

paralysed by the vote. Consequently, the Committee could only report as follows to the twenty-first session of the General Assembly:

During the debates that took place in the resumed session, various new ideas and proposals on different aspects of peacekeeping operations were advanced. Negotiations took place among members of the Committee, with the co-operation of the Chairman and other members of the Bureau. It was found, in the course of the resumed session, that certain differences of opinion on the part of member states continued to exist on the subject. The Chairman has endeavoured to reconcile the different views held by member states, but it was not possible to achieve this.

At its twenty-first session, therefore, the General Assembly was again confronted with the task of reconciling deeply divergent views. At the twentieth session, the Canadian delegation had believed that the best tactic was to preserve the *status quo* by referring specific proposals for further consideration to the Committee of 33. This year, however, the delegation believed that it was necessary to put forward specific proposals. In his major address to the General Assembly on September 23, the Secretary of State for External Affairs suggested the following specific steps:

First, we think that the time has come to respond to the proposal put forward by the Secretary-General in 1964 that studies should be made on the means of improving preparations for peacekeeping operations.

Secondly, we think that the time has come for the Security Council and its Military Staff Committee to re-examine the possibilities for negotiating agreements with member states for the provision of armed forces, assistance and facilities to be made available to the Council in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

Thirdly, we think that, without prejudice to any action which may be taken by the Security Council, member states should be encouraged to inform the Secretary-General of the kinds of forces or facilities they would be prepared to provide for duly authorized peacekeeping operations.

Fourthly, we have already agreed by a large majority in this Assembly that certain principles should govern the sharing of the costs of peacekeeping operations involving heavy expenditures. It should now be possible to convert these principles to uniformly applied practices.

With these four concrete steps as a basis, the delegation, after extensive consultations among representatives of every shade of opinion, decided to table a resolution which, it was hoped, would achieve some progress on the financing of and preparations for peace-keeping without prejudice to the question of whether the General Assembly had the power to authorize peace-keeping operations. One factor influencing the decision to table a resolution was the desirability of providing a practical alternative to the resolution, tabled by Ireland and 12 co-sponsors, which seemed likely to divide the membership by reviving the dispute which had immobilized the organization at the nineteenth session. The Irish resolution established a fixed scale of mandatory assessments on member states for the financing of peacekeeping operations not covered by other agreed arrangements.