- 3 -

approximately \$217 million $\overline{/U.S.7}$, while ONUC, from its inception to its termination in 1964, cost \$392.8 million /U.S.7). From 1956 until 1961, the General Assembly, led by the U.S.A., Britain, Canada and a number of other countries upholding the principle of collective responsibility, continued to support and adopt resolutions assessing the costs of UNEF and ONUC against the whole membership according to the UN regular scale of assessments, with reductions to the developing countries. However, the U.S.S.R., in accordance with its view that peace-keeping in all its aspects, including financing, is the sole prerogative of the Security Council, refused to pay its assessments. France, on its part, argued that only "decisions" by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter could bind a member state without its consent. Accordingly, it chose to meet its financial obligations with respect to UNEF but not with respect to ONUC. Assisted unique leased to gaionsait edu no every

million in voluntary contributions, the deficit remains signific Because of the failure of these two countries to meet their financial obligations for peace-keeping, and because many other countries were also in arrears in payments for UNEF and ONUC, the United Nations faced a serious financial situation by 1961. No assessments were levied to meet peacekeeping expenses during the last half of 1962. Instead, the General Assembly, in a resolution co-sponsored by Canada, authorized the Secretary-General to issue \$200 million (U.S.) in United Nations bonds to provide working capital to help overcome the organization's financial crisis. Proceeds from the sale of these bonds were used to finance peacekeeping operations during the last half of 1962 and first half of 1963. Canada was the first country to announce its intention to subscribe to the bond issue and purchased \$6.24 million (U.S.) of bonds. (The Soviet Union and France, claiming that the bond issue was a backdoor method of financing the costs of peace-keeping, have refused to pay that portion of their annual UN budget assessments attributable to the costs of repaying the principal and interest to the bond purchasers.)

est uniske the financing of UNEP and ONUC, it has never been by In 1961, the Assembly also decided to seek an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice as to whether peacekeeping costs were "expenses of the organization" and thus assessable under Article 17 of the UN Charter. On July 20, 1962, the Court decided that the costs of UNEF and ONUC were legitimate expenses of the organization and, in turn, the seventeenth session of the General Assembly "accepted" this advisory opinion of the Court.

From 49 countries (no contributions having been i As of January 1, 1964, the Communist countries, because of their continuing refusal to pay peacekeeping costs, had accumulated arrears in excess of their assessments for the preceding two years and thus, under the provisions of Article 19 of the Charter, were subject to losing their votes in the General Assembly. France came into the same category on January 1, 1965. To avoid the possibility of the U.S.S.R. and France being disenfranchised, which would have gravely imperilled the future of the United Nations, the General Assembly in February 1965, as the final act of its abortive nineteenth session, authorized the establishment of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (the Committee of 33) to undertake "a comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects, including ways of overcoming the present financial difficulties of the organization". On September 1, 1965, the General Assembly agreed to the consensus worked out in the Committee of 33 that

mont havena