

the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to obtain earlier payment of current assessments, increased the Working Capital Fund from \$23.5 to \$25 million, and granted authority to the Secretary-General to borrow at short term from Governments and commercial sources as well as from the special accounts in his custody. Canada supported the resolution on the grounds that there was little constructive alternative if the organization was to be assured of sufficient funds to meet its commitments. The Delegation emphasized, however, that only prompt payment of contributions could place the organization on a sound financial basis over the long term.

### Scale of Assessments

Since the percentage assessments of member states for contributions to the United Nations budget were approved at the twelfth session of the Assembly for the three-year period 1959-61 (Canada's assessment is 3.11%) this question was not debated at the thirteenth session.

At the fourteenth session the Fifth Committee examined the possibility of making available to member states statistical and other information at the disposal of the Committee on Contributions. This Committee is a small body of ten experts whose main function is to recommend a scale of assessments for adoption by the General Assembly. In reaching its recommendations it applies established principles of assessment to national income and statistical and other data at its disposal. Neither this material nor the Committee's proceedings have ever been made public though a particular member has always had the right to seek an explanation from the Committee as to the basis of its own assessment.

In a report to the fourteenth session the Contributions Committee stated that the publication of "factual material" at its disposal would be inadvisable. The report, as elaborated by the Committee's Chairman during the debate in the Fifth Committee, pointed out that the material was complex, drawn from many different sources and often inadequate or not comparable. Its evaluation required the exercise of considerable judgment and publication would be misleading. In addition publication would discourage countries from submitting to the Committee unpublished confidential information and to this extent would impair the validity of recommended scales. Finally it might entail discussion of intricate and controversial issues in the Fifth Committee which could not be readily resolved in a body of over 80 member states. It was for this reason that the Assembly had appointed the Committee on Contributions, a small group of experts.

While it did not advise general disclosure of information, the Contributions Committee agreed that the factual information pertaining to the assessment of a particular member might be made available to that member upon request.

The Representative of Ecuador believed the Committee's position was too restrictive. He introduced a draft resolution which stated that "in principle the material at the disposal of the Committee on Contributions should be available to all member states". Furthermore its operative paragraph provided that such material should be released to member states upon request "as far as the Committee deems it feasible".

While a number of delegations spoke in favour of this resolution, others found it unacceptable. They believed it would lead to a general disclosure of information and was thus open to the objections raised by the Committee on Contributions.

These two points of view were reconciled in a revised draft resolution which was adopted unanimously by the Assembly. The resolution omitted the reference to principle contained in the original draft and recommended