

Secretary-General nor could it agree to the use of Special Accounts in the Secretary-General's custody as a means of temporary financing. It stressed that such measures would only encourage the financial delinquency which was largely responsible for the depleted cash position and, as a result, present difficulties could be expected to recur. To prevent this from happening the Delegation suggested that more severe penalties should be imposed on members who did not pay their contributions promptly.

Despite these views the Fifth Committee authorized the Secretary-General by 47 votes to 11 with 10 abstentions (Canada) to obtain Working Capital by borrowing from the Special Funds and Accounts in his custody at normal current rates of interest. However, the Committee was unable to agree to the \$8 million increase in the level of the Fund which the Secretary-General had proposed. Instead it authorized an increase of \$1.5 million on a vote of 48 (Canada) to 14 with 6 abstentions. The Assembly adopted the Fifth Committee's recommendations by 68 (Canada) to 9 with 1 abstention.

Scale of Assessments

Members of the United Nations are assessed for contributions to the budget on the basis of a scale determined by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Committee on Contributions and the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee.

In its report to the thirteenth session the Contributions Committee recommended a scale for the period 1956-61 which was based on the average national income statistics of member states for 1955-57, and which took into account all the approved United Nations principles of assessment (agenda item 47). The principle that "in normal times the per capita contribution of any member should not exceed the per capita contributions of the member which bears the highest assessment" (i.e. the United States) was adhered to. Since Canada's population has been growing faster than that of the United States its assessment was increased in the recommended scale from 3.09 per cent to 3.11 per cent.

The Committee on Contributions indicated that it continued to experience difficulties in recommending equitable assessments because national income statistics furnished by member states were either inadequate or not comparable. Many representatives speaking in the Fifth Committee stressed the need for more complete data as well as the importance of establishing comparability between statistics provided by countries with free economies and those with centrally planned systems. They noted with approval that a study by experts of the co-ordination of different statistical systems is to be undertaken in 1959.

The Chairman of the Contributions Committee, in his report to the Fifth Committee, stated that on the basis of the data submitted by the U.S.S.R. there should have been a decrease in that country's assessment, since, according to those figures, the rate of economic increase of the Soviet Union was less than the increase rate of some other members. The Committee nevertheless had decided to retain the U.S.S.R. assessment at its 1958 level. Several delegations questioned whether the data supplied correctly reflected the U.S.S.R.'s national income, pointing out that the Committee's decision was difficult to reconcile with statements made by high Soviet authorities in recent years that the rate of economic development in the U.S.S.R. had been much more rapid than in the industrial countries of the West.