping operations should be carried by the Member States according to the principle of collective responsibility. When the Swedish Government supported the idea of studying the desirability and feasibility of establishing a Peace Fund, it did so in the hope that such a study might pave the way to a system whereby the United Nations, as an organization whose principal purpose is to secure more stable peace in the world, could benefit also materially from the good-will it enjoys among Governments as well as private organizations, institutions, associations and individuals all over the world. Funds raised under those auspices might be put at the disposal of the Secretary-General to be used by him in accordance with procedures previously agreed upon. Such a solution would significantly increase the possibilities of the Secretary-General to act swiftly and efficiently in emergency situations. By giving in this way the Secretary-General resources at his immediate disposal the effectiveness of a United Nations action, particularly at its initial stage, when rapidity often is of decisive importance, could be considerably raised, to the benefit of the parties interested in the intended action and of the World Organization. Alternative courses for the use of the funds might also be considered.

Regarding "interested organizations" to be consulted in the matter the Swedish Government has no particular recommendation to make.

Finally, it is suggested that the question of the establishment of a Peace Fund should be further explored within the Working Group on the Examination of the Administrative and Budgetary Procedures of the United Nations.

TOGO

[Original: French]

The Togolese Republic is in favour of the principle of the establishment of such a fund.

The Togolese Government is convinced that prompt and effective action is a decisive and essential factor for the smooth conduct of peace-keeping operations. Furthermore, experience has shown that a lack of adequate financial resources can slow down and seriously endanger the success of any operation. It is in order to anticipate and prevent such an eventuality that we have supported and wish to associate ourselves with the idea of the establishment of a Peace Fund supplied by the voluntary contributions not only of Member States but also of organizations and individuals.

As far as Togo is concerned, however, in view of the extremely limited financial resources at our disposal and the very important tasks and problems of economic development with which we are at present faced, I am authorized by my Government to inform you that the Togolese Republic, while anxious to spare no effort in any matter concerning the United Nations, has very few means available to it for participation in the establishment of the Peace Fund. It goes without saying, however, that my country is firmly resolved to make its modest contribution to the work of peace in which the United Nations is engaged.

TURKEY

[Original: French]

The Turkish Government, faithful to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, has always contributed to the Organization's efforts for maintaining peace, and supported resolution 1879 (S-IV), adopted at the fourth special session of the General Assembly, which provided for consultations with Governments and interested organizations on the desirability and feasibility of establishing a Peace Fund, to be financed by voluntary contributions from Member States as well as organizations and individuals, which would enable the Secretary-General to discharge, without undue delay, his responsibilities under the Charter in cases of breaches of the peace.

However, while convinced of the usefulness of the above-mentioned proposal, the Turkish Government considers that the Peace Fund should be used by the Secretary-General only as a last resort, after he has exhausted all other possible means for the maintenance and safeguarding of peace.

UGANDA

[Original: English]

The Government of Uganda supports in principle the establishing of a Peace Fund in accordance with resolution 1879 (S-IV) adopted by the General Assembly at its fourth special session on 27 June 1963.

The Ugandan Government is also prepared to make a small contribution in accordance with her financial position.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

[Original: Russian]

The aforesaid resolution of the fourth special session of the General Assembly concerning the establishment of the special fund conflicts with the Charter of the United Nations, under which the Security Council alone is authorized to decide questions of the maintenance of international peace and security, including questions of financing measures taken to that end. The existence of such a fund would facilitate the actions of those seeking to bypass the Security Council - the fundamental organ of the United Nations which bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of world peace and which is empowered to act on behalf of all Members of the United Nations. All this could have adverse consequences for the cause of peace and international security.

For these reasons, the USSR delegation at the fourth special session of the General Assembly opposed and voted against the said resolution.

The position of the Soviet Union in this matter remains unchanged.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

[Original: English]

1. ...
2. In considering this matter a number of questions arise, on the answers to which would depend Her Majesty's Government's attitude to the desirability and feasibility of such a fund. These questions relate principally to the role which the proposed peace fund would play in financing peace-keeping operations, and to the manner in which the fund would be administered.
 - A. The role of a peace fund
3. A peace fund might be designed to cover the entire costs of all peace-keeping operations by the United Nations; or it might cover a major part of such costs, leaving substantial amounts to be raised from other sources; or it might be confined to a relatively small sum, intended solely to finance the initial stage of a particular operation for a brief period while arrangements were made for a special assessment for the purpose.
4. If the fund were designed to cover all peace-keeping costs, it appears that this would, in principle, be placing the costs, of all such operations on a voluntary, and to the extent that non-governmental contributions are accepted, a private, basis. It is perhaps questionable whether this is wholly compatible with successive decisions of the General Assembly (of which the latest is paragraph 1 (a) of resolution 1874 (S-IV) of 27 June 1963) that the financing of peace-keeping operations is the collective responsibility of all Member States. Her Majesty's Government would in general deprecate any financial arrangements, whether made on a voluntary or other basis, which might have the effect of reducing Members' sense of responsibility for financing the activities of the Organization, or of relieving Members of the financial consequences of their decisions.
5. If the fund were intended to cover only part (even if a major part) of the costs of peace-keeping, this would presumably entail its supplementation by funds raised through assessments on Member States and thus reduce the force of the arguments in paragraph 4 above. The difficulties which have arisen owing to the refusal of certain States to accept the validity of assessments for this purpose, and their consequent refusal to pay such assessments, would however, remain unresolved.

6. Another possibility would be that the fund should provide an immediate reserve of money in order to enable the Organization to take urgent action, pending the making of an assessment to finance a particular operation. Such a fund could not be committed unless the Security Council or the General Assembly had authorized the initiation of an operation, bearing in mind all the probable financial consequences of such a step and unless members were ready to make available the necessary forces and supplies. If the General Assembly decided to initiate an operation, the Assembly ought presumably at the same time to determine an assessment for the purpose. A fund of this description might, therefore, most likely be called into play in circumstances in which the Security Council felt obliged to authorize urgent and immediate action of such a nature that it was not practicable to await the convening of the General Assembly and would have value if it strengthened the Organization's capacity to react flexibly to such a situation. In such a case the General Assembly would consider the provision of finance for the purpose of continuing the operation.

B. Administration of fund

7. Power to issue money from the fund would require to be vested in one authority, and for this purpose there would appear to be three possibilities, namely the General Assembly, or the Security Council, or the Secretary-General. Of these three, it is doubtful whether the Secretary-General would desire, even if it were within his competence, to initiate a peace-keeping operation except on the instructions of either the Security Council or the General Assembly and whether the General Assembly would be ready to extend the Secretary-General's power to enter into unforeseen expenditure beyond the limit indicated in resolution 1862 (XVII). In effect therefore the choice would be between the Security Council and the General Assembly.

C. Size of fund

8. The appropriate amount for a peace fund would, of course, depend upon the role which it was intended to play. If it were designed to cover the cost of all peace-keeping operations, the amount involved could be substantial. In 1961 and 1962, the costs of peace-keeping operations were of the order of \$140 million

per annum. In 1964, the Middle East operation alone may be expected to cost about \$19 million. Something of the order of \$100 million might be required and even this could, on recent experience, be exhausted in less than one year, entailing presumably recurring appeals for further substantial contributions. For a fund intended to cover only part of the costs of peace-keeping about \$50 million might be required and to this somewhat similar considerations would apply.

9. A contingency fund might, however, be limited to possibly \$10 million. It is assumed that this amount would be returned to the fund soon after an assessment had been made for the purpose of financing the operation as a whole.

D. Sources of contributions

10. For a peace fund intended to finance either the whole or a major part of peace-keeping operations the sums required, both for its initial establishment and for its replenishment as money was expended, would be formidable, and it is doubtful whether such contributions could be obtained from any source except Governments. Neither private donors (including industrial and commercial interests) nor philanthropic foundations appear as likely contributors on this scale. On the other hand individuals and foundations might be able to make a significant contribution towards building up a contingency fund, as described in paragraph 6 above.

E. General observations

11. More generally, Her Majesty's Government would observe that the difficulties which have given rise to the suggestion of a fund seem to be of a political rather than a strictly financial character. The deficiency in the peace-keeping accounts has accumulated mainly because certain Governments are unwilling to pay their assessed share on grounds other than their inability to do so. The position of developing countries has been recognized in various assessment formulae, and there appears to be little doubt that Member States collectively are in a position to meet peace-keeping costs, of the order already encountered, without undue difficulty, provided they are willing to support those operations.

12. It seems probable that the differences of view which have led to the refusal of certain countries to pay assessments, would not be removed by the establishment of a peace fund.

13. Except for a small contingency fund, it is doubtful whether sums of the order required could be provided, except from Governments. On the other hand, if Governments are to provide the resources, it may be considered that the methods already in use by Governments to finance such operations (namely contributions to the special accounts opened for the various security operations) could be used for any further governmental voluntary contributions.

F. Conclusion

14. In view of the considerations set out in the preceding paragraphs, Her Majesty's Government feel obliged to reserve their position in respect of the proposal for the establishment of a peace fund. They would however be ready to accept the establishment of such a fund were its desirability and feasibility to be demonstrated as a result of the study which the Secretary-General is at present conducting.

VENEZUELA

[Original: Spanish]

The Venezuelan Government considers the proposal for the establishment of a peace fund to be worthy of study, since it considers that such a fund would provide the Organization with effective means for the discharge of its responsibilities in cases of breaches of the peace.
