

CANADIAN MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

CAUTION: ADVANCE TEXT

PRESS RELEASE No. 70

November 16, 1966

FOR RELEASE ON DELIVERY

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

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

PEACEKEEPING

Text of Statement to be made by the Canadian Representative, Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, M.P., Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister of Canada, on Item 33 (Comprehensive Review of the Whole Question of Peacekeeping Operations in all Their Aspects: Report of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations) in the Special Political Committee on Wednesday, November 16, 1966.

Mr. Chairman,

The first purpose of the United Nations, as the Charter makes clear, is the maintenance of international peace and security. It was a desire to ensure universal peace, after the world-wide struggle of 1939-1945, which provided the incentive for the establishment of this Organization. This is a consideration which Canada believes it necessary to keep foremost in mind--a consideration of which no Member State can, or should, lose sight.

In our view it is indispensable to the promotion of orderly international relations that we maintain and strengthen the capacity of this Organization to keep the peace. This is of importance to all Member States but particularly, we believe, to the smaller States. It is especially in their interest that reliable security arrangements should exist, arrangements in which they can participate politically and financially. The financial contribution of the smaller States, in fact of all developing countries, may of course be small for it should not place too great a burden upon them. But the contributions of these States, which form the majority of States in our Organization, are an essential element in keeping alive the concept of collective security.

It is, Mr. Chairman, in this broad context, conscious of the purposes and the principles of the Charter, that my Delegation approaches the item before us. The latest report of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations is no doubt disappointing to many delegations interested in this question. This is due in our opinion not only to the absence of agreed solutions to fundamental issues, but to the difficulties which the Committee found in coming to grips with these issues. It is true of course that a few delegations, including my own,

the factor of th and the second s attempted to suggest subjects for careful examination. For our own part we did this in a spirit of conciliation, in a desire to meet the views of other delegations and to register some modest achievements. Nevertheless our efforts were not fruitful. In view of the basic importance of the issues involved, we consider that these efforts should be renewed here in this forum, in the same spirit of conciliation and with the same hope of positive results. The Canadian Delegation, for one, is willing to make such an attempt, and to put forward specific proposals for consideration. Any such proposals on our part are placed before this Committee with only one goal in mind: to preserve and, indeed, to enhance the capacity of this Organization to keep peace in the world.

Before embarking on the discussion of specific proposals I should like, Mr. Chairman, to recall some observations made by the Honourable Paul Martin, the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, in his statement in the General Debate on September 23. The existence of differing opinions on the nature and value of UN peacekeeping activities, as between a majority and a minority of Member States, was fully recognized, after which Mr. Martin remarked: "... the views of this minority must be respected, even if we do not share their views. We appreciate that we may have to accept the limitations thus imposed, particularly with respect to the position held by some of the great powers on the principle of collective financial responsibility. But even if these limitations are accepted there remains much to be done."

Mr. Chairman, those remarks reflect an approach which, we trust, will be regarded in the way in which it is meant to be regarded—as being both positive and realistic. If such an approach commends itself to other delegations this Twenty-first Session of the General Assembly may manage, despite obvious difficulties, to produce solid accomplishments in the field of peacekeeping.

In developing the aforesaid approach, Mr. Chairman, my delegation would like to group its observations under three principal headings:

- (i) the financing of peacekeeping operations;
- (ii) preparations for peacekeeping; and
- (iii) constitutional aspects.

The question of financing peacekeeping operations involving heavy expenditures is a matter of great importance. Long-standing disagreement over the financing of some past peacekeeping operations brought this organization to a virtual standstill two years ago. The future of the United Nations seemed to be in jeopardy. Then, through a process in which the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations played a

The state of the s

. r drift ar t' are pe

significant part, a consensus was achieved by which the General Assembly could resume its normal activities. While one provision of that consensus has not yet been fully implemented we are hopeful that it soon will be, so that at least the financial consequences of past disagreements over peacekeeping financing can be dealt with.

Our main interest now turns to the future. The principle of collective financial responsibility is one to which Canada still adheres. For us it is a logical complement of collective security. Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, Canada cannot help but draw certain conclusions from the crisis through which the United Nations has passed. We consider that, for the time being, we will have to accept the following situation: namely that the application of mandatory apportionment among Member States of the costs of a major peacekeeping operation will only be possible when the Security Council, including its Permanent Members, agrees that the costs of such an operation should be so apportioned. If mandatory apportionment among the Members is so decided upon then, in our view, the General Assembly retains the responsibility under the Charter of deciding how apportionment should be implemented.

If mandatory apportionment is not possible then other methods or combinations of methods may be used.

Taking this into account, the question arises as to what the General Assembly may usefully do in the area of peacekeeping_financing at this session. My Delegation believes that we should set forth some guidelines for the financing of a particular peacekeeping operation involving heavy expenditures in the event that apportionment is decided upon. Thus the General Assembly could place on record its considered view that in such circumstances certain considerations should be taken into account and provision should be made to ease the burden on the developing countries. In making these observations, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that our position on financing is taken with a desire to ensure that the Security Council and the General Assembly can work in harmony. We believe it is consistent with the Charter and with the interests of Member States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to turn to my second heading: preparations for peacekeeping. This is a matter in which Canada, due to her own involvement in past peacekeeping activities, has long had a special interest. The Ottawa Conference in 1964 on the technical aspects of peacekeeping was a simple reflection of that interest. Preparations for peacekeeping represent, we believe, another area where some modest progress might be made without prejudice to the differences in attitudes of Member States. Indeed, in one respect, what is required is action by Member States taken individually. We believe it would help, for example, if the General Assembly would simply call upon Member States to inform the Secretary-General of the kinds of military or civil forces or services which they might be in a position to provide, in response to a request to

1916 1 1, The state of the s V 45 4 J.

participate in a duly authorized UN peacekeeping operation. This would be of course on the understanding that in each instance any Member State would reserve the right to decide whether it wished to participate in the specific operation being set up.

Given the willingness of Member States to make information of that kind available, the question arises as to how the Security Council might improve the capacity of this Organization to maintain peace and security. My Delegation, recognizing the primary responsibility of the Security Council in this field, thinks that it would be quite appropriate for the General Assembly to make some recommendations to the Security Council. We would hope the Council would give careful thought to such recommendations.

In his statement in the General Debate on September 23 our Secretary of State for External Affairs mentioned the following two possibilities:

- (i) that something should be done now to respond to the Secretary-General's 1964 proposal for a study of the means of improving peacekeeping preparations; and
- (ii) that it was perhaps time for the Security Council to re-examine the possibilities of negotiating agreements with Member States for the provision of armed forces, assistance and facilities, to be made available to the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

Regarding the first possibility my Delegation considers that it would now be desirable to recommend to the Council that a study of the kind suggested by the Secretary-General be authorized. This could be done without prejudice to the position of any Member State on the results of the study or the use of it. But the very exercise involved in making the study would be helpful in clarifying the existing situation.

As for the second possibility, it is of course for the Security Council to decide what, if anything, it wishes to do. There should be no objection however if this Assembly were to place on record its view that a re-examination of the possibilities under Article 43 would be useful. In putting this suggestion forward my Delegation is aware of the fact that from time to time over the last two years a number of delegations have expressed interest in that idea and that they might welcome the extra incentive which would be provided by General Assembly approval.

Under my third and final heading, Mr. Chairman, I will deal with highly controversial but extremely important constitutional questions: the authorization of peacekeeping

operations, and the respective responsibilities of the Security Council and of the General Assembly. On balance, my Delegation continues to believe that little will be gained by any effort to force the point of view of the majority on the minority or vice versa. Indeed as we have already indicated, the most desirable approach is one which involves making some progress on certain practical problems without prejudging the positions of principle of various Member States.

With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, my Delegation feels we may be approaching a stage where certain basic elements could be agreed upon. I should have thought that in this case we could all recognize that the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, while not reaching any conclusions regarding the future, served a useful purpose during its first 18 meetings in encouraging a widely-representative group of delegations to outline clearly and carefully their respective viewpoints.

Those statements, taken together with the guidelines suggested by the Secretary-General and the President in the Spring of 1965, and with the comments of a substantial number of Member States both inside and outside the Committee, represent in a broad sense the comprehensive review which the Committee was asked to undertake. Taking all that work into account, and having studied delegation statements very carefully, the Canadian Delegation ventures to suggest that it should be possible at this time, or in the near future, to agree on certain basic elements. I would thus suggest, interalia, that the General Assembly could do the following:

- recall that the first purpose of the Charter is to maintain international peace and security;
- (2) express the conviction that all Member States should co-operate to ensure that purpose is achieved;
- (3) recognize that the Charter has conferred:
 - (a) on the Security Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security; and
 - (b) on the General Assembly the right to discuss any question relating to the maintenance of international peace and security and the right to make recommendations on any such questions.
- (4) recognize further that if the Security Council is unable to adopt decisions in exercise of its primary responsibility the General Assembly, which also bears its share of responsibility in maintaining international peace and security, may

4.81

At a case of the contract of t

the state of the state of the state of

. .

- consider the matter immediately and, pursuant to the Charter, make appropriate recommendations; and
- (5) express its belief that the Organization should be in a position to respond promptly and effectively to the need for duly authorized action to maintain peace and security.

In our statement today, Mr. Chairman, my delegation has tried to assess the present state of the continuing discussion of peacekeeping, and to suggest areas in which some constructive work might be done. If the main elements of this approach could be reflected in a resolution, a very useful step forward would have been taken, a step which would further the achievement of our aims. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we do believe that, on that highly important subject of peacekeeping, this Twenty-first Session of the General Assembly should move forward.