the immediate application of the per capita principle would shift part of the financial burden from countries with higher per capita income to those less able to pay. The Canadian Representative therefore gave assurances that the Canadian Government would be satisfied to have the per capita principle applied as improvements occurred in the economic condition of other member states, or when new members were admitted. At the same time, the Canadian Delegation stated it to be their understanding that the Committee on Contributions would freeze the *percentage rates of contributions* of those member states whose per capita contributions were in excess of the per capita contribution of the United States.

The scales of assessment continued to be set on this basis until the ninth session in 1954, when, in submitting the scale for 1955, the Committee on Contributions expressed doubt as to the correct interpretation of the per capita ceiling principle and reinterpreted the decision of the seventh session. The Committee then took the position that "Since the per capita ceiling principle relates to the per capita contribution and not to the rate of assessment, the proper implementation of the directive would be to recommend assessments which would maintain the per capita contribution of members subject to the per capita ceiling principle at approximately the level of 1953 when the directive became effective, provided that their capacity to pay, assessed on the basis of prescribed criteria, would not warrant lower rates of contributions". The Committee also expressed the view that since the rate of assessment of the United States was fixed, its per capita contribution would gradually decline, as its population increased. This would eventually lower the per capita ceiling to a level where the contributions of a number of other countries with high per capita income would also be reduced; and this, in turn, would entail shifting the financial burden to countries with lower per capita income. The Committee therefore asked the General Assembly to reconsider the per capita principle as a criterion for assessment.

In the 1954 debate in the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, Canada took the position that the proposed interpretation of the Contributions Committee was untenable and inconsistent with past directives of the Assembly. Although the time had not yet arrived for full application of the per capita principle, under no circumstances should there be an increase in the percentage contribution of a member already paying a per capita contribution higher than the United States. The Canadian Representative also pointed out that the Committee on Contribution was in error in its view that the long-run application would result in a gradual shift in the incidence of the financial burden of the United Nations to countries with lower per capita income because at the same time as the population of the United States would be increasing, there was equal reason to predict a corresponding ratio of increase in the population of various other countries with high per capita income.

In order to avoid misunderstanding in future years, the Canadian Delegation submitted a resolution re-affirming the decision of the seventh session to defer application of the per capita principle until new members were admitted or substantial improvements in the economic capacity of existing members permitted adjustments to be absorbed in the scale of assessments; the resolution also stated that the correct interpretation of this earlier decision would be that the *percentage rate of contributions* of the members subject to the per capita ceiling principle would be frozen against any increase over the level approved for the 1953 budget until they reached per capita parity with the highest contributor, and that downward adjustments would occur when conditions warranted. The resolution also instructed the Committee on Contributions to apply this interpretation to the 1956 scale of assessments. When