

develop outside the framework of Chapter VII.

If we are to maintain the peace-keeping machinery we have been developing it is clear, as many previous speakers have pointed out, that we must carefully avoid the financial precedent of UNEF. The method we adopted in 1956 has failed to provide financial resources in the amount required by the organization's political decision to maintain UNEF at its present level.

As we know, many states have not contributed to the UNEF special account because, rightly or wrongly, their parliaments and governments do not believe that they are obliged to contribute to such an account in the same way that they are obliged to contribute to the other expenses of the organization. My Delegation believes experience has made it evident that a procedure which follows the UNEF precedent--whether or not the special account is assessed--simply will not produce the required resources. Moreover, a large portion of the announced voluntary contributions towards expenses of the organization in the Congo have been made on the assumption that the financial precedent of UNEF would not be followed. I would strongly support, therefore, the view expressed by the distinguished delegates of Tunisia, Argentina and others that the General Assembly should carefully avoid the financial precedent of UNEF.

In the complete absence of any other workable procedure, the United Nations as a whole--acting through the General Assembly--must continue to assume full financial responsibility for supplementary estimates such as are now before us. This means that such cost estimates must continue to be recognized as an expense of the organization under Article 17. To this end, my Delegation believes that the best, most obvious and most simple step would be to have such costs contained in a section of the organization's ^{present} budget.

Many member states for understandable financial reasons may be most concerned about the possible magnitude of future bills arising out of Security Council decisions. I believe one delegate has mentioned the possibility of a future action of the size of Korea. I think it would serve to ease our apprehensions if we were to recognize that in the last analysis decisions of the Security Council can never place a financial burden on member states larger than the Advisory Committee and the General Assembly are able to approve and able to apportion. In the unlikely event that such a situation