

the control of the member. It should be noted that there was no question of taking away a defaulting member's vote in the Security Council or any United Nations body apart from the General Assembly, nor of depriving any country of membership in the United Nations for financial default. The one and only Charter sanction against non-payment of assessed shares was loss of vote in the General Assembly itself. There was some discussion at San Francisco as to whether the right to vote disappeared when simple arithmetic decreed, or whether the penalty had to be imposed by the General Assembly. The majority, including the representative of the Soviet Union, were on record as believing that the penalty was both mandatory and automatic. An ancillary Article defining the functions and powers of the General Assembly (Article 17) stipulated that the Assembly would consider and approve the budget of the Organization and went on: "The expenses of the Organization shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly."

With the exception of the United Nations intervention in Korea, which, because of the special circumstances involved, did not engage the financing machinery of the United Nations, the costs of all peace-keeping activities authorized before the Suez crisis were included in the regular budget, with the funds coming from assessments on the member states. These early peace-keeping activities were on a relatively modest scale and involved the use of military personnel only in an observer capacity. With the establishment of UNEF in 1956, the Organization was faced for the first time with the problem of meeting heavy peace-keeping costs. The estimate for the initial years of operation was \$25 million (U.S.); by comparison, the regular budget for all other United Nations activities in 1957 totalled only \$50 million (U.S.). Canada took the lead in arguing that it would be inadequate and unworthy of the United Nations to finance UNEF by appeals for voluntary contributions. In Canada's view, it was essential, in the words of the Secretary-General, to assure "this vital United Nations undertaking of the same degree of certainty of financial support as afforded to other United Nations activities which have as their purpose the maintenance of security and peace". There was widespread disagreement about incorporating the costs directly into the regular budget but general agreement on common assessment through a special account. Financing through common assessment was seen by Canada and others as an all-important symbol of collective sharing in the collective effort for peace.

Canada's view prevailed but support was far from unanimous. Fifty-one nations supported the assessment resolution (by which the costs were assessed separately from the regular budget, although in the same manner and at the same rate), but the Soviet bloc, together with Chile and Ecuador,