CANADIAN MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

CAUTION: ADVANCE TEXT

FOR RELEASE ON DELIVERY

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

PRESS RELEASE NO. 46

December 8, 1965

Press Office
750 Third Avenue
New York, N.Y.
YUkon 6-5740

PEACEKEEPING - Item 101

Text of Statement on Peacekeeping to be Delivered In the Special Political Committee by the Canadian Representative, Mr. Paul Beaulieu, on Wednesday, December 8, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for the floor in order to introduce the draft Resolution contained in Document A/SPC/L.122 This Resolution is being submitted under the sponsorship of the Delegations of Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Iran, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Sweden, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia. Since this draft Resolution was tabled, I am pleased to inform the Committee that the following four countries have become co-sponsors: Finland, Iceland, Mauritania and Uganda. I should like now to explain briefly the purpose of this draft Resolution which we believe should be able to command a very wide measure of support.

The subject of peacekeeping operations is of course one which my Delegation regards as being of the highest importance. The views of Canada on the subject of peacekeeping were, I believe, clearly expressed in the statement which I had the pleasure to make to this Committee on November 19. I do not need to repeat all of those views now. Suffice it to recall that Canada continues to believe that the authorization, control, and financing of peacekeeping operations must be put on a sounder footing; and that the sharing of the financial burden amongst member

states is an essential principle of equity and fair play. Thus Canadian co-sponsorship of the present Resolution implies no change in the Canadian position as outlined in that statement.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, my Delegation does believe, in company with all the other Delegations which are co-sponsors of this Resolution, that, whatever arrangements may be made on an interim or long-term basis for the authorization and financing of future peacekeeping operations, there are two immediate questions which should be dealt with as a matter of priority and in a completely noncontroversial manner. These questions arise directly from the reports of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations which form Part (a) of Item 101 on our agenda. They are:

(1) Continuation of the Committee of 33 so that it may complete its work involving the study of all aspects of peacekeeping operations; and

(2) A call for voluntary contributions in the spirit of the consensus of September 1--which made these present meetings possible--and in consequence of the appeal by the Secretary-General at that time to all member governments "to make voluntary contributions so that the financial difficulties of the organization may be solved and the future may be faced with renewed hope and confidence".

It is the considered view of the co-sponsors that these are the two elements on which virtually all members of this organization should be able to agree without difficulty and that to reflect them

in the body of one Resolution, together with the suggestion that the Special Committee elect its own bureau, gives the General Assembly an opportunity to demonstrate its willingness to pursue the study of the whole subject of peacekeeping operations in an atmosphere of harmony. At the same time we consider it would be useful if the General Assembly went on record itself as calling upon all Member States to make voluntary contributions and thus enable the organization to surmount its present financial difficulties.

My Delegation appreciates the concern of some Delegations about the need to specify the questions to which the renewed Committee should give consideration. While agreeing that the sort of questions outlined in the Resolution placed before us in Document A/SPC/L.121 should be studied in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, my Delegation does not consider it wise to include such detail in any Resolution continuing the Special Committee, particularly since there may be disagreement over the wording or over selection of some questions for study as distinct from others. It is useful to recall that when the Special Committee on Peacekeeping was established it was asked to undertake a "comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects". That wording is in itself comprehensive and could hardly be construed to exclude any particular problem relative to the question of peacekeeping operations. It is not appropriate for my Delegation to prejudge the approach of the Committee of 33 when it resumes but it does seem to my Delegation and, I should think, to many other Delegations that the Committee would naturally resume by drawing up a programme of work and that it would logically be bound in doing so to establish its own priorities. Presumably too the Committee would continue to find useful as a basis for its work the guidelines drawn up by the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly in paragraph 52 of their joint report which was submitted to the Special Committee on June 2, 1965, and on which a substantial number of Delegations have already commented.

Generally speaking, Mr. Chairman, there are perhaps two approaches represented in this Committee as revealed in the statements made so far. There are those who consider that the Committee of 33 should be given an opportunity to try to complete its work and study all proposals relating to peacekeeping in detail before any further decision is taken by the General Assembly on the manner in which unspecified future peacekeeping operations are to be authorized and financed. There are others who consider that at least some sort of interim arrangement is necessary to enable the General Assembly to deal with unforeseen peacekeeping operations in the near future on a more reliable and equitable basis.

While reserving its position on the substance of the proposal found in operative paragraph 4 of the Resolution incorporated in Document A/SPC/L.121, my Delegation has very carefully balanced the respective merits of the two principal approaches which have been followed by members of the Special Political Committee during the current debate.

Having done so, my Delegation considers that at this 20th Session, when the United Nations is still in the process of emerging from a major constitutional and financial crisis, it would be wiser, given the present strong differences of opinion, not to attempt at this Session to reach detailed agreement on arrangements which should govern our action regarding the financing of future peacekeeping operations, even on an interim basis.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.