



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Scale of assessment for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (<i>continued</i>)	99

Chairman: Mr. Awni KHALIDY (Iraq).

Scale of assessment for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (A/2461, A/C.5/548, A/C.5/L.244, A/C.5/L.245) (*continued*)

[Item 42]*

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue consideration of the report of the Committee on Contributions (A/2461) and the Statement of Advances to the Working Capital Fund and Contributions to the Budget for the Financial Years 1951, 1952 and 1953 (A/C.5/548).
2. Mr. IBÁÑEZ (Philippines) said that his delegation realized the difficulties of the Contributions Committee's task; if its recommendations were not entirely satisfactory, that was due to the nature of the problems which it had to study and the inadequacy of the statistics made available to it.
3. In drawing up a scale of assessment for 1954 the Committee had based itself on an average of the national income estimates for 1950, 1951 and 1952. But in 1953 there might be certain factors which had modified a country's economic position and accordingly even its capacity to pay. In Greece, for instance, the Ionian Islands disaster would be a heavy charge on the national economy and recent economic developments in the Philippines could not fail to give rise to difficulties. The Contributions Committee had perhaps been unable to take those factors into account in drawing up the scale.
4. For those reasons he felt that the Contributions Committee should, during its discussions, consult the governments of Member States, particularly those whose contributions it was proposing to raise, so as to afford the governments concerned an opportunity to furnish the latest information and explain the economic situation of their countries in detail. The Committee would then be in a better position to draw up a fair assessment scale. That method had been used successfully by the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds. He was willing to submit his suggestion as a formal proposal.
5. Mr. PSCOLKA (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that, despite the stipulation in General Assembly rule of

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

procedure 159 that the scale of assessments should be fixed for three years, the Contributions Committee was once again proposing the adoption of a scale for one year only. Czechoslovakia and certain other Member States had more than once felt obliged to vote against the scale proposed by the Contributions Committee. The contributions of one group of countries—the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR, the Byelorussian SSR and Poland—had been systematically and unjustifiably increased ever since 1950. Thus, between 1950 and 1953 the aggregate rate of contribution for those four countries and Czechoslovakia had been raised from 9.5 per cent to 16.97 per cent. The increase had exceeded 40 per cent in 1952 and 25 per cent in 1953 and for 1954 the Contributions Committee was proposing a fresh increase of approximately 15 per cent. A rise like that was unjustifiable, especially in view of the decision adopted by the Committee on Contributions in 1950, and confirmed by the General Assembly, that generally no change either upwards or downwards of more than 10 per cent in any one year should be made in any contribution (A/1330, paragraph 12).

6. During the same period the contributions of another group of countries had steadily declined. Thus between 1950 and 1953 the United States rate of contribution had been reduced from 39.79 per cent to 35.12 per cent; that of the United Kingdom from 11.37 per cent to 10.30 per cent, and that of the Union of South Africa from 1.12 per cent to 0.83 per cent.

7. For 1954 a majority of the members of the Contributions Committee was recommending an increase of 2.61 per cent in the contributions of thirteen Member States and a reduction *pro tanto* in the contributions of nine States. The Committee was proposing that the USSR, the Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR and Poland should shoulder most of the increase, viz., 2.34 per cent, while the United States, the United Kingdom and the Union of South Africa were to have the benefit of a proportionate reduction. It followed that the contribution rate for those three countries was being reduced at the expense of the USSR and the people's democracies. Similarly, countries with low *per capita* income were to benefit by the reduction already mentioned in a ratio of only 10 per cent. The Contributions Committee had thus failed to respect the principles laid down by the assembly; and in particular it had omitted to take into account the factors mentioned in paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 14 A (I), namely the temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War and the ability of Members to secure foreign currency.

8. Certain countries were suffering from a severe dollar shortage and had difficulty in acquiring dollars owing to the policy of commercial discrimination against them followed by the United States and other countries. His delegation had frequently described those discriminatory measures in detail.

9. In the beginning, the rates of contribution of the countries which had suffered most from the Second World War had not been fixed by guess-work. Those countries, the victims of Hitlerian occupation, were known to have lost large numbers of their inhabitants and to have suffered economic disorganization due to the war. They were still obliged, even now, to devote very large sums to reconstructing their economy. That did not apply to all Member States. Thus the United States production capacity had doubled during the Second World War, and its economic and financial situation had been greatly strengthened. The Contributions Committee, therefore, should take that aspect into account and observe the most elementary principles of fairness. During the war the American monopolies' profits had risen very appreciably. The United States was the only country free from foreign exchange problems and lucky enough to be able to make its contribution in its own currency. It had the further advantage of having United Nations headquarters on its territory. The other Member States were obliged to spend considerable sums on maintaining their permanent Headquarters' delegations and their delegations to sessions of the different United Nations organs. Expenditure in United States territory represented the lion's share of the United Nations outlay. Nor, lastly, would it be right to overlook the problem caused by the taxation of Secretariat staff members who were United States nationals. Between 1946 and 1952 the United Nations had paid over \$7 million to the United States Treasury on that account, and in 1954 would spend \$1,800,000 more for the same purpose.

10. In conclusion, the reason why the majority recommendations of the Contributions Committee failed to satisfy certain Member States was that the Committee had disregarded the General Assembly's resolutions. His delegation could not support the systematic increase in the contribution rates of the countries at which the United States discriminatory commercial policy was aimed and which had sustained the greatest losses in the Second World War. Their representatives had legitimately asked that their contribution rates for 1954 should not exceed those of 1953. His delegation unreservedly supported that request.

11. Mr. KIA (Iran) congratulated the Committee on Contributions and its Chairman on the excellent way in which they had performed their task. Iran's financial situation would certainly have justified a greater reduction in its rate of contribution; but he thanked the Committee for having taken account of his country's financial difficulties. He hoped that in 1954 the Committee would take into consideration General Assembly resolution 665 (VII) drawing attention to the special situation of countries with low *per capita* incomes, and trusted that the scale of assessment was not fixed at the expense of the under-developed countries.

12. The Committee on Contributions should, as the Egyptian representative had requested (393rd meeting), give effect to the General Assembly's recommendation (resolution 311 B IV) authorizing it to advise on the scale of contributions for a specialized agency if requested by that agency to do so.

13. Mr. VIGNALE (Uruguay) acknowledged the inherent difficulties of the Contributions Committee's task of analyzing each country's economic situation and determining its capacity to pay. The Committee had done its work well. Some delegations did not, of

course, agree with all the Committee's recommendations, among them those of several countries whose contribution rates had had been increased. It must however be recognized that, as the United Kingdom representative had said, the dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War was gradually being righted, for the representatives of the Member States concerned had themselves stated that their countries were making steady progress in the economic field.

14. The Contributions Committee stated in its report that it would undertake a further review of the scale in 1954. He hoped that it would give due attention to the situation of the under-developed countries. As the Argentine representative had pointed out (394th meeting), the financial burden on those countries was proportionately heavier than that on developed countries.

15. In conclusion, he agreed with the remarks of the Colombian, Chilean and Bolivian representatives (394th meeting) and urged the Contributions Committee to make a close study of the question of the collection of a portion of the contributions in currencies other than United States dollars. The General Assembly had already given instructions to that effect in resolution 665 (VII). His delegation would support the Contributions Committee's recommendations.

16. Mr. VANER (Turkey) congratulated the Contributions Committee on having submitted a brief, accurate and objective report. Not only had the Committee had to take into account the various countries' national income, their capacity to pay and their ability to secure foreign currency; it was also obliged to have some regard for certain psychological factors.

17. Greece, an ally of Turkey, had suffered a terrible catastrophe in 1953. Having taken as its basis the figures for 1950, 1951 and 1952, the Committee had perhaps been unable to take the consequences of that disaster into consideration. But public opinion would certainly react if Greece's contribution for 1954 were increased. For that reason, the Turkish representative heartily approved the French proposal (394th meeting).

18. In 1949, the Turkish delegation (190th meeting) had asked the Contributions Committee to make a comparative study of the assessment methods used by the United Nations and those employed by specialized agencies. In paragraphs 26 and 27 of its report, the Committee had given some information on that point. However, in the Turkish delegation's view there were certain principles governing the method of fixing the scales for all the international organizations. It would be valuable to define those principles with some exactitude so that the various scales might be more readily compared. The Turkish delegation would vote in favour of the scale proposed by the Contributions Committee for 1954.

19. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) congratulated the Contributions Committee on an excellent report. His delegation would support the recommendations contained in it. He expressed his regret at the absence of Miss Witteveen, whose assistance had been most valuable.

20. The General Assembly, in its resolution 665 (VII), had given instructions that, if new members were not admitted, relief could be given through implementation of the *per capita* ceiling only after an improvement in the economic capacity of some existing

members, and, by clear inference, at the expense of those members.

21. If a low *per capita* income country were entitled to the same allowance, say, for 1955 as it was for 1954, the General Assembly's directives would prohibit the Committee from reducing that allowance in order to implement the *per capita* ceiling. He would not object to the inclusion in the rapporteur's report, or in the draft resolution, of a paragraph which would request the Contributions Committee to maintain the allowance to low *per capita* income countries outlined in its report to the Seventh Session of the General Assembly (A/2161, paragraph 12).

22. Some delegations had criticized the increase in the assessments of the USSR, the Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR and Poland and the simultaneous decrease to the United States. That criticism should have been addressed not to the Contributions Committee but to the General Assembly, which had instructed that Committee to fix the biggest contributor's assessment at 33.33 per cent. The Committee had had no choice and had been obliged to act accordingly.

23. The same delegations had maintained that the Committee had failed to allow for the economic dislocation arising out of the Second World War in the USSR and the other countries mentioned. On that point he shared the majority opinion of the Contributions Committee. If it could be assumed that a country's present economic capacity had improved appreciably since the end of hostilities, it could be deduced that the temporary dislocation arising out of the war had disappeared, at least in part. Furthermore, that fact had been confirmed by the pronouncements of Soviet statesmen who had dwelt on the palpable progress achieved by their country's economy during the last few years.

24. The same delegations had stated that the Committee had ignored the difficulty experienced by certain Member States in acquiring foreign currency. The Committee had certainly not overlooked that factor, but it had been obliged to regard it as secondary in view of the economic progress achieved by those countries.

25. The New Zealand representative had stated that the Committee should base its estimates of Member States' national income on a longer period than three years. The Argentine representative, on the other hand, had maintained that to arrive at a scale holding good for one year, the Committee should have based its estimates on a one-year period. It should be remembered that although the present scale was only valid for one year, it nevertheless represented a further step towards the establishment of a permanent scale and therefore the Committee had rightly felt obliged to base its estimates of national income on a fairly long period.

26. Mr. HUSAIN (India) desired to add his meed of praise for the Contributions Committee's work. It was not that Committee's task to fix the amount of the funds required by the Organization. Nor could it reduce the amount so needed because a few Member States wanted their contribution lowered. It was not, therefore, surprising that some delegations should be dissatisfied with the Committee's proposals. The Committee had to ensure that the financial burden was distributed equitably among the Member States, taking into account their capacity to pay. The members of the

Committee were not required to study the economic position of each country in detail. They had only to make sure that each Member State was able to pay the contribution asked of it. On that basis, the Committee had submitted recommendations which the Indian delegation would support.

27. In accordance with the instructions given by the General Assembly in resolution 665 (VII), the Committee had fixed the United States assessment at 33.33 per cent. It should, however, be remembered that in fact that country's contribution had already been reduced to that figure through the payment to the United States Treasury of the income tax of the United States staff members. The Indian delegation therefore hoped that the negotiations between the Secretary-General and the United States Government on the ratification of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities would be successful and that it would be possible during the next financial year to reduce the financial burden falling on the Organization and so permit of reliefs being granted to the under-developed countries.

28. The Committee had made due allowance for the position of countries with low *per capita* income, and it had taken no action in regard to the *per capita* ceiling. In that connexion the Indian delegation agreed with the New Zealand and Canadian representatives' remarks. If the under-developed countries were asking for consideration of their special position, it was because they had need of the totality of the funds required by the development of their agriculture and industry. Such foreign currency as they could acquire was used by them to import capital goods. The difficulties of those countries in trying to obtain the bare necessities of life for their peoples should not be overlooked. While agreeing that the principle of the *per capita* ceiling was equitable, and that no Member State's *per capita* contribution should exceed that of the smallest contributor, the Indian delegation considered that those were not the only reasons to be invoked at the present moment for reducing a country's contribution. For that it was necessary to wait until the under-developed countries had reached a sufficient level of economic development, and for new Member States to be admitted to the Organization.

29. He had noted with satisfaction the increase in the amount of contributions paid in currencies other than the United States dollar in 1953. He hoped that means would be sought to increase still further the portion paid in those other currencies, and that in that connexion attention would be paid to the difficult position of the under-developed countries.

30. Mr. NASER-ZIA (Afghanistan) noted that in the general trend of reduction of contributions of under-developed countries with low *per capita* income, no reduction had been proposed for Afghanistan, although its economic position was very difficult. The persistent drought had obliged the Government for the first time to import cereals and to seek foreign loans to finance the completion of vast irrigation works. The sheep population had suffered severely, and the income from exports was considerably lower owing to the fall in the price of astrakhan skins. For those reasons, the Afghan delegation suggested a study of the possibility that its contribution might be reduced to .07 per cent.

31. Mr. TRANOS (Greece) gladly acknowledged the objectivity and care shown by the Contributions

Committee in preparing the revised scale. He feared, however, that the system applied was over-rigid and did not allow account to be taken of emergencies which occurred, like the earthquake that had ravaged Greece, when the Committee was on the point of completing its work.

32. He was therefore specially grateful to the French representative for his proposal, supported by the Turkish representative, to return to the unit system of calculating contributions, which would allow Greece to receive relief without increasing other countries' contributions.

33. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that notwithstanding the arguments advanced by countries whose assessments the Contributions Committee was proposing to reduce, there was no justification for increasing the contributions of the USSR, the Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR and Poland. The criteria adopted by the General Assembly, namely, the comparative *per capita* income, the temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War and the ability of Member States to secure foreign currency, were still valid, and the Committee had to apply them.

34. It appeared that since 1951 a systematic policy had been followed of increasing the contributions of certain countries—the contributions of the USSR, the Byelorussian SSR, and the Ukrainian SSR had been increased by 90 per cent—and reducing those of another group, comprising, in particular, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and South Africa.

35. To justify the increase falling on the USSR and the People's Democracies, some representative had pointed to the considerable economic progress recently achieved by them. That progress was undeniable, but the enormous losses sustained by them on account of the War must not be overlooked. In the USSR, the war and the occupation had caused the destruction of 1,710 towns, more than 70,000 villages, 6 million houses and 31,850 industrial undertakings. It had not yet been possible to repair all that damage, and reconstruction was still demanding a very heavy outlay.

36. It was all the more unjust to increase the USSR's contribution when the Contributions Committee was at the same time recommending a reduction in that of the United States, whose economic and financial position, unlike that of the USSR, had been considerably enhanced by the War, and whose living standard was still rising, as was indicated in the economic report submitted to Congress by the President of the United States in January 1953. Thus, if it had been really impartial, the Contributions Committee would have recommended not a reduction but an increase of the contributions of the United States, the United Kingdom and South Africa.

37. The Contributions Committee's recommendations also failed to take into consideration the General Assembly's instruction that attention should be paid to the ability of Members to obtain foreign currency. As everyone knew, contributions had to be paid in dollars, and Member States could only pay an insignificant fraction in other currencies. The United States was particularly well placed inasmuch as it paid its contribution in its national currency. The USSR and the People's Democracies, on the other hand, had very great difficulty in obtaining dollars owing to the policy

of commercial discrimination practised by the United States, the latter country having suspended commercial exchanges with the USSR and applying pressure to other countries to adopt a similar policy.

38. Finally, he must protest against the constant violation of the provisions of rule 159 of the rules of procedure which prescribed that the scale of assessment was to be reviewed only every three years. Annual review was a source of abuse, and its only object was to allow the contributions of the USSR and the People's Democracies to be increased.

39. For all those reasons, the Soviet delegation would vote against the Secretariat's draft resolution (A/C.5/L.244) and hoped that the Fifth Committee would refuse to endorse the Contributions Committee's recommendation to increase the assessment of the USSR, the Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR and Poland.

40. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) observed that in the view of certain delegations the increases imposed on the USSR and the People's Democracies were justified by their remarkable economic recovery. Poland and good grounds to be proud of its achievements, but the fact should not be forgotten that it had sustained heavy losses on account of the War and was still devoting a large part of its national revenue to reconstruction. The Polish Government was also endeavouring to raise its people's living standard, which had been exceptionally low before the War, when the means of production had been in the hands of foreign capitalists. At present, social expenditure accounted for 22 per cent of the total budget. Poland had certainly made great progress, but much remained to be done.

41. The draft resolution prepared by the Secretariat (A/C.5/L.244) proposed in paragraph 2 that the scale of assessment should be reviewed in 1954, notwithstanding rule 159 of the rules of procedure providing that the scale should be subject to revision only every three years. That proposal was particularly dangerous; it hinted at fresh proposals for increases at the expense of certain countries.

42. Mr. LALL (Chairman of the Committee on Contributions) thanking representatives who had paid a tribute to his Committee's work, said the Committee would not fail to bear all the suggestions in mind at its next session.

43. The changes proposed for 1954 reflected the General Assembly's instructions, which had been based on decisions of the Fifth Committee and made for the gradual establishment of a permanent scale.

44. He assured the Philippine, Cuban and Colombian representatives that his Committee had taken full account of their countries' economic difficulties. The statistics supplied by the Philippines could have been taken as the basis of a contribution of 0.54 per cent, and the Committee had proposed a quota of only 0.45 per cent. Cuba's contribution, which might well have been increased, had been left at 0.34 per cent. Colombia's had been fixed at only 0.41 per cent, whereas on the basis of the statistics available to the Committee it might legitimately have been set at 0.49 per cent.

45. With reference to the Greek representative's request at the 393rd meeting, he said that the Committee would have been justified in thinking in terms of a rate of 0.31 per cent on the basis of the available statistics. That would have increased the Greek con-

tribution by over 50 per cent, but feeling that such a rise would be excessive, the Committee at first considered a rate of 0.27 per cent for 1954. Subsequently, to make allowance for the catastrophe sustained by the Greek people and the recent devaluation of the drachma, it had lowered the rate from 0.27 to 0.21. The Fifth Committee might feel that the Contributions Committee could have made an even greater allowance for Greece's difficulties, but it could not be said that they had not given them the most sympathetic consideration.

46. With regard to the French proposal for the adoption of a system of assessment by unit, the Contributions Committee had dealt with that subject in paragraphs 29 and 30 of its 1951 report (A/1859) and the General Assembly had approved its conclusions. It could, if it so wished, ask the Committee to reconsider the matter and submit recommendations at the ninth session, but it was perhaps not feasible for the Fifth Committee to adopt the French proposal forthwith.

47. Several members had mentioned the General Assembly's two recommendations made at the seventh session and had asked whether they were right in assuming that they still continued to be in force. In resolution 665 (VII) the General Assembly had asked the Committee to continue its work, bearing in mind the position of countries with low *per capita* income and had instructed it to defer further action on the *per capita* ceiling until one or other of the conditions it had specified had been fulfilled. The Committee consequently could go on complying with those directives unless the General Assembly instructed it to the contrary. With regard to scales of contributions for specialized agencies, the Committee would in future draw the agencies' attention to the General Assembly's directives including that on countries with low *per capita* income.

48. Several members of the Committee had alluded to the special position of a certain category of countries; he could assure representatives that the Committee on Contributions did not divide Member States into categories and that it used the information furnished by Member States themselves in making its recommendations and applied the same standards to all alike; only countries with low *per capita* income received special treatment, in accordance with the General Assembly's directives. True, several countries' rate of contribution had been steadily increased in recent years, but the rise would have been even greater had the Committee gone strictly on the basis of the data those countries themselves had furnished.

49. The Philippine representative had asked the Committee to consult with States whose contribution was likely to be increased. There was nothing to prevent the Committee from obtaining further information from Member States. It should indeed be noted that the Committee in its report had asked Member States for the fullest data available.

50. Mr. A. K. FAHMY (Egypt) asked that the opinion of the Chairman of the Contributions Committee on the two recommendations made by the General Assembly at its seventh session and his pledge with regard to the specialized agencies' scales of assessment be recorded in the Rapporteur's report.

51. The CHAIRMAN observed that the Committee had before it the draft resolution on the report of the

Committee on Contributions (A/C.5/L.244) and two Greek amendments, one proposing that the contributions of Member States be calculated on the basis of a unit system and fixing the total number of units for 1954 at 9998, and the other proposing that Greece's contribution in 1954 be fixed at 19 units.

52. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom) and Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed the opinion that the first Greek amendment, in proposing a complete alteration of the system of assessment, raised a matter of substance which was not on the Committee's agenda, and was therefore out of order.

53. The CHAIRMAN agreed that the point was well taken.

54. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) said that despite his great sympathy with the sorely tried Greek people, he would be compelled to vote against the first amendment, which changed the present system—a change which required prior study—and against the second amendment, which was consequent on the first. He very much hoped that the Greek representative would modify his proposal.

55. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) assumed that the sole purpose of the first Greek amendment was to allow the Greek contribution to be reduced without increasing that of other States, and that the Greek representative would not press that amendment if the second were rejected.

56. The result of the first amendment would be to fix a scale of assessment showing a deficit; that was reason enough to reject it. Should it be decided to allow Greece some relief, it would still be necessary to make sure that the contributions covered the whole of the budget estimates. However, after the explanations of the Chairman of the Contributions Committee, he felt that that Committee in reducing the rate of Greece's contribution from 0.27 to 0.21 had taken ample account of the two criteria to which the Greek permanent representative had drawn attention in his letter to the Chairman of the Contributions Committee. Accordingly, the Fifth Committee should, in his opinion, approve the Contributions Committee's recommendations with regard to Greece.

57. Mr. VANER (Turkey) thought that the Committee could adopt the Greek proposal, which made no change in the percentages that had been fixed; surplus income would make good the relief of 0.02 per cent accorded to Greece.

58. Mr. HALL (United States of America) expressed sympathy for the plight of Greece but disagreed with the Turkish representative. If Greece received relief, the difference would have to be made up and other Member States' contributions proportionately increased. He stated he could not support the Greek amendment because in the first place the amendment proposed dropping the percentage system, which was a sound system. Secondly, the adoption of the amendment would set a dangerous precedent inasmuch as the Committee would be ignoring the technical advice of its Contributions Committee, and would be departing from the principle that the assessments should be based on data for a full statistical year. On the basis of the assurances from the Chairman of the Contributions Committee, the Greek representative could be sure that, if the full facts were presented to the Committee during the coming year, the rate

of Greece's contribution for 1955 recommended by the Committee in 1954, would reflect the facts presented and the economic effects of the ordeal through which Greece had recent passed. He therefore hoped that the delegation of Greece would not press its amendment in respect to the 1954 scale.

59. Mr. AHSON (Pakistan), Rapporteur, recognized that the adoption of the system of calculation by unit would enable exceptional situations, such as that of Greece, to be taken into account more easily and proposed that in its report the Fifth Committee should ask the Committee on Contributions to consider the matter.

60. Mr. TRANOS (Greece) thanked the United States representative for his assurance and the Rapporteur for his proposal; they went far to satisfy his delegation. If the Greek contribution for 1955 was not to be so high as that for 1954 and if the Committee on Contributions was to study the unit calculation system, the Greek delegation would withdraw its amendments.

61. The CHAIRMAN observed that, the Greek amendments having been withdrawn, the Committee was required to vote on the draft resolution on the report of the Committee on Contributions (A/C.5/L.244). He put the draft resolution to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 39 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 42 votes to 5.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 were adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 44 votes to 5.

Paragraph 6 was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 39 votes to 6, with 3 abstentions.

62. The CHAIRMAN read out a Philippine draft resolution (A/C.5/L.245) requesting the Committee on Contributions to consult with Member Governments before fixing a new scale of assessment. He suggested that the Philippine representative, having heard the explanations of the Chairman of the Committee on Contributions and having been assured that his views would be recorded in the report, might perhaps refrain from pressing for a vote on his delegation's draft resolution.

63. Mr. IBAÑEZ (Philippines) thought the Committee might adopt the draft resolution at once, as it would not in any way hamper the Contributions Committee's work and would facilitate the Fifth Committee's consideration of the scale of assessment. If the Philippine delegation, for instance, had had knowledge of the gist of the explanations given by the Chairman of the Contributions Committee at the current meeting the consideration of the 1954 assessment scale would have presented them with fewer difficulties.

64. Mr. LALL (India), Chairman of the Committee on Contributions, repeated the assurances he had given in the meeting.

65. After a discussion in which Mr. VANER (Turkey), Mr. HALL (United States of America), Mr. FRIIS (Denmark), Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) and Mr. IBAÑEZ (Philippines) took part, Mr. ASHA (Syria) moved the adjournment in order to enable the Secretariat to distribute the Philippine draft resolution, and the Philippine representative to consult with the Chairman of the Committee on Contributions and the Rapporteur on some method of satisfying his delegation without the necessity for a full discussion and vote on the draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.