

embodying these principles received wide support, the Canadian Representative, in order to avoid any future misunderstanding on its interpretation, intervened in the discussion of the Rapporteur's report to state, and I quote from the Official Record:

"In practical terms the Canadian Delegation understood that the Committee on Contributions would "freeze" any further upward movement in the contributions of those Member States whose per capita contributions would thereby exceed the per capita contribution of the United States. At the same time, downward adjustments would await fulfilment of the conditions referred to in the resolution."

NOTE: The text of the resolution is in the Report of the Committee and the results of the voting.

This interpretation was not challenged by anyone in either the Fifth Committee or the General Assembly. Furthermore, the Committee on Contributions adhered to this interpretation when preparing the 1954 scale by deciding that the best way to implement the seventh assembly resolution was to maintain the 1953 rates of assessment on the countries subject to the per capita ceiling. The eighth assembly accepted this recommendation and issued no new directives on the interpretation of the per capita principle.

It seems to me that this record clearly indicates that the seventh assembly decided, in effect, to avoid aggravating the per capita disparity by "freezing" any further upward movement in the percentage contributions of those Member States whose per capita contributions already exceeded the per capita contribution of the highest contributor.

Reinforcing this belief is the fact that the Contributions Committee's new interpretation of the seventh assembly resolution would defeat the purpose of the per capita principle and create the situation its sponsors were trying to avoid. When the United Nations was first established, the General Assembly decided that the cost of administering the organization should be shared among Member States broadly according to capacity to pay. Although the Canadian Government accepted this formula, it was argued by some members that in an organization of sovereign equals no nation should pay too high a share of the budget and it was proposed that a ceiling of 33 1/3 per cent be placed on the contributions of the highest contributor. Adoption of this proposal would have meant that Canada and others would be required to pay more on a per capita basis than the United States, the country with the highest per capita income in the world. To avoid this inequitable situation, the Canadian Delegation pressed for the adoption of a related principle: that the per capita contribution of any member should not exceed the per capita contribution of the highest contributor. The Canadian Delegation expressed the belief that it would be difficult to convince the Canadian Parliament and public that each Canadian citizen should make a higher contribution to the United Nations than each citizen of the United States. My delegation went on to suggest that no other delegation would wish to be placed in a similar position. The third assembly accepted this view and approved Resolution 238A (III) recognizing