LIBRARY E A / BIBLIOTHÈQUE A E
3 5036 01031993 0

CANADIAN MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

CAUTION: ADVANCE TEXT

FOR RELEASE ON DELIVERY

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

PRESS RELEASE NO.7

March 29, 1967

Press Office
750 Third Avenue
New York, N.Y.10017
YUkon 6-5740

PEACEKEEPING

Text of Statement to be made by the Permanent Representative of Canada, Mr. George Ignatieff, in Working Group A of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations on Wednesday, March 29,1967

When the Committee of 33 held its first meeting this year on February 16, I said that the Canadian Delegation was prepared to lend its support to further efforts to try to work out some specific recommendations from this Committee, particularly on financing and peacekeeping preparations. Since then two meetings of Working Group A have taken place and some very constructive and positive suggestions have been made. The contribution of my Ethiopian colleague was a particularly eloquent and thought-provoking statement of the nature of the difficulties we are faced with, in trying to achieve some consensus on the various aspects of peacekeeping operations. The statement by the distinguished representative of Mexico was also interesting: his suggestion for the creation of a fund "made up of part of the income of the organization" to reimburse bondholders in strict compliance with the agreement on contributions in Resolution 1739(XVI) warrants elaboration in greater detail.

At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I should like to focus attention on what seem to be especially practical proposals

...2/

made in Working Group A. While Canada continues to reserve its position on the attitude which it will adopt at the Special Session towards the resolutions which will then be again before it, my Delegation finds no difficulty in seriously examining at this time and in this forum the possibilities of agreement suggested as a result of the pragmatic approach adopted by the representatives of India and Japan. I hasten to add that I believe we have heard this afternoon a further constructive contribution from the representative of France which obviously merits careful consideration. If the French statement, taken together with the statements by other delegations, does enable us to achieve some significant understandings on the future financing of peacekeeping operations, then the Canadian Delegation will be the first to applaud this as a triumph of common sense.

In their very helpful statements, Ambassador Parathasarathi of India proposed, and Ambassador Matsui of Japan supported, the proposition that we confine our attention to consideration of the financing of peacekeeping operations authorized by the Security Council. This is an approach which is entirely consistent with the approach of my Delegation. It meets our desire to achieve an understanding on practical remedies, without prejudice to the various positions of Member States regarding the respective responsibilities of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Here we are really concerned with two points: (a) that financing of future

peacekeeping operations should be more reliable than the rather haphazard ad hoc arrangements in the past; and (b) that the formulae used for apportioning costs of such operations should be equitable to all Member States. In an ideal situation my Delegation of course would like to believe that collective financing of peacekeeping operations will be the rule, and that other methods will be exceptions. Nevertheless we have to recognize that perhaps the most we can try to do at this juncture is to achieve an understanding on the implementation of apportionment, when that method of financing is recommended by the Security Council. And I believe that our Indian and Japanese colleagues have perhaps shown us the way.

I would emphasize that what the Committee of 33 badly needs to do is to try very hard in the short time available before the Special Session to produce some consensus on a significant aspect of peacekeeping. This will enable the United Nations to meet future arrangements with less improvization and more assurance of being able to deal with them in an orderly, economical and efficient way.

If there is a general willingness on all sides to try to develop a consensus on future financing then it seems to me that the following elements might provide the basis for it:

(1) that prior to the initiation of the peacekeeping operation the Council should obtain from the Secretary-General an estimate of its probable costs;

(2) that having decided to initiate a peacekeeping operation the Council should provide for an appropriate method of financing in each case;

(3) that if the Security Council considers, as we hope it usually would, that apportionment of the costs among Member States is the best method, then privision should be made for the General Assembly to deal with the question of how apportionment should be implemented.

In situations in which the Security Council recommends that the costs of a particular peacekeeping operation involving heavy expenditure are to be apportioned among the members of the organization, we also believe that provision should be made for the equitable sharing of the costs on the basis of a model special scale. Such a model scale can be very simple in itself providing a guideline for more detailed special scales to be used in specific instances.

A number of countries have suggested the establishment of a finance committee to recommend the specific variations in a model special scale which might be necessary to reflect the particular circumstances of the operation being financed. It seems to my Delegation that the desirable involvement of the General Assembly in working out an apportionment formula might well be met by some form of finance committee which could have links both with the General Assembly and with the Security Council and which would be asked to suggest an appropriate and detailed apportionment scale in each case. R.18, as suggested by India, or any reasonable alternative, would undoubtedly prove to be very helpful to the work of the proposed Committee when it was developing its specific recommendations.

At our last meeting Ambassador Matsui suggested the establishment of a standing finance committee of the General Assembly composed of representatives of states from five groups of contributors including at least four permanent members of the Security Council. I also note that, at the

seventh meeting of the Committee of 33 on May 17, 1965, Ambassador Seydoux proposed the establishment of such a committee by the Security Council, the composition of which "could be fixed on a broader basis than that of the Security Council". Then, at our last meeting, Ambassador Goldberg stated that the United States Delegation "would be prepared to consider the various proposals for a finance committee including the French proposal for a committee linked to the Security Council"; and he suggested that "perhaps a compromise could be found in a committee made up of members of the Security Council but reporting to the General Assembly". Surely within these rather similar approaches lies a basis for agreement.

The Canadian Delegation for one is fully prepared to try to seek an understanding along the above-mentioned lines because in my Delegation's view such a practical approach to financing is completely consistent with the purposes which motivated Canada in putting forward, together with six other countries, a resolution at the last General Assembly. Indeed it seems increasingly clear to us that the financing paragraphs of Resolution L.130,Rev.4, including a provision for a guideline for the costs to be assumed by developing countries under any apportionment formula, command widespread understanding among Member States.

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, I cannot help making reference to the need for further voluntary contributions to clear up the remaining financial deficit. In this connection

it is appropriate to recall Resolution 2053(XX), which was adopted by an over-[illegible] majority and which in its fourth operative paragraph "calls upon all Member States to make voluntary contributions so that the future may be faced with renewed hope and confidence". That resolution in turn recalled the consensus of September 1, 1965 as well as the Secretary-General's consequent appeal for voluntary contributions. Further voluntary contributions at this time, designed to complete the implementation of the consensus of September 1, 1965, would not only serve to improve the atmosphere in which the peacekeeping question is discussed, but should also enhance the chances of progress in reaching an understanding on the future financing and preparations of peacekeeping operations.