

European countries objected to the suggested increase and proposed a return to the 1950 rates of assessment. The United States Delegate asked that the 33 1/3 per cent ceiling on the United States contribution be introduced at once in view of a resolution adopted by the United States Congress to this effect in July 1952. Neither of these positions received much support. The Canadian Delegation and many others drew attention to the inconsistency of the stand of the Soviet representatives who objected to an increased assessment while claiming a vast improvement in the economic position of the U.S.S.R. Though most members indicated an understanding of the United States position, they joined the Canadian Representative in urging that the United States accept the scale recommended by the Committee for one more year, on the understanding that the 33 1/3 per cent ceiling would be applied in 1954.

There was also a full examination of the per capita principle. The Contributions Committee had pointed out the possibility that the immediate application of both the United States ceiling and the per capita principle might result in the shifting of financial burdens to countries less able to pay. The Canadian Representative stated that, although Canada attached importance to the per capita principle, it had no wish to press for its implementation if this should be inequitable. The final resolution adopted was in line with the views expressed by the Canadian Representative. It accepted the recommendations of the Contributions Committee, stated that the 33 1/3 per cent ceiling should be applied to the United States assessment in 1954 and instructed the Contributions Committee "to defer further action on the per capita principle until new members are admitted or the economic position of member states improves."

Specialized Agencies

Important changes were also made in the scales of assessment of the Specialized Agencies. These changes were facilitated greatly by improved statistical information, permitting more precise measurement and comparison of national incomes and other data on which the scales are largely based. At the same time, considerable attention was directed to an appropriate level of assessments for the largest contributor (the United States).

In the Specialized Agencies, as in the United Nations, United States Representatives had pressed successfully for reductions in United States assessments to 33 1/3 per cent — the ceiling set by Congress for contributions to these Agencies. With the attainment of this ceiling in UNESCO and WHO, and the Assembly decision to introduce it during 1954 in the United Nations, a number of member states, including Canada, have drawn attention to the unsatisfactory situation in other Agencies where, for a variety of reasons, United States assessments have been below its "relative capacity to pay."

In discussion of the 1954 scale at the ILO, United States spokesmen registered strong objections to any increase in the United States assessment on the general grounds of Congressional pressure