United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION
Official Records *

FIFTH COMMITTEE
9th meeting
held on
Friday, 9 October 1981
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 9th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/36/SR.9
21 October 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

81-56981 1849e (E)

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 106: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (continued) (A/36/11 and Add.1)

1. Mr. FALL (Mauritania) said that, although considerable progress had been made, the Committee on Contributions would have to make still greater efforts to find a precise definition of capacity to pay and to fulfil its terms of reference. Regrettably, no agreement had been reached on a formula to avoid excessive variations of individual rates of assessment between two successive scales; his delegation would favour a formula combining the percentage and percentage points limits in order to avoid anomalies which placed an unfair burden on developing countries. Particular attention should be devoted to the case of developing countries whose economies had deteriorated over the past year, and the system of relief through the application of the low per capita income allowance formula should be further refined to assist countries which had to devote substantial resources to their development efforts. The $2,500/75 per cent formula would be the most appropriate in view of the constant deterioration of terms of trade and the devaluation of the dollar that had occurred over the past decade. To take account of exchange rate fluctuations and internal inflation rates, calculations should be in constant rather than current prices.

2. Unfortunately, the Committee had still not been able to come to a decision on the extension of the statistical base period; a period of 12 to 15 years would more realistically reflect capacity to pay and should be used until some fairer method could be worked out. The study of seven supplementary economic and social indicators was of interest, particularly to the extent that the Committee believed they could be valuable in reviewing individual cases. All Member States should co-operate by providing all the necessary data.

3. His delegation continued to attach great importance to the principles of capacity to pay and collective responsibility, and urged the Committee on Contributions to spare no effort to find a way of measuring capacity to pay which did not rely solely on national income data. His delegation supported the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 70 of its report.

4. Mr. SAGRERA (Spain) said that, while his delegation recognized the difficulty of objectively defining the concept of "excessive" or "extreme" variations of individual rates of assessment between two successive scales, on occasion variations had occurred which merited such an epithet. For instance, in 1977 his country's assessment had increased by some 55 per cent; that was certainly excessive in relation to its real economic development during the statistical base period concerned. In the last two scales, its assessment had risen by some 72 per cent; obviously, therefore, a precise definition had to be found based on an objective criterion.

5. The problem of the smallest assessments could be mitigated by calculating them to at least one more decimal point. In the meantime, since it had so far proved

(Mr. Sagrera, Spain)

impossible to use an indicator other than national income, the permissible increase in an assessment should in no case exceed the percentage of increase in real terms, in the national income of a Member State during the statistical base period adopted by the Committee. He stressed the concept of an increase in real terms because account had to be taken of any possible inflation which distorted national income and led to unduly large increases in assessments. He suggested that the Committee on Contributions should study and test methods of applying such a criterion, which would in no way represent a departure from the principle of capacity to pay.

6. His delegation had noted the reasons which had so far prevented the use of other economic and social indicators to supplement or adjust national income data in determining the scale of assessments. However, it believed that the Committee should continue to study the problem and obtain the necessary data from all States because such indicators would obviously provide a useful supplementary tool.

7. The Committee should proceed with caution in discussing the possibility of raising the ceiling for the application of the low per capita income allowance formula in order to ensure that it retained its original purpose of benefiting the low income countries. He reiterated the suggestion made by his delegation at the thirty-fifth session (A/C.5/35/SR.18, para. 29) on the usefulness of studying the effects on the scale of defining various income brackets instead of setting a single dollar limit between high and low income categories. His delegation had no objection to the suggestion for the further categorization of per capita income figures made in the last sentence of paragraph 27 of the report.

8. While taking note of paragraphs 31 to 33 dealing with the comparability of the two major systems of national accounts, and welcoming the progress that had been made, his delegation wondered why in recent years there had been a decrease in the assessments of the centrally-planned economies, and in particular whether that had anything to do with the differences between the two systems of national accounts. Since there was greater price stability in the centrally-planned economies, in contrast to the inflation which affected many market-economies, unless the national incomes of the latter, expressed in monetary terms, were corrected in constant prices, the figures would be excessive with respect to real economic growth. The Committee on Contributions should therefore give more detailed consideration to the application and repercussions of the methodology involved in comparing the two systems of national accounts. It was a pity that the Committee had not decided to prepare at least a draft of general rules which could be applied in establishing the next scale of assessments, taking into account the greater availability of data on price changes. It should be possible for the Statistical Office to produce some guidelines for the Committee on Contributions for uniform application in compiling data in constant prices for all Member States. They in turn should submit data in constant prices, and those States which did so should not be penalized by the Committee's failure to take them into account in determining their assessments.

9. Until it proved possible to find some objective method of avoiding excessive or extreme variations of individual rates of assessments, his delegation would favour any statistical base period - including one in excess of seven years - which would produce a balanced scale. The structural problems affecting the scale of

(Mr. Sagrera, Spain)

assessments should be kept under constant review; the ceiling and floor rates introduced rigidity in constructing the scale and undoubtedly departed from the strict principle of capacity to pay. In addition, with the exception of one member, those contributors which enjoyed a privileged position under Article 23 of the Charter should receive no further reduction in their assessments; indeed, thought should be given to recommending a minimum assessment commensurate with their importance and responsibilities under the Charter.

10. Mr. OKLESTEK (Czechoslovakia) said that, if the Committee on Contributions had not made any discernible progress, it was primarily because of the diversity of the tasks assigned to it under General Assembly resolution 34/6 B.

11. The principle of capacity to pay was the only fair criterion for establishing the scale of assessments, and must be rigidly adhered to, and the only true and acceptable indicator of countries' capacity to pay was, for the moment, their national income in current prices. The very notion of "excessive variations" in individual rates of assessment between two successive scales was obscure. Strictly speaking, only variations in assessments which were not attributable to corresponding changes in national income could be called "excessive". Any limit on upward or downward movements would eventually result in a departure from the principle of capacity to pay. The seven-year base period used to calculate average national income should be a sufficient guarantee against sharp changes in individual rates of assessment.

12. His delegation sympathized with the concern at the growth of the financial burden on Member States. That burden should be alleviated, not by reviewing the basic principles governing the size of contributions, but by reducing the Organization's expenditures. His delegation had no objection to the Committee's studying various additional criteria, but believed that such criteria would be most useful for the consideration of individual cases, since, at least for the moment, they could not be used systematically. For example, it was doubtful whether "national wealth" could yet be used as a criterion because the requisite data were not available, no agreement had been reached on what they should cover, and there generally appeared to be no direct relationship between national wealth and a State's capacity to pay at any given time. The use of additional economic and social indicators also caused problems; some seemed to be concerned with the distribution of national income rather than its level, and might thus imply criticism of States' economic policies, which was no part of the Committee's mandate. However, such problems as difficulties in obtaining convertible currency, dependence on a small number of export commodities and dependence on imports for all essential commodities deserved special consideration.

13. Mr. CULLEN (Argentina) noted the statement contained in paragraph 4 of the report of the Committee on Contributions with respect to the complexities of its major task of selecting indicators to supplement that of national income in determining a country's capacity to pay. Unfortunately, after an extensive examination, the Committee had reached the conclusion that, at the present stage, it would not be possible to use those indicators in a systematic way.

/...

(Mr. Cullen, Argentina)

14. In a number of resolutions, the General Assembly had called upon the Committee on Contributions to take special account of the economic and financial problems of the developing countries, the continuing disparity between their economies and those of the developed countries, and the need to find criteria and statistical systems which better reflected capacity to pay. Some of the views set forth in the report, such as the suggestion to divide developing countries into two categories for the purpose of applying the low per capita income allowance formula, appeared to run counter to that approach. Such a suggestion was unacceptable because the developing countries all shared the same development problems; though priority consideration might well be given to certain cases, no new categories could or should be introduced. That was the view, not only of his delegation, but of the Group of 77 as a whole. In addition, the approach of some members of the Committee seemed to fail to take account of the growing disparity between the developed and developing countries, and the fact that the latter, as stated in paragraph 28 of the report, had to allocate an increasingly large share of their income for economic development. The suggestion made in paragraph 27 was doubly erroneous in view of the further deterioration caused by inflation. In sharing the view of those members of the Committee who had pointed out that the $1,800 limit set in 1976 would be equivalent to $2,800 in terms of current United States prices, he hoped that the Committee would not overlook the need for an adjustment. Obviously, such an increase would not be in real terms, so there were no grounds for the criticism that it would only benefit middle-income countries.

15. It was a matter of concern that the Committee on Contributions had not been able to respond adequately to the request of the General Assembly with respect to the avoidance of excessive variations of individual rates of assessment between two successive scales. The view set forth in paragraph 7 of the report could only lead to the maintenance of existing distortions; the defects of the current system for determining capacity to pay should at least be compensated by an adequate method of mitigating excessive variations; so far, the most effective solution was the setting of limits.

16. His delegation was pleased with the conclusion in paragraph 37 of the report that inflation, uncompensated by exchange rate movements could produce misleading national income data and looked forward to its application in determining the scale of assessments.

17. Mr. SAVCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation fully endorsed the Committee's reaffirmation of the current principles and criteria for establishing the scale of assessments and the need to draw up the scale in accordance with States' true capacity to pay, as determined by their national income in current prices. It agreed that no single indicator to account for different inflation rates could be found, and hoped that, in drawing up the following scale of assessments, the Committee would again take account of the circumstances affecting individual countries and adjust their assessment rates accordingly.

18. The Committee had again concluded that the use of various supplementary economic and social indicators would lead essentially to the same ranking in the

/...

(Mr. Savchuk, Ukrainian SSR)

scale of assessments as would data based on national income, but that deriving a single, composite indicator from such criteria was a problem which had still not been solved. His delegation therefore agreed with the Committee that at present it would not be possible to use such indicators systematically to measure capacity to pay.

19. An indicator of national wealth might, per se, merit theoretical study, but it could not be considered for practical use since very few countries kept national data on the subject. Such national data as there were, moreover, were not compatible at the international level. Comparing data on national wealth involved a great many unresolved problems, and his delegation saw no likelihood of using the method in the foreseeable future.

20. His delegation was unfavourably disposed towards attempts to introduce a longer statistical base period as a substitute for a national wealth indicator. Such an extension would only complicate the calculation of the scale of assessments. His delegation had not been enthusiastic about the recommendation to extend the base period from three to seven years, but had gone along with it for practical reasons. It was obvious, however, that as the base period grew, the resulting national income averages bore less and less relation to current economic circumstances which the scale of assessments was supposed to reflect. The greater the disparity, the greater would be difficulties faced by the Committee on Contributions in determining certain countries' rates of assessment.

21. He could not support the idea of percentage limits to variations in assessment between successive scales; as the Committee stated, in paragraph 7 of its report, setting a percentage limit was too mechanistic and arbitrary and would lead to a distortion of capacity to pay. The Committee was made up of highly competent representatives and there was no need to shackle it with restrictions which would necessarily run counter to actual economic conditions and the primary criterion of capacity to pay.

22. The financing of United Nations peace-keeping operations was governed by Chapter VII of the Charter, not Article 19, which related exclusively to contributions to the regular budget. Attempts by the Secretariat to confuse the issue were without foundation in law.

23. Mr. MOHIELDIN (Sudan) observed that the use of per capita national income as the only basis for determining capacity to pay had many short-comings because it did not take account of fluctuations in rates of exchange, different monetary systems, accumulated national wealth, and the actual economic and social situation of individual countries. It was therefore important that the Committee on Contributions should, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 34/6 B, find ways and means of increasing the fairness and equity of the scale of assessments. However, in order for other social and economic indicators to be used, all Member States would have to make efforts to supply the necessary statistics. Particular attention should be paid to countries with large balance-of-payments deficits, to those dependent on the export of specific commodities, as well as to the relative

/...

(Mr. Mohieldin, Sudan)

levels of economic and social development of the developing countries. The Committee on Contributions had unfortunately not reached full agreement on objective and equitable criteria on which to determine the scale of assessments and to ensure justice for all Member States. He urged it to carry out the directives of the General Assembly in that respect.

24. Mrs. LOPEZ-ORTEGA (Mexico) expressed the view that the Committee on Contributions should continue to concentrate its efforts on fulfilling the tasks entrusted to it by the General Assembly, *inter alia* in resolution 34/6 B, in order to find a method of identifying all the factors which had a bearing on the calculation of the scale of assessments. It should further pursue its attempts to achieve greater equity and fairness, paying greater attention to the situation of developing countries, in the light of the economic disparities which existed between the developed and the developing world. It should likewise find a method of avoiding excessive and extreme variations of individual rates of assessments between two successive scales. Finally, the assessments recommended for Zimbabwe and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines met with her delegation's approval.

25. Mr. GUBCSI (Hungary) observed that the report of the Committee on Contributions reflected the widely varying views and interests which had influenced the implementation of General Assembly resolution 34/6 B. As the time for the preparation of the scale of assessments for 1983-1985 drew near, the problems to be resolved became more complex and difficult.

26. In the calculation of future scales of assessments, the principle of capacity to pay should be maintained and strictly observed, and national income should be the principal measure of capacity to pay. The various economic and social indicators considered by the Committee on Contributions could at best supplement *per capita* national income. In that regard, his delegation agreed with the Committee's conclusions in paragraph 23 of its report.

27. The low *per capita* income allowance should be kept under constant review and updated. A *per capita* limit of either $2,500 or $2,800 and a maximum percentage reduction of 75 per cent would be more in keeping with current realities.

28. His delegation was pleased that the Secretariat and most of the members of the Committee on Contributions no longer held the view that the comparison of data compiled on the basis of different systems of national accounts was a cause for worry. The countries concerned, among them his own, were providing the United Nations Statistical Office all the detailed data necesssary for calculating their assessments.

29. The Committee on Contributions should endeavour to lessen the burden of the least developed countries not by creating artificial percentage limits but by offering equitable relief according to their capacity to pay. The Committee should also give due consideration to the ability of Member States to secure convertible currency and to changes in their terms of trade, both of which had an important bearing on capacity to pay.

/...

(Mr. Gubcsi, Hungary)

30. His Government held that Article 19 of the Charter was applicable only to contributions to the regular budget. The question of arrears within the meaning of Article 19 did not arise in connexion with the financing of peace-keeping operations.

31. The financial burdens of Member States should be eased by strict controls on the budget and by increasing the effectiveness of the Organization, not by arbitrarily or artificially changing the existing principles for the calculation of the scale of assessments. Fairness and equity could be increased by considering factors having a bearing on capacity to pay but not by weakening the validity of accepted principles.

32. Referring to annex I of the report of the Committee on Contributions, he suggested that resolutions of the General Assembly, which were readily accessible elsewhere, need not have been reproduced in the report; in the interests of economy they should have been referred to by number only.

33. Mr. PAL (India) said that India had originally paid 4.09 per cent of the budget of the Organization, although its economic situation at the time had not been particularly sound. Increasing membership, the application of the low *per capita* income allowance and the faster growth of the industrialized countries had gradually brought its contribution down to 0.6 per cent, and it had accepted the relief gratefully. In spite of the immense needs of its economy, India had never looked on contributions to the United Nations as a waste of resources, since it wished to see continuing peace, continued progress towards disarmament, and a restructuring of the international economy, without which no country could hope for real prosperity.

34. India did not, therefore, find a conflict between contributions to the United Nations and national development. The goals of the United Nations and of all peace-loving countries were the same; the distinction should rather be made between contributions and armament, between increased contributions to the cause of peace and development and increased outlays for fear of war.

35. He agreed with those delegations which advocated a reform in the current system of assessing contributions. The Committee on Contributions had faced difficulties in accomplishing the tasks laid down for it in General Assembly resolution 34/6 B; nevertheless, it should intensify its efforts to work out an acceptable methodology. For example, the criteria it had used in considering economic and social indicators of capacity to pay had been those selected by the Committee for Development Planning to identify least developed countries, which were unlikely to be valid as a yardstick for measuring the full capacity of other countries' capacity to pay.

36. One of the difficulties faced by the Committee had been a lack of data on accumulated national wealth. He suggested that it should examine, instead, the effects on capacity to pay of accumulated national poverty, on which the data were plentiful. It should consider such factors as: a country's balance-of-payments

(Mr. Pal, India)

position over a decade; the amounts it spent on financing its current deficit as a percentage of gross domestic product; its long-tem external debt and debt service payments; the ratio of its debt to its export of goods and services and its domestic output; and changes in its terms of trade. Those were factors on which IMF and the World Bank based their annual over-view of the international economy. It ought to be possible, within that range of useful indicators, to agree on the parameters of a country's capacity to pay, particularly in foreign exchange. It should certainly be possible to arrive at a synthesis of the financial data available and agree on measures of relief for accumulated poverty. Such a system could more accurately reflect the true capacity to pay of countries whose national income and per capaita GNP might have increased without any coresponding or long-lasting structural improvement in their economies. A UNITAR publication pointed out that 80 per cent of the Third World's total foreign debt ($250 billion) was incurred by just ten countries, including countries with high, low and middle incomes and oil-producing States. The rates of assessment for six out of the ten had already gone up and were likely to go up again, unless fairer and more comprehensive criteria for establishing their assessments were found.

37. The Committee had, unfortunately, been unable to recommend a scale of assessment reflecting the disparities in economic positions between developed and developing countries. In issuing mandates to the Committee, the General Assembly had not excluded any group of developing countries. It seemed logical, therefore, for the Committee to do its best to avoid any obvious injustice. It would be both fair and logical to revise the ceiling adopted for the low per capita income formula so as to compensate for inflation, as countries whose income had risen in nominal terms beyond the current ceiling had not, in real terms, become more prosperous. Despite the formula, glaring anomalies existed. He could cite examples of developed and developing countries paying comparable contributions to the United Nations; in each case, the developed country had had a far higher GNP per capita and a markedly lower inflation rate during the 1970s. There was an obvious need for reform, and his delegation hoped that the Committee on Contributions would do its best to satisfy Member States.

38. Mr. ZINIEL (Ghana) acknowledged that it was not easy for the Committee on Contributions to apportion the costs of the Organization among the Member States, especially since the principles on which its calculations were based were hotly contested. It was clearly impossible to establish an acceptable scale of assessments wihout taking certain factors into account, such as those indentified in resolution 34/6 B, and his delegation was concerned and disappointed at the deadlock in the Committee over the problems posed by that resolution.

39. His delegation had deplored the Committee's reliance, in 1979, on per capita income figures in establishing the scale of assessments. It had abstained on the resolution concerning the scale of assessments, being convinced that the scale proposed did not reflect the spirit of a number of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. For example, some developed countries had had their rates of

/...

(Mr. Ziniel, Ghana)

assessment reduced, while some developing countries had seen theirs double. In the context of the new international economic order, the scale of assessments should increase relief for developing countries.

40. A nation's accumulated wealth was a key factor in its capacity to pay, but the Committee had again failed to take a firm decision on that crucial issue. He was surprised that the Committee had neglected to draw a distinction between developed and developing countries. Indeed, in paragraph 39 of its report, it listed land and subsoil resources as components of national wealth; for developing countries, they were at best potential wealth, which might be realized through the transfer of resources from developed to developing countries.

41. Not enough time had yet elapsed for the seven-year statistical base period to prove its value. Nevertheless, his delegation supported the Committee's study of the effects of using different base periods, as it believed that a longer base period would make for a fairer scale of assessments.

42. Mr. SAKKIJHA (Jordan) said that his delegation was convinced of the value of the United Nations to the international community as a whole. It therefore firmly believed that Member States should be willing to give tangible expression of their commitment to the Organization in the form of financial contributions. For its part, Jordan had regularly increased its contributions to the regular budgets of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and to voluntary programmes.

43. Many delegations had expressed their dissatisfaction with the criteria used in calculating the scale of assessments, and the General Assembly had repeatedly asked the Committee on Contributions to identify the best ways and means of ensuring greater equity in assessing capacity to pay. Per capita national income taken alone was not sufficient, as there were many other relevant factors. His country, for example, had made great strides in its national development efforts, and its national income had risen considerably. However, closer examination of the situation revealed that much of the progress did not reflect the country's real economic capacity but rather was the result of a number of transitory and external factors, such as remittances from Jordanian nationals working abroad, financial assistance from other Arab States to help Jordan to maintain security and stability in the area, assistance intended for the many Palestinian refugees in Jordan, and development loans from various sources.

44. He acknowledged that it was not an easy task to develop equitable criteria for assessing capacity to pay. However, in choosing national income, the Committee on Contributions had taken the easy way out. National income did not reflect a country's real income-generating capacity. Accordingly, other economic and social indicators had to be developed, and the fact that statistical data were not available for some countries should not deter the Committee from continuing its efforts towards that end. It was necessary to find improved ways to measure the real and lasting economic progress achieved by countries. His delegation therefore supported the idea of extending the statistical base period from seven to 12 years, the proposal to increase the limit of the low per capita income allowance formula

(Mr. Sakkijha, Jordan)

from $1,800 to $2,500 in order to compensate for the loss in the purchasing power of the United States dollar since 1976, and the application of the low per capita allowance to all developing countries.

45. With regard to measures to mitigate extreme variations in the assessments of States between two successive scales, his delegation was in favour of the method outlined at the end of paragraph 6 of the Committee's report.

46. In order to ensure that the contributions of Member States were commensurate with the privileges they enjoyed in the Organization, there should be no reduction in the rates of assessment of the permanent members of the Security Council.

47. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that his delegation supported the intention of the Committee on Contributions to continue to study measures to increase the fairness and equity of the scale of assessments, even though it was no more convinced now than when it had acquiesced to resolution 34/6 B that the directions given to the Committee were likely to be effective or even possible. His delegation therefore considered the criticisms levelled against the Committee on Contributions by some delegations to be completely unjustified.

48. His delegation had noted the views expressed by delegations that believed that the current system did not adequately reflect the capacity to pay. However, it considered that most of the alternative methods under consideration would create greater inequities. The difficulties encountered in applying the principle of capacity to pay suggested the need to consider some principle other than capacity to pay as the basis for calculating the scale of assessments.

49. The establishment of a percentage or percentage point limit and the lengthening of the statistical base period as a means of avoiding extreme or excessive variations between two successive scales would initially benefit nations that had experienced significant economic growth but would do little to alleviate the burden of those Member States that had been affected by economic decline. However, in the longer term, Member States with rising national incomes whose increased rates of assessment were postponed might find themselves faced with an increase at a time when they were no longer able to cope with it.

50. Full consideration had not been given to the consequences of adopting certain measures to mitigate variations in rates of assessment for certain Member States. The proposal to increase the low per capita income ceiling could further distort the distribution of expenses by requiring fewer Member States to finance a greater share of the budget. Currently, the countries with per capita incomes over $1,800 which comprised roughly one fourth of the membership, were assessed more than 90 per cent of the budget. Such an imbalance was a recipe for fiscal irresponsibility, and certain disaster threatened any organization that divorced responsibility for voting for programmes from the necessity to pay for them. Most major contributors had limited resources to devote to the Organization, and to the extent that assessments rose onerously, voluntary contributions would inevitably decline.

/...

(Mr. Papendorp, United States of America)

51. With regard to the future work of the Committee on Contributions, he considered that it was not proper or productive for the Fifth Committee to place technical limitations on or otherwise specifically direct the work of an expert group. The Committee on Contributions should be encouraged to develop the scale of assessments for 1983-1985 objectively, sensibly, and on the basis of the unquestioned professional skill, integrity and independence of its members.

52. With regard to criticism of the maximum rate of assessment of 25 per cent, he drew attention to the addendum to the report of the Committee on Contributions, which showed that, for the last two years, his country's payments had accounted for 29.34 per cent of collections on regular budget assessments, 38.74 per cent of collections for peace-keeping operations in the Middle East and 24.45 per cent of all voluntary contributions collected. That was a record on which critics of a nominal maximum limit might wish to reflect. If assessments were no longer to be made broadly on the basis of ability to pay, perhaps the General Assembly should consider whether some other principle would be more appropriate. The principle which seemed to be followed by too many Member States with respect to their assessments was clearly not ability to pay but rather "willingness to pay" and, as the Secretary-General had stated when introducing his budget proposals, that was a dangerous situation for the Organization.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

53. Mr. PAL (India) asked whether the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC), which contained observations on the programme-budget proposals, was part of the Committee's documentation under item 100 (Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983).

54. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) said that the report of CPC was formally listed as part of the documentation under agenda item 101 (Programme planning). Of course, it was also relevant to the budget proposals. For that reason, a concurrent discussion of agenda items 100 and 101 was planned. He had already discussed with the Secretary of CPC the possiblity of having the report introduced at the earliest possible date so that the Fifth Committee could consider its budgetary aspects, and hoped to be able to report to the Committee early the following week on the arrangements made.

55. Mr. BROTODININGRAT (Indonesia) said that his delegation agreed that, during the consideration of agenda item 100, the Fifth Committee should discuss at least those parts of the CPC report that dealt specifically with the programme budget.

56. He expressed the hope that delegations would structure their statements in the general debate on item 100 so as to avoid repetition when individual sections of the budget were taken up at a later stage.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.