

ARTICLE 17 (2)

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>
Text of Article 17 (2)	
Introductory Note	1
I. General Survey	2-4
II. Analytical Summary of Practice	5-42
A. Basis for determining capacity to pay	5-22
1. Terms of reference	5-9
2. Statistical information	10-12
3. Use of comparative estimates of national income	13
4. Factors to be taken into account to avoid anomalous assessments	14-22
a. Comparative income per head of population	14-19
b. Temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War ..	20
c. The ability of Members to secure foreign currencies	21-22
B. Upper and lower limits on contributions	23-27
1. Over-all maximum ceiling	23
** 2. <i>Per capita</i> ceiling	
3. Minimum assessment	24
4. Minimum contribution for new Members for the year of admission	25-27
** C. Revision of scales of assessments	
** D. Relative merits of the percentage system and the unit system of assessment	
E. Extent to which expenses have been shared by non-member States	28
F. The Working Capital Fund	29-30
** G. Adjustment of accounts with Member States and non-member States	
H. Membership of the Committee on Contributions	31-32
** 1. Appointment of members	
** 2. Substitute members	
3. Enlargement of the Committee on Contributions	31-32
I. Apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF)	33-35
J. Apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations Operation in the Congo (ONUC)	36
K. United Nations bonds	37-40
** L. The question of whether certain expenditures authorized by the General Assembly constitute "expenses of the Organization" within the meaning of Article 17 (2)	
M. Financing of United Nations peace-keeping operations	41-42

ARTICLE 17 (2)

TEXT OF ARTICLE 17 (2)

The expenses of the Organization shall be borne by the Members as apportioned by the General Assembly

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

1. The structure of the present study follows that of previous studies of Article 17 (2) in the *Repertory* and *Supplements Nos. 1, 2 and 3*. A new sub-section has been added under section H to deal with the enlargement of the membership of the Committee on Contributions.

I. GENERAL SURVEY

2. During the period under review, the original terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions continued to apply. In compliance with directives from the General Assembly and in the light of the debates on the item during the twenty-second and twenty-third sessions, the Committee reviewed in detail the criteria it applied in establishing the scales of assessment and also reviewed its own terms of reference. As requested by General Assembly resolution 1927(XVIII), it continued its efforts to give due attention to the situation of developing countries when considering the scale "in view of their special economic and financial problems."

3. The Committee on Contributions continued to recommend, and the Assembly to approve, scales of assessment for three-year periods. Further action was taken by the

Committee on Contributions to reduce, in accordance with General Assembly directives, the contribution of the largest contributor.¹ The Committee decided also that it could not support the view expressed in the Fifth Committee favouring the adoption of a system of advance consultations with Members whose assessments it proposed to increase substantially.²

4. Non-member States continued to contribute to the expenses of certain United Nations activities. During the period under review, another body was added to those already receiving contributions from non-members.³

¹ See para. 23 below.

² See para. 12 below.

³ See para. 28 below.

II. ANALYTICAL SUMMARY OF PRACTICE

A. Basis for determining capacity to pay

1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

5. At the twenty-second session, the Committee on Contributions recommended, and the General Assembly adopted, a scale of assessments for the three-year period 1968-1970.⁴ During the debate on the new scale in the Fifth Committee, doubts were expressed as to whether the guidelines developed over the previous twenty years still constituted a satisfactory framework for the work of the Committee. Some Member States were of the opinion that it was time to review, clarify and perhaps extend the terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions. It was

suggested that the Committee should review the various criteria applied in determining the scale of assessments.

6. During its 1968 session, the Committee on Contributions reviewed its terms of reference and studied in detail existing procedures and the implementation of the various General Assembly directives relating to the preparation of the scale. In its annual report to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session,⁵ the Committee concluded that the scale which it had recommended for 1968-1970 and which the General Assembly had adopted was fully consistent with its existing terms of reference. Moreover, it believed that, whether or not those terms of reference, some of which had been prescribed twenty years earlier, were still appropriate and sufficiently precise, was primarily a matter

⁴ G A resolution 2291 (XXII).

⁵ G A (XXIII), Suppl. No. 10, paras. 51 and 52.

for decision by the General Assembly. The Committee had always considered that the intention of the Assembly had been to establish a coherent set of rules to be observed jointly and simultaneously by the Committee.

7. At its twenty-third session, under resolution 2472 B (XXIII), the General Assembly expressed its desire to have available all elements required to make a decision as to the appropriateness or otherwise of the terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions. It requested the Committee to keep under review the criteria used in establishing the scale as well as its own terms of reference, in the light of the debates on the subject at the twenty-second and twenty-third sessions of the General Assembly and of the opinions which Member States had already expressed or might express in writing to the Committee. The Committee was requested to submit a report to the Assembly at its twenty-fourth session.

8. In its report to the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly,⁶ the Committee on Contributions reviewed the basic rules by which it worked as well as the techniques it employed in the application of those rules. The Committee stated that, in general, it was satisfied that the various guidelines laid down for it by the Assembly had withstood the test of time and had permitted the establishment of "a balanced and equitable scale based primarily on the principle of capacity to pay". The Committee cautioned against the hope that a scale of assessments could be devised which would meet all the views expressed by Member States. Those views were too diverse and too divergent to be encompassed in a single formula. The Committee concluded that, by working under the general guidance of the Assembly and by keeping abreast of new statistical techniques, it could, by the judicious use of its discretion, establish a scale of assessments which would not only hold an equitable balance between the interests of Member States but would also reflect the realities of their economic situations.

9. Many divergent views were expressed in the Fifth Committee at the twenty-fourth session during the consideration of the report of the Committee on Contributions⁷ and it became apparent that no general agreement could be reached on the revision of any of the criteria or guidelines used by the Committee on Contributions for the establishment of the scale. The Fifth Committee recommended, and the Assembly agreed,⁸ that the Committee on Contributions should take into due consideration the debate which had been held on the question during the twenty-fourth session and report on it, as appropriate. It was also noted that the use of the terms "criteria" and "guidelines" should not be construed to imply any new limitation on the exercise by the Committee on Contributions of its discretion and judgement.

2. STATISTICAL INFORMATION

10. For the purpose of drawing up the scale of assessments for 1968-1970, the Committee on Contributions used the national accounts data of Member States for the years 1963-1965. It noted that the relevant statistical material provided was more comprehensive than for previous

periods by reason of the fact that many more countries were providing systematic national accounts which had greatly facilitated the Committee's work.

11. As its starting point for the 1968-1970 scale, the Committee took the net national products (at market prices)⁹ of Member States for the period 1963-1965. In using this aggregate as the basis for its discussions, the Committee was satisfied that it had eliminated an important element of incompatibility in the statistical data of Member States in that an evaluation at market prices for all Members achieved a greater equity among them. The Committee reiterated its earlier position that, irrespective of the system of national accounts used, there were various other institutional and economic factors which prevented exact comparability of national accounts aggregates whether the comparisons were among Member States using the United Nations System of National Accounts (SNA) or the Material Product System (MPS) or between such systems. The most important of those general factors, which the Committee intended to continue to study, were the varied structures of prices within a State and the problems associated with the conversion to a common currency.

12. During the period under review, the view was expressed, both in the Fifth Committee and in representations to the Committee on Contributions, that the Committee should be under an obligation to consult in advance those Member States whose assessments it proposed to increase substantially. In its report to the twenty-third session¹⁰ the Committee noted that existing arrangements made it possible for Governments to submit statistical data and all other relevant information they might wish the Committee to take into account in arriving at its recommendation. Moreover, the Committee pointed out that the proposed system of advance consultations would clearly raise problems with respect to the relationship of the Committee with the General Assembly. Such consultations would also be inconsistent with the position taken by the Fifth Committee at the eighth session of the General Assembly, when a similar proposal had been made, that it would be improper for the Committee to act as a negotiating committee.

3. USE OF COMPARATIVE ESTIMATES OF NATIONAL INCOME

13. The Committee on Contributions continued, whenever practicable, to base its computations of relative capacity to pay on an average of national income estimates based on the three latest years for which figures were available. The Committee's recommendations on the scale of assessments for the years 1968, 1969 and 1970 were based on statistics for the period 1963-1965.

4. FACTORS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT TO AVOID ANOMALOUS ASSESSMENTS

a. Comparative income per head of population

14. Under the original terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions,¹¹ the expenses of the United Nations were apportioned broadly according to capacity to pay, and comparative estimates of national income were recom-

⁶ G A (XXIV), Suppl. No. 11, paras. 47-50.

⁷ G A (XXIV), Annexes, a.i. 78, A/7816.

⁸ G A (XXIV), Plen., 1823rd mtg., para. 6.

⁹ See *Repertory, Supplement No. 3*, under Article 17 (2), para. 9.

¹⁰ G A (XXIII), Suppl. No. 10, paras. 47 and 48.

¹¹ G A resolution 14A(1).

mended as the fairest guide. One of the main factors to be taken into account to minimize the possibility that anomalous assessments would result from the use of comparative estimates of national income is comparative income per head of population.

15. During the period under review, the method employed in order to compensate for differences in comparative *per capita* income continued to be, briefly, to grant all countries with a *per capita* income below \$1,000 per annum a reduction of their assessment basis by amounts which, for countries with the very lowest *per capita* income, approached a maximum of 50 per cent. In 1964, in its resolution 1927 (XVIII), the General Assembly requested that the Committee on Contributions, when calculating rates of assessment, give due attention to the situation of developing countries "in view of their special economic and financial problems". A similar directive was given to the Committee in 1965 under General Assembly resolution 2118 (XX). The Committee, taking into account the principles laid down by the Assembly regarding "ceiling" assessments and "floor" assessments, stated at that time that the possibility of giving further relief to developing countries was limited.

16. At its 1966 session, the Committee studied the possibility of varying the allowance for low *per capita* income but decided not to recommend a change in the established formula. For its review of the scale in 1967, it decided again to make small downward adjustments for countries with *per capita* incomes below \$300.

17. In 1967, during the debate on the scale of assessments recommended by the Committee on Contributions for 1969-1970,¹² the main observations made in connexion with the appropriateness of the criteria upon which the new scale had been established were directed at the allowance for low *per capita* income and whether or not the Committee on Contributions had fully implemented resolutions 1927 (XVIII) and 2118 (XX) when considering the scale. It was pointed out by some Member States that, with few exceptions, reductions had been recommended in the assessments of highly industrialized and developed countries, while increases had been recommended for many of the developing countries. It was contended by a number of Members that the allowance for low *per capita* income had not been given full effect in the scale and that, in making downward adjustments in the assessments of countries with *per capita* income below \$300, the situation of developing countries with *per capita* income above that level also deserved additional recognition.

18. In the course of the debate on the new scale in the Fifth Committee, four members jointly introduced amendments to the draft resolution recommended by the Committee on Contributions regarding the scale of assessments. Those amendments called for the adoption of the scale of assessment for 1968 only and for a review of the scale in 1968 instead of in 1970, taking into special consideration the recommendations of the General Assembly covering Member States' capacity to pay and their ability to secure foreign currencies (resolution 14A(1)) and also any representations which the Governments concerned might make to the Committee. Those amendments were rejected by the Fifth Committee.

19. At its 1968 session, the Committee on Contributions studied in detail existing procedures and the implementation of the various General Assembly directives with respect to the preparation of the scale. In its report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly,¹³ the Committee concluded that the scale which it had recommended for 1968-1970 and which the Assembly had adopted at its previous session,¹⁴ was fully consistent with its existing terms of reference. As regards resolutions 1927 (XVIII) and 2118 (XX), it pointed out that it had in 1966 and 1967 studied the possibility of varying the allowance for low *per capita* income but had decided not to recommend a change in the formula. It concluded that a change in the basic system of allowance would further emphasize the changes in the relative capacity to pay of Member States and would lead to even more pronounced changes in the scale.

b. *Temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War*

20. During the period under review, the General Assembly endorsed the view of the Committee on Contributions that the temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War had been an important factor when considering the scale of assessments in the early stages of the Committee's work, but that it was no longer necessary to make any special allowance for that factor, particularly in view of the time that had elapsed since the Second World War.¹⁵

c. *The ability of Members to secure foreign currency*

21. In order to lessen the difficulty of paying contributions in United States dollars, as prescribed by financial regulation 5.5,¹⁶ the General Assembly, under the scale of assessments' resolution, customarily empowers the Secretary-General to accept, at his discretion and after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee on Contributions, a portion of the contributions of Member States in currencies other than United States dollars.¹⁶ In spite of that provision, some Member States felt that, when considering the scale of assessments, more attention should be given by the Committee on Contributions to the difficulties they encountered in obtaining foreign currencies.

22. In its report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly,¹⁷ the Committee explained that it could not devise any systematic and sound way of taking payment difficulties into account in the determination of contribution rates for all Member States. It was suggested by some Members during the twenty-third session that certain easily identifiable elements such as the external debt of a country could be taken into account in making allowance for this factor. Other criteria mentioned were the effect of discriminatory practices in commercial activities, the application of the most-favoured-nation clause, and the artificially fixed price of gold in the United States market, which had an impact on the payment of contributions by certain coun-

¹³ G A (XXIII), Suppl. No. 10.

¹⁴ G A resolution 2291 (XXII).

¹⁵ G A (XXIV), Suppl. No. 11, para. 31.

¹⁶ Financial regulation 5.5 states that "Annual contributions and advances to the Working Capital Fund of the United Nations shall be assessed and paid in United States dollars".

¹⁷ G A (XXIII), Suppl. No. 10, para. 37.

¹² G A (XXII), Suppl. No. 10.

tries. The Committee examined the problem in the light of those observations and again failed to find a formula for making a systematic allowance for the foreign currency factor. It intended, however, to continue to take this factor into account as seemed necessary in arriving at individual rates of assessments.¹⁸

B. Upper and lower limits on contributions

1. OVER-ALL MAXIMUM CEILING

23. At its twelfth session, the General Assembly had decided, in resolution 1137 (XII), that "in principle, the maximum contribution of any one Member State to the ordinary expenses of the United Nations shall not exceed 30 per cent of the total" and gave certain specific directives to the Committee on Contributions with regard to the steps to be taken in preparing the scale of assessments for 1958 and subsequent years. In compliance with those directives, the United States' assessment was reduced from 33.33 per cent in the 1957 scale to 31.91 per cent in the scale for 1965-1967. A further reduction, to 31.57 per cent, was included in the scale of assessments adopted by the General Assembly under resolution 2291 (XXII) for the financial years 1968, 1969 and 1970.

**2. Per capita CEILING

3. MINIMUM ASSESSMENT

24. The General Assembly, in the scale it adopted during the second part of its first session (resolution 69(I)), introduced the minimum rate of 0.04 per cent which was maintained in all subsequent scales. During the debates on the scale for the period 1969-1970, it was indicated that the Committee on Contributions should keep under study the minimum rate of assessment, since some countries assessed at the "floor" rate might find the cost of participating in the United Nations a heavy burden. In its report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly,¹⁹ the Committee stated *inter alia* that the minimum rate superseded the usual criteria for capacity to pay, and that other considerations entered into its decision as to the appropriateness of a minimum rate and the minimum amount that any Member State should be obliged to contribute. While the Committee recognized that small, newly independent countries were faced with many financial and economic problems, it believed that the grounds for maintaining the minimum rate continued to be valid.

4. MINIMUM CONTRIBUTION FOR NEW MEMBERS FOR THE YEAR OF ADMISSION

25. During the period under review, the General Assembly continued its practice, begun in 1955, of assessing nearly all new Member States at an amount equal to one-ninth of their percentage assessment for the year of admission.

26. Effective from 1 January 1965, Indonesia declared its decision to withdraw from the Organization.²⁰ It later

¹⁸ G A (XXIV), Suppl. No. 11, paras. 32 and 33.

¹⁹ G A (XXIII), Suppl. No. 10, para. 44.

²⁰ S C, 20th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March, S/6157.

decided "to resume full co-operation with the United Nations and to resume participation in its activities starting with the twenty-first session of the General Assembly".²¹

27. When the General Assembly, at its twenty-first session, adopted resolution 2240 (XXI) dealing with the assessments for 1967 of States admitted to membership during that session, it also decided, upon the recommendation of the Secretary-General,²² to assess Indonesia for the period of its non-participation, namely, 1 January 1965 to 28 September 1966, as well as for the remainder of 1966 and for 1967, at special rates negotiated by the Secretary-General and Indonesia.

**C. Revision of scales of assessments

**D. Relative merits of the percentage system and the unit system of assessment

E. Extent to which expenses have been shared by non-member States

28. Non-member States continued to contribute to the United Nations activities listed in the *Repertory* and its *Supplement No. 3*.²³ In its report to the twenty-second session,²⁴ the Committee on Contributions drew the attention of the General Assembly to the possibility of using the same percentage rates it was recommending for non-member States for any other United Nations activities such as the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) in which non-member States participated and to which they would be required to contribute.²⁵ Other aspects of practice under this heading remained unchanged.²⁶

F. The Working Capital Fund

29. At its seventeenth session the General Assembly, under resolution 1863 A(XVII), decided to establish the Working Capital Fund for the year ending 31 December 1963 at \$40 million and continued the Fund at that level during the period under review.

30. At its twenty-second session, under resolution 2365 (XXII), the General Assembly decided to increase from \$125,000 to \$150,000 the amount which the Secretary-General was authorized to advance from the Working Capital Fund for the purpose of continuing the revolving fund to finance miscellaneous self-liquidating purchases and activities; advances in excess of a total of \$150,000 would continue to be made with the prior concurrence of the ACABQ.

**G. Adjustment of accounts with Member States and non-member States

²¹ S C, 21st yr., Suppl. for July-Sept., S/7498.

²² G A (XXI), Annexes, a.i. 77, A/C.5/1097.

²³ See *Repertory*, under Article 17 (2), para. 21, and *Repertory, Supplement No. 3*, para. 17.

²⁴ G A (XXII), Suppl. No. 10, para. 26.

²⁵ At the twenty-fifth session, under General Assembly resolution 2654 (XXV), the Industrial Development Organization was added to the list of activities for which participating non-member States were assessed.

²⁶ See under Article 17 (2), *Repertory*, para. 22; and, *Repertory, Supplement No. 2*, para. 11.

H. Membership of the Committee on Contributions

**1. APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

**2. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

3. ENLARGEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS

31. At its twenty-third session the General Assembly decided²⁷ to increase the membership of the Committee on Contributions from ten to twelve, and to amend accordingly, with effect from 1 January 1969, rule 159²⁸ of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

32. In taking this action the Assembly was prompted by the fact that the membership of the United Nations had increased substantially since the adoption of resolution 14 (I) of 13 February 1946 by which the membership of the Committee had been established. It also noted that the principle of broad geographical distribution should be taken into account in the composition of the Committee, as well as the fact that the membership did not include any nationals of African Member States.

I. Apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF)

33. At its twenty-first session, under resolution 2194 (XXI), the General Assembly approved the revised cost estimates for UNEF submitted by the Secretary-General for the financial year 1966 in the amount of \$16,146,000 and authorized him to meet the cost of actual requirements over the appropriation of \$15 million, and within the amount of \$16,146,000, by use of the surplus account of UNEF. The Assembly further decided to appropriate an amount of \$14 million for the operation of UNEF in 1967 and to apportion that amount as follows:

(a) An amount of \$740,000 among the economically less developed Member States²⁹ in the proportions determined by the scale of assessments for 1967;³⁰

(b) An amount of \$13,260,000 among the economically developed Member States in the proportions determined by the scale of assessments for 1967, plus an additional 25 per cent of each contributor's apportionment—in order to meet reserve requirements—as in 1965 and 1966.

34. The Assembly again called on States members of the specialized agencies and of IAEA but which were not Members of the United Nations to make contributions appropriate to their circumstances, and made the same provisions that had been made since 1963 for contributions to take the form of services and supplies.

35. At its twenty-second session, in resolution 2304 A (XXII), the General Assembly took note of the revised cost estimates submitted by the Secretary-General for the financial year 1967 in the amount of \$11,396,000, but took no apportionment action in view of the termination of the Force.³¹

J. Apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations Operation in the Congo (ONUC)

36. The *ad hoc* ONUC account³² was terminated on 30 June 1964 pursuant to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1885 (XVIII) of 18 October 1964. Liquidation and final closing arrangements were still in progress during the period under review.

K. United Nations bonds

37. At the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, when the Fifth Committee discussed the method used for financing the amortization payments and interest on United Nations bonds,³³ four States Members introduced a draft resolution³⁴ by which the Assembly would ask the ACABQ to study the question in the light of the debates held during the twenty-first, twenty-second and twenty-third sessions, and the proposals submitted during those debates, and report to the General Assembly in 1969. Although the draft resolution was adopted by the Fifth Committee, the General Assembly rejected it³⁵ following its decision that the issue raised therein was an important one within the meaning of Article 18 (2) of the Charter,³⁶ thereby requiring a two-thirds majority for adoption.

38. The supporters of the draft resolution objected to the method used for meeting interest payments and instalments of principal due on the bonds by means of an assessment in the regular budget, apportioned according to the scale of assessment for the budget. They maintained that,³⁷ since the entire proceeds of the bond issue had been used to meet expenditures resulting from ONUC and UNEF operations, those payments should be made subject to the same special criteria as had been applied to the apportionment of contributions to those operations. They called attention to General Assembly resolution 1874 (S-IV)³⁸ of 27 June 1963 which recognized, in principle and in practice, that special criteria should be used for the apportionment of the expenditures related to major peace-keeping operations among Member States, taking into account the relatively limited capacity of economically less developed countries to contribute to them. Moreover, since some Members were, as a matter of principle, withholding payment of their share of the contributions required for the repayment

²⁷ G A resolution 1583 (XV). See also *Repertory, Supplement No. 3*, paras. 40-55.

²⁸ G A (XXIII), 5th Com., 1271st-1273rd and 1276th mtgs.

²⁹ Draft resolution A/C.5/L.961, sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, India and Nigeria.

³⁰ G A (XXIII), Plen., 1752nd mtg.

³¹ The first sentence of Article 18 (2) of the Charter reads: "Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting."

³² For the texts of the statements referred to in paras. 38-40, see: G A (XXIII), 5th Com., 1271st mtg.: Brazil, paras. 20-25; United Kingdom, paras. 27-31; United States, paras. 32-34; 1272nd mtg.: Canada, paras. 38-41; Italy, paras. 34-37; New Zealand, paras. 47 and 48; and Norway, paras. 42-46; 1273rd mtg.: Australia, paras. 17-19; Austria, para. 7; Brazil, paras. 10-12; Denmark, para. 8; Finland, para. 1; Guatemala, paras. 44-47; Ireland, paras. 2-5; Japan, para. 6; Malaysia, para. 13; Netherlands, paras. 14-16; United States, paras. 22-34; and USSR, paras. 52 and 53; 1276th mtg.: Pakistan, paras. 4-8; Tanzania, paras. 9-11.

³³ G A resolution 1874 (S-IV) sets out general principles to serve as guidelines for the sharing of the costs of future peace-keeping operations involving heavy expenditures.

²⁷ G A resolution 2390 (XXIII).

²⁸ Subsequently renumbered as rule 158.

²⁹ See *Repertory, Supplement No. 3* under Article 17 (2), para. 28(b).

³⁰ See G A resolution 2118 (XX) and 2240 (XXI)

³¹ For the closing of the Special Account for UNEF, see in this *Supplement*, under Article 17 (1).

of the bonds,³⁹ to continue the method of financing in use added to the over-all problem created by the Organization's increasing financial deficit.

39. Several other Members, among them the major purchasers of the bonds, objected strongly to any change in the method of repayment of the bonds as laid down by General Assembly resolution 1739 (XVI) of 20 December 1961⁴⁰ and considered the terms of that resolution to be an integral condition of the sale and purchase of the bonds. They maintained that, if any attempt were made to use any other basis than the regular scale of assessments for these expenditures, it would constitute a major breach of faith and could raise grave doubts as to the reliability and credit rating of the United Nations.

40. Certain other delegations, mainly the socialist Member States, reiterated their reservations regarding the legality of the inclusion in its regular budget of any provision related to the bond issue;⁴¹ they held the view that all peace-keeping operations and their financing must be authorized by the Security Council.

³⁹ See also para. 42 below.

⁴⁰ G A resolution 1739 (XVI) authorized the Secretary-General to issue the bonds, determined the conditions of issue and repayment and prescribed the method of financing the repayment and payment of interest.

⁴¹ Cross-reference, Article 17 (1) and see also G A (XXIII), 5th Com., 1273rd mtg.

****L. The question of whether certain expenditure authorized by the General Assembly constitute "expenses of the Organization" within the meaning of Article 17 (2)**

M. Financing of United Nations peace-keeping operations

41. The General Assembly, at its nineteenth session, under resolution 2006 (XIX), decided to establish a Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to undertake a comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects, including ways of overcoming the financial difficulties of the Organization.⁴²

42. During the period under review the General Assembly adopted several resolutions⁴³ which, in general terms, requested the Special Committee to complete as soon as possible the work assigned to it in resolution 2006 (XIX) and to revise the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all its aspects including those relating to "methods of financing future peace-keeping operations in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations". The decisions also called on Member States, and particularly the highly developed countries, to make voluntary contributions to those operations.

⁴² See *Repertory, Supplement No. 3*, under Article 17 (2), para. 65.

⁴³ G A resolutions 2053 (XX), 2249 (S-V), 2308 (XXII), 2451 (XXIII) and 2576 (XXIV).