



**REPORT**  
**OF THE COMMITTEE**  
**ON CONTRIBUTIONS**

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

OFFICIAL RECORDS : TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

SUPPLEMENT No. 11 (A/7611)

**UNITED NATIONS**



**REPORT  
OF THE COMMITTEE  
ON CONTRIBUTIONS**

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

OFFICIAL RECORDS : TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

SUPPLEMENT No. 11 (A/7611)



**UNITED NATIONS**

*New York, 1969*

#### NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

## CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Membership of the Committee . . . . .	1 - 2	1
II. Subjects of the session . . . . .	3 - 5	1
III. Review of the criteria and terms of reference used in establishing the scale of assessments . . . . .	6 - 50	2
A. Summary of the views expressed in the Fifth Committee at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly and in the representations submitted by Member States . . . . .	10 - 11	3
B. Review of the criteria and terms of reference used in establishing the scale of assessments and comments on the views expressed during the discussion in the Fifth Committee and in representations . . . . .	12 - 46	7
C. General conclusions . . . . .	47 - 50	22
IV. Other matters considered by the Committee . . . . .	51 - 53	23

## ANNEXES

I. Terms of reference of the Committee . . . . .	25
II. Statements listing for the financial years 1967 and 1968 assessments and voluntary contributions paid by Member States . .	31
III. Development of net national product, population and <u>per capita</u> product for various groups of countries . . . . .	41



## I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

1. The twenty-ninth session of the Committee on Contributions was convened at United Nations Headquarters from 31 March to 25 April 1969. The following members were present:

Syed Amjad Ali  
Mr. Raymond T. Bowman  
Mr. N. Fakhreddine  
Mr. J.P. Fernandini  
Mr. T. Idzumbuir  
Mr. F. Nouredin Kia  
Mr. S. Raczkowski  
Mr. John I.M. Rhodes  
Mr. D. Silveira da Mota  
Mr. Maurice Viaud  
Mr. A.V. Zakharov  
Mr. Abele Zodda

2. The Committee re-elected Syed Amjad Ali as Chairman and Mr. Kia as Vice-Chairman.

## II. SUBJECTS OF THE SESSION

3. The General Assembly on 21 December 1968 adopted the following resolution (resolution 2472 B (XXIII)):

"The General Assembly,

"Considering that at its recent sessions a number of doubts have been expressed concerning the guidelines developed over the past twenty years as a framework for the work of the Committee on Contributions,

"Considering also that at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly it was suggested in the Fifth Committee that the Committee on Contributions should review the various criteria applied in determining the scale of assessments,

"Considering further that, after making the requested review, the Committee on Contributions itself concluded, in paragraph 52 of its first report, 1/ that whether or not those terms of reference, some of which were prescribed twenty years ago, were still appropriate and sufficiently precise was primarily a matter for decision by the General Assembly,

---

1/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 10 (A/7210).

"Expressing its desire to have available all the elements of judgement needed in order to be able to accomplish the task indicated in the preceding paragraph and, if necessary, to be able to give the Committee on Contributions guidelines as closely as possible in keeping with the economic realities of Member States, especially those of the developing countries, and with other realities of Member States in relationship to the United Nations,

"1. Requests the Committee on Contributions to keep under review the criteria it now uses in establishing the scale of assessments, and also its terms of reference, in the light of the debates on the subject at the twenty-second and twenty-third sessions of the General Assembly and of the opinions which Member States have already expressed or may express in writing to the Committee;

"2. Also requests the Committee on Contributions to submit a report to the General Assembly for consideration at its twenty-fourth session."

4. In compliance with the General Assembly's request, the Committee made a detailed review of the criteria it now uses in establishing the scale of assessments and of its terms of reference, in the light of the debates on the subject at the twenty-second and twenty-third sessions of the General Assembly and of the opinions which Member States had expressed in writing to the Committee. The Committee's terms of reference are set out in annex I to the present report.

5. Under rule 161 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee also considered the status of collection of contributions.

### III. REVIEW OF THE CRITERIA AND TERMS OF REFERENCE USED IN ESTABLISHING THE SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS

6. In section IV of its report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly 2/ the Committee on Contributions summarized and commented on the views expressed on the subject of the scale of assessments in the Fifth Committee at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, and in the representations submitted by Member States.

7. During the debate on the report of the Committee on Contributions in the Fifth Committee at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, some delegations expressed the view that the report gave a careful analysis of the comments made in the Fifth Committee at the previous session of the General Assembly and a clear representation of the interrelationship between all the various criteria that had to be taken into account in determining assessments. Several delegations also endorsed the conclusion of the Committee on Contributions in its report that the scale of assessments it had recommended for 1968, 1969 and 1970, and which was approved by the General Assembly, was fair and equitable and fully consistent with the existing terms of reference and directives of the Assembly. Other delegations expressed disappointment that the Committee had

---

2/ Ibid.



neither found it possible to support any of the various suggestions made by delegations for changes in the present system of assessment nor analysed the problems involved. These delegations were of the opinion that it was time to review, clarify and perhaps extend the terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions.

8. When the twenty-ninth session of the Committee on Contributions was scheduled to convene on 31 March 1969, the Secretary-General, in line with the agreed practice, informed Member States of the dates fixed for the meetings in order to give them the possibility of submitting their opinions in writing.

9. At its twenty-ninth session, the Committee considered the views expressed at the 1257th, 1258th, 1263rd and 1266th meetings of the Fifth Committee when it considered agenda item 77 (Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations), and in the report of the Fifth Committee on that item, 3/ as well as the views expressed on the subject in the Fifth Committee at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, and in the representations submitted by Member States. Furthermore, the Committee considered the representations submitted for consideration at its current session by Canada, Greece and Japan.

A. Summary of the views expressed in the Fifth Committee  
at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly and  
in the representations submitted by Member States 4/

10. The Committee on Contributions noted the following main observations which were expressed during the discussion in the Fifth Committee at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, some of which had also been expressed at the twenty-second session:

(a) It was stated that the scale adopted for 1968, 1969 and 1970 had demonstrated the need for a review of the present criteria and guidelines for assessment. In that scale highly industrialized and developed countries, with only a few exceptions, had received reductions in their assessments, while those of many developing countries had been increased. This, it was held, was in conflict with the economic reality of the world situation.

(b) With reference to the allowance for low per capita income and the General Assembly's request in resolution 2118 (XX) that due attention be given to the special problems of the developing countries, it was suggested that:

(i) The Committee on Contributions might find it possible to devise a more systematic method of making allowance for low per capita income than by making small downward adjustments in the rates of countries with per capita income below \$300;

---

3/ Ibid., Twenty-third Session, Annexes, agenda item 77, document A/7451.

4/ The views summarized in this section of the report are, to a very large extent, expressed in the same words as those used by the delegations making the observations or suggestions as recorded in the documents before the Committee.

- (ii) Under the current system of assessment the countries with per capita income between \$300 and \$1,000 were at a disadvantage in comparison with countries with less than \$300, while the General Assembly in its resolutions made no such distinction;
- (iii) Special attention should be given to developing countries whose contributions had been substantially increased since their admission to membership in the Organization;
- (iv) The difficulties involved in classifying countries with per capita income below \$1,000 as "highly industrialized" or "developing" might be overcome through the use of selected statistical indicators;
- (v) A review of its terms of reference might facilitate re-examination by the Committee of previous proposals, especially for the present amount of allowance for low per capita income to be calculated and established as an "invariable percentage".

(c) It was suggested that consideration might be given to the possibility of applying an adjustment factor to the net national product of each country including those with per capita income above \$1,000, the adjustment to be graded downwards for countries with per capita income below \$1,000 and upwards for countries with per capita income above that level.

(d) It was observed that, in determining the capacity to pay of Member States, the Committee based itself on national income for a specific period of years, and failed to consider wealth accumulated over the centuries. While it was recognized that there were as yet no reliable national standards for estimating that factor, it might, nevertheless, be advisable to envisage taking it into account in the future.

(e) While recognizing the difficulties involved in devising a systematic method of making allowance for the ability of Members to secure foreign currency, it was suggested that certain easily identifiable elements, such as the external debt of countries, particularly the developing countries, might be taken into account in making allowance for that factor. Other elements mentioned were the effects of discriminatory practices in commercial activities, the application of the most-favoured-nation clause and the artificially fixed price of gold in the United States market, which complicated the payment of contributions in United States dollars by certain countries.

(f) It was pointed out that it was difficult to justify a ceiling on the contributions of the United States of America, the richest country in the world. Furthermore, the United Nations Headquarters was located in the United States and the major portion of the United Nations budget was spent in New York, so that it gained a considerable influx of foreign currencies. The per capita ceiling principle was equally difficult to justify, since it provided for possible reductions in the assessments of the countries with the highest per capita incomes. Even if the per capita ceiling principle at the present time affected only one Member State, it was not excluded that radical changes in the economy of countries could occur that would again make this principle operative in other cases.

(g) It was indicated that the Committee should keep under study the minimum rate of assessment, since some countries assessed at the floor rate of 0.04 per cent might find the cost of participating in the work of the United Nations a heavy burden.

(h) With reference to the use by the Committee of averages of net national product for a base period of three years, it was suggested that in the interest of further reducing the effect of short-term fluctuations in economic conditions and variations in exchange rates, the Committee might consider the possibility of extending the base period to six or even to nine years.

(i) In connexion with the stated objective of the Committee to obtain for all Member States data as nearly comparable as possible, the suggestion was made that the Committee should examine the possibility of using national income statistics expressed in constant prices instead of in current prices, as at present, thereby mitigating the effects of inflation on rates of assessment.

(j) It was suggested that the present system of assessment does not provide sufficiently prompt compensation for changes in exchange rates.

(k) Several delegations expressed their satisfaction with the present criteria and guidelines for the establishment of the scale. They felt that the system of broadly apportioning the expenses according to capacity to pay, as measured by national income statistics adjusted for low per capita income, had resulted in a fair and equitable scale and was fundamentally sound. The terms of reference of the Committee, although originally prescribed twenty years ago, had not in fact, it was stated, remained unchanged, but had been adapted to meet changing world economic conditions by subsequent General Assembly directives. Instead of a general revision of the terms of reference, it might be preferable, it was said, to follow as hitherto a course of evolution. If, however, it was the intention that any of the principles applied in the assessment of contributions should be revised before the establishment of the next scale in 1970, it would be necessary to review the whole system of assessment. For instance, the question of the relief to be given to developing countries could not be considered in isolation from, for instance, the implementation of the ceiling principle. The relationship between the size of the contribution and the financial responsibility of Member States must also be borne in mind in order to ensure that the interest of Member States in sound budgetary procedures was maintained.

(l) In connexion with the observations made on the ceiling principle, it was stated that in the original terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions adopted by the General Assembly in 1946 the possibility of a ceiling on the contribution of the highest contributor had been recognized. From the beginning the Assembly had therefore seen no conflict between the ceiling principle and the principle of capacity to pay. The reason for the adoption of the ceiling principle was that in an organization of sovereign equals, no State should be able to exercise too great an influence, which would be the inevitable result if a financial contribution to the United Nations budget were disproportionate to that of other States. The reduction in the level of the ceiling with the increase in the membership was rational and in the interest of the Organization. The current maximum contribution, which was more than twice that of the next highest contributor, could not, it was held, be

considered inequitable. As the grounds for the adoption of the ceiling were sound, it should continue to apply.

(m) Certain observations were also made in the course of the Fifth Committee's debate, for consideration or re-examination by the Committee on Contributions in connexion with its review:

- (i) The possibility was mentioned that in the next scale of assessments, if based on present criteria, a permanent member of the Security Council might be required to pay a lower contribution than a non-permanent member. A General Assembly directive to prevent such an occurrence might be called for, it was suggested. In that connexion it was pointed out that the introduction of further artificial rates of assessment in the scale would reduce the importance of the basic principle of capacity to pay and could therefore not be supported. Attention was also drawn to the fact that a non-member State was already contributing to the United Nations activities in which it participated at a higher rate than some permanent members of the Security Council.
- (ii) Regrets were expressed that the Committee had not found it possible to adopt fixed percentage limitations on increases in rates of assessments as suggested during the Fifth Committee's debate at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly.
- (iii) With reference to the conclusion of the Committee that a system of consultations, which might transform the Committee into a negotiating body, should not be adopted, the argument was advanced that consultations would not necessarily mean negotiations, but a procedure to ensure that assessments were determined with the greatest possible objectivity. It was felt therefore that the Committee on Contributions should be under obligation to consult in advance the Member States whose assessments it proposed to increase substantially. Others supported the conclusion of the Committee on Contributions and stated that since the Committee's responsibilities were solely to the General Assembly, consultation with individual States might lead to constitutional difficulties.

(n) In connexion with the task of the Committee under General Assembly resolution 2472 B (XXIII), it was explained by the sponsors that the decision whether the terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions should be changed would rest with the General Assembly but, before such a decision could be taken, it would be necessary for the Assembly to have all the relevant background information. They also stated that the Committee on Contributions was not asked to make decisions or judgements of a political nature, but to provide the necessary background for judgement and final decision by the General Assembly.

11. As regards the opinions submitted to the Committee by three Member States, the communications received from the Permanent Representatives of Japan and Greece referred to the statements made by their delegations in the Fifth Committee at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, and the Permanent Representative of Canada reiterated Canada's support for the present terms of reference of the Committee and expressed his Government's concurrence

with the present scale of assessments. In the Canadian view, the principles laid down by the General Assembly were fair and reasonable and did not require any significant alteration. Furthermore, resolution 2472 (XXIII) did not empower the Committee on Contributions to make changes.

- B. Review of the criteria and terms of reference used in establishing the scale of assessments and comments on the views expressed during the discussion in the Fifth Committee and in representations

12. The Committee's terms of reference and the various criteria taken into account in arriving at the scale of assessments may be summarized as follows:

(a) Under the Committee's original terms of reference, the expenses of the United Nations should be apportioned broadly according to capacity to pay, and comparative estimates of national income were recommended as the fairest guide. The main factors to be taken into account to prevent anomalous assessments resulting from the use of comparative estimates of national income were:

- (i) Comparative income per head of population;
- (ii) Temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War;
- (iii) The ability of Members to secure foreign currency.

(b) In subsequent resolutions, the General Assembly has given further directives to the Committee for drawing up the scale, namely:

- (i) It has imposed a ceiling on the rate of assessment of the highest contributor which in principle should not exceed 30 per cent of the total;
- (ii) It has directed that the per capita contribution of any Member State should not exceed the per capita contribution of the largest contributor;
- (iii) It has imposed a minimum rate of assessment of 0.04 per cent;
- (iv) It has requested that due attention be given to the developing countries in view of their special economic and financial problems.

#### Capacity to pay

13. Under its original terms of reference, the Committee was directed to apportion the expenses of the United Nations broadly according to capacity to pay. The General Assembly recognized that it is difficult to measure such capacity merely by statistical means and impossible to arrive at any definite formula. It was indicated, however, that comparative estimates of national income would appear prima facie to be the fairest guide. The Committee has from the beginning used national income statistics as a basis for measuring

the relative capacities to pay of Member States. It is of course important for drawing up an equitable scale to have as reliable and as comprehensive data as possible. During the period since 1946, when the first United Nations scale was established, there has been considerable improvement in the statistical data provided by Member States by reason of the fact that many more countries are now providing systematic national economic accounts. The Committee has also, as explained in earlier reports, taken a number of steps further to improve the comparability of the basic data. As an improvement in comparability, the Committee had decided from 1964 onwards to use net national products at market prices for all Member States as a basis for the scale. This change was made primarily so that the national product data for those Member States using the "net material products" system of accounts could be more appropriately compared with data for Member States using a system of national accounts which include non-material products.

14. At an early stage of its work, the Committee on Contributions adopted the use of averages of national income statistics for a period of three years instead of for a single year as had been the original practice. One of the suggestions in the Fifth Committee was that the Committee on Contributions should consider the possibility of extending the base period from three years to six or even nine years, which would further reduce the effect of short-term fluctuations in economic conditions and variations in exchange rates. In connexion with this suggestion, it may be recalled that under the present procedure, the scale to be established in 1970, which would apply for the three years 1971, 1972 and 1973, would be based on averages of national income statistics for the period 1966-1968. There is thus a considerable time lag between the period used as a basis for the scale and the period of application of the scale, and it might be questioned if a further extension of the time lag would be desirable and equitable. The Committee recognized that an extension of the base period to six or nine years would not only, as stated, further retard the effects of short-term fluctuations in economic conditions but would also fail to disclose adequately differential rates of expansion in the economies of Member States. The Committee was of the opinion, therefore, that for a three-year scale, a three-year base period is a more appropriate means of reflecting the relative economic developments of Member States and is sufficiently long to provide for correction of the effects of short-term fluctuations.

15. It was also suggested in the Fifth Committee that the Committee on Contributions might examine the possibility of using national income statistics expressed in constant prices instead of in current prices. The Committee on Contributions examined the problems associated with the effects on comparative national income of differential changes in prices and radical changes in exchange rates. It noted that movements in the current price value of the national product of Member States, when expressed in United States dollars, could normally result from changes in: (a) quantity of output; (b) price levels; and (c) exchange rates. Traditionally, the Committee has based its calculations on a measure of national output data expressed in current prices converted into United States dollars but has taken account of price changes wherever they were found to have had a noticeable effect on the level of assessment. The Committee recognized that the choice between using current or constant prices was not important when changes in a country's exchange rate were in line with changes in its price level. The Committee also recognized that the need for special attention in its work arose where changes in price levels were not proportionately reflected in exchange rates, either for the whole or part of the period under review.

16. At the same time, the Committee considered that there were serious difficulties involved in the use of constant prices instead of current prices. These difficulties include: (a) non-availability of constant price data for the economies of many Member States; (b) the possibility that the rate of conversion applied to the base period might by itself be undervalued or overvalued; and (c) imperfections in price indexes. The Committee therefore agreed that, in drawing up the scale of assessments, it would pay particular attention to the effect of noticeable differential changes in price levels in relation to exchange rates in individual cases. In order to secure additional information needed to study this matter further, as well as to obtain a better basis for future judgement, the Committee requested the Secretariat at its next session to supplement the data showing national products in current prices with data on price changes and rates of exchange for all Member States for which data is available. The Secretariat was also requested to prepare a study on methods, and the relevant factors associated with them, concerning the use of data in constant prices as contrasted with data in current prices. The Committee further requested the Secretariat to prepare a study exploring the relevance of international terms of trade for the establishment of improved comparative data on national economies of Member States, taking into account changes in export prices in relation to changes in import prices.

17. In connexion with the argument that the wealth accumulated by a country over the centuries should be taken into account to determine relative capacity to pay, the Committee pointed out that current national product data are to a certain extent related to the wealth of a country. Specific estimates of national wealth are virtually non-existent and their development in an acceptable form would meet serious technical difficulties. The Committee concluded that it would not be appropriate to give special consideration to this concept in determining a country's relative capacity to pay.

18. In using national income statistics for measuring the relative capacities to pay of Member States the Committee is required under its original terms of reference to take into account certain main factors to prevent anomalous assessments. These factors are dealt with in the following paragraphs.

(i) Comparative income per head of population

19. A systematic allowance for the factor "comparative income per head of population" has been made in all the scales recommended by the Committee on Contributions. For its review of the scale in 1952, the Committee was directed by the General Assembly, in resolution 582 (VI) of 21 December 1951, to give particular attention to countries with low per capita income. In compliance with that directive, the maximum allowance for low per capita income, which had until then been 40 per cent, was increased to 50 per cent, and it has remained at that level in all subsequent scales. Under the present formula 5/ all Member

---

5/ The method used for making allowance for low per capita income is in brief as follows: a deduction is made from the national income of each Member State with a per capita income below \$1,000. The difference between \$1,000 and a country's per capita income below \$1,000 is expressed as a percentage of \$1,000 and 50 per cent of that percentage is used to reduce the country's total national income for the purpose of assessment.



States with per capita income below \$1,000 receive a reduction for the purpose of assessment in their national income figures. As explained in the Committee's 1968 report, 6/ the size of the percentage deduction is determined by the level of the per capita income so that, for instance, the net national product of a country with a per capita of \$50 will be reduced by 47.50 per cent, while a country with a per capita income of \$950 will receive a reduction in its net national product of only 2.5 per cent. At its seventh and again at its ninth session the General Assembly asked the Committee on Contributions to continue to give recognition to countries with low per capita income. In compliance with the General Assembly's request, the Committee continued to give attention to the allowance made for low per capita income and considered various alternative formulas. At its session in 1964, in drawing up the scale for 1965, 1966 and 1967, the Committee sought to give special attention to the countries whose level of per capita income fell below \$300 and within the general revision of the scale made a number of small downward adjustments in the assessment of such States, with the result that none of these countries showed an increase and the great majority of the countries in this group showed reductions from the previous scale. The General Assembly, in resolution 2118 (XX) of 21 December 1965, noted with appreciation the action taken by the Committee on Contributions and requested it, in calculating rates of assessment, to continue its efforts to give due attention to the situation of the developing countries in view of their special economic and financial problems. Following a suggestion in the Committee's 1964 report, which was endorsed by the General Assembly at its twentieth session, the Committee, at its session in 1966, made a detailed review of the effects of variations in the present system of allowances for low per capita income in establishing rates of assessment. It studied the effects on the scale of varying the present upper limit of \$1,000, of increasing to varying degrees the present maximum allowance of 50 per cent and of increasing the maximum allowance for the very lowest ranges of per capita incomes. The study provided the Committee with valuable information regarding the effects in the scale that might result from variations in the existing system of allowances. It reached the conclusion, however, that it would be advisable to appraise the effects of any change in the basic rules in relation to the later national income figures which would form the basis of the Committee's review of the scale in 1967. The Committee was also confirmed in the opinion that variations in the allowance formula to take account of comparative income per head of population should not be such as to cause too radical changes in the assessments either from one per capita income group to another or in the assessment of individual States, changes that might be further accentuated through the use of later national income statistics.

20. In its review of the scale in 1967, when the scale for 1968, 1969 and 1970 was drawn up, the Committee found, as had been expected, that there had been important changes in the relative capacity to pay of Member States since the last review of the scale. 7/ A change in the basic system of allowances would have further emphasized the changes in the relative capacity to pay of Member States and would have led to even more pronounced changes in the scale, which

---

6/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 10 (A/7210), para. 26.

7/ Ibid., Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 10 (A/6710), para. 17.



the Committee had agreed should be avoided. The Committee therefore reached the conclusion "that it would not be desirable to make fundamental changes in the basic rules at the present time". Consequently, the Committee, for its 1967 review of the scale, maintained the adopted formula of a maximum allowance of 50 per cent applied to countries with per capita income below \$1,000 as determined by each country's per capita income. It also decided again to make small downward adjustments for the very low per capita income countries below the level of \$300, particularly when assessments for these countries would otherwise have shown an increase.

21. At the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, in the course of the Fifth Committee's debate of the scale of assessments for 1968, 1969 and 1970, a number of observations were made, inter alia, in connexion with the allowance for low per capita income and the Committee's implementation of the Assembly's request in resolution 2118 (XX) to give due attention in its review of the scale to the special problems of the developing countries. At its 1968 session the Committee studied the various observations made in the Fifth Committee and in the representations submitted to the Committee subsequently by several Member States. In its report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly <sup>8/</sup> the Committee commented in detail on all these observations. In connexion with the suggestions for giving further relief to developing countries, the Committee stated in paragraph 28 of its report: "While recognizing that these possibilities are limited within the existing terms of reference, which include the capacity to pay, the ceiling, the floor, and the maximum allowance for low per capita income, the Committee will continue its endeavours in that direction at its next session."

22. At its current session the Committee made a special study of the allowance for low per capita income taking into account the various suggestions made in the Fifth Committee at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, which included:

(a) Examination of the possibility of devising a more systematic method of making allowance for low per capita income than by making small downward adjustments in the rates of assessment of countries with per capita income below \$300;

(b) Consideration of the attention to be given to countries with per capita income between \$300 and \$1,000,

(c) Consideration of the criteria applied to highly industrialized countries with per capita income of less than \$1,000,

---

<sup>8/</sup> Ibid., Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 10 (A/7210).

(d) Re-examination of a previous proposal for the present amount of allowance for low per capita income to be calculated and established as an "invariable percentage".

(e) Consideration of the possibility of applying an adjustment factor to the net national product of each Member State, the adjustment to be graded downwards for countries with per capita income below \$1,000 and upward for countries with per capita income above that level.

23. In the light of these observations, the Committee studied in detail the effects on the scale of the present allowance for low per capita income as well as variations of the allowance by increasing the maximum percentage allowance or by raising the present limit below which the allowance applied or by both. The main views expressed in this respect are set out below:

(a) During the discussion, it was pointed out that the original reason for the introduction of this principle seems to be the progression in the taxable income of Member States, depending on the size of their per capita national income. When the limit of \$1,000 was established, only two Member States, both subject to the ceiling and per capita ceiling principles, had a per capita income exceeding this limit; all the remaining forty-nine original Member States had their taxable income progressively reduced. During the last twenty years the situation has changed greatly and in the present scale seventeen Member States have a per capita national product higher than \$1,000. Some members of the Committee thought that it would be appropriate to raise the upper limit for the application of the low per capita allowance to a higher figure, for instance \$1,500, and to increase the maximum discount to 60 per cent. This could, in their opinion, mitigate to some extent the impact of the allowance formula on countries which have at present their assessments increased not only on account of the increases in their national product but also on account of a diminishing low per capita allowance, when they approach the \$1,000 limit. After discussing this suggestion, the majority of the members of the Committee were of the opinion that it would not be appropriate at this time to raise the limit beyond \$1,000 because such a change would involve serious problems, such as introducing radical shifts in the scale of assessments. It would also give rise to questions as to whether \$1,500 would not be too high an upper limit for the concession of relief.

(b) Certain members of the Committee reached the conclusion that the present allowance formula should not be changed. These members believed that the view expressed in previous reports is still true, namely that a change in the basic system of allowance would further emphasize the changes in the relative capacity to pay of Member States and would lead to even more pronounced changes in the scale. They further emphasized that changes in the basic allowance principle designed to prevent anomalous assessments from the use of comparative estimates of national income would do just the opposite. They pointed out that the present allowance formula taken by itself, and before the exercise of the special consideration given to Member States with per capita income below \$300 and other exercises of the Committee's judgement, now reduces the assessment rate for Member States with different per capita income levels, as follows:

<u>Per capita income</u>	<u>Present formula (50 per cent maximum reduction)</u>	
	<u>Percentage change in national product</u>	<u>Percentage change in assess- ment rate (excluding "floors" and "ceilings")</u>
100	- 45	- 36
200	- 40	- 30
300	- 35	- 24
400	- 30	- 13
500	- 25	- 13
600	- 20	- 7
700	- 15	- 1
800	- 10	+ 4
900	- 5	+ 10
1,000 and above	0	+ 16

These members felt therefore that due attention could be best given to developing Member States with low per capita income not by a change in the present formula but by the exercise of the judgement of the Committee with respect to groups of such countries or individually as circumstances warrant. They maintained that changes in the allowance formula disrupted the orderly shift from one scale to another and that such allowance formula changes shifted assessments indiscriminately from a large number of Member States to a small group of countries. They were of the view that such a development would tend to diminish financial responsibility since it responded to a rise in the budget by an adjustment of assessment rates.

(c) On the other hand, after examining all the issues and suggestions connected with the question of the allowance for comparative income per head of population, several members of the Committee reached the conclusion that the variant which would be best suited to comply more systematically with the recommendations of the General Assembly concerning the attention to be given to developing countries in view of their special economic and financial problems would be to increase the maximum allowance from 50 to 60 per cent. These members were convinced that this change in the allowance formula would benefit the group of countries with per capita product below \$1,000, would be simple to administer and would be compatible with the principle of capacity to pay. In justification of the proposed change these members drew attention to the actual effects of the existing formula. This is shown in the following table which sets out in column 1 percentage changes in national products accorded by the formula on the basis of 1963-1965 national product figures - compared with the percentage changes in assessment which result from the application of the formula in column 3.

Effect of per capita relief formula with 60 per cent maximum reduction as compared with the present formula (based on 1963-1965 national products) a/

<u>Per capita national product</u>	Percentage change in national product	Percentage change in assessment rate (excluding "floors" and "ceilings")	
	Present formula 50 per cent maximum reduction (1)	Suggested formula 60 per cent maximum reduction (2)	Present formula 50 per cent maximum reduction (3)
100	- 45	- 45	- 36
200	- 40	- 38	- 30
300	- 35	- 30	- 24
400	- 30	- 23	- 18
500	- 25	- 16	- 13
600	- 20	- 9	- 7
700	- 15	- 2	- 1
800	- 10	+ 6	+ 4
900	- 5	+ 13	+ 10
1,000	- 0	+ 20	+ 16

a/ The figures in this table show only the theoretical working of the per capita allowance formula (on the 1963-1965 data) independent of other considerations taken into account by the Committee in drawing up the scale, particularly in the case of countries with per capita products below \$300.

In the opinion of these members, it would readily be seen that the change proposed by increasing the maximum allowance to 60 per cent (column 2) has the advantage of bringing the reductions in assessment for the low income countries more into line with the percentage reductions in national products accorded to them by the present formula (maximum reduction of 50 per cent). In further justification the members recommending this change emphasized the steady reduction in aggregate in the allowance for low per capita national products which has come as a result of the over-all movement upwards of per capita national products and the movement of large contributions beyond the \$1,000 limit. At the same time they recognized that the adoption of an increased allowance for low per capita income would reduce substantially the need for the present practice of making small downward adjustments in the rates of assessment of the very lowest per capita income countries below \$300. As there might still be some cases requiring special consideration, however, they were of the opinion that even with an increase in the allowance the Committee should retain its discretion in that respect.

(d) It was recalled that the terms of reference and criteria observed by the Committee are a coherent set of rules and that any substantial changes in the present practice of giving relief for low per capita income should be considered in conjunction with all these rules. In this connexion, it was noted that with the present application of the ceiling principles the burden of the increases in

the maximum allowance for lower per capita income would be shifted almost entirely to the countries with per capita income above \$1,000 except those protected by the ceiling principles. It was pointed out therefore that the Committee would require a certain amount of flexibility so as not necessarily to exclude the highest contributor in the distribution of the burden resulting from the increase in the maximum allowance.

The position set forth in sub-paragraphs (c) and (d) was held by more members than any of the others.

24. One of the reasons given in the Fifth Committee for requesting a review of the present criteria and guidelines for assessment was that, in the scale adopted for 1968, 1969 and 1970, highly industrialized and developed countries with only a few exceptions had received reductions in their assessments, while those of many developing countries had been increased. This, it was held, was in conflict with the economic realities of the world situation.

25. In connexion with this contention, the Committee wishes to reiterate the views expressed in its report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly:

"It may first be emphasized that any increases or decreases in the scale reflect primarily changes in the economic situation of Member States as established by the basic statistical data. If the Committee had not taken into account factors other than the current market value of the national outputs, and the adjustments for low per capita income below \$1,000, the changes upward or downward that have been criticized in the Fifth Committee would have been even greater." 9/

At its current session the Committee again analysed its 1968, 1969 and 1970 scales. It was pointed out that, when the assessments in the present scale of the generally recognized industrial countries as a group are compared with their assessments in the previous scale, they show an increase from 83.04 to 83.55 per cent. The remaining ninety-five Member States are assessed in the present scale at 16.45 per cent. It was also noted that this group included fifty-six Members assessed at a minimum rate of 0.04 per cent or four more than in the previous scale. It was also pointed out that the scale of assessments drawn up in accordance with the Committee's terms of reference reflects the changes in the economic situation of Member States as well as the consequences of the application of certain principles included in the terms of reference, such as the ceiling, the floor and the low per capita income allowance.

26. At the twenty-third session of the General Assembly regret was expressed in the Fifth Committee that the Committee on Contributions had not found it possible to adopt fixed percentage limitations on increases in rates of assessments. In this connexion, the Committee would like to reiterate the views expressed by it in its report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly:

"It may be opportune in this connexion to refer to a suggestion made in the Fifth Committee and in the representations submitted, that changes in the scale should be limited to a fixed percentage, such as 14 or 20 per cent. In making modifications in the scale and deciding

---

9/ Ibid., para. 30.

on the extent to which such modifications could be made, the Committee has had to take into account that if, as a result of its adjustments, the rates of assessments of Member States become too much out of line with the rate indicated by the statistics, the gap between the two rates may be even greater at its next review of the scale. In the case of some of the large increases, it was also true that the countries experiencing such increases revised their statistics of national product upward after the 1965-1967 scale had been established. Had the revised figures been used in the development of the 1965-1967 scale, as they were for the 1968-1970 scale, the increases which appeared between the two scales would have been smaller. If a fixed percentage limitation were imposed on changes in the scale, the gap between the statistical rate and the actual rate of assessment would, for a country with a rapidly expanding economy, be constantly increasing. A procedure which would restrict percentage changes in assessments between scales to a predetermined amount would prevent appropriate consideration of capacity to pay as revealed by revised national product data. This situation would be in conflict with the principle of capacity to pay and the Committee would, therefore, not express itself in favour of the introduction of artificially fixed percentage limitations on changes. It is, however, in line with its procedures to study in great detail any large changes in the scale in order to insure that such changes are not excessive and are mitigated to the extent compatible with the basic principle of capacity to pay." 10/

27. The Committee also considered a suggestion that it should give attention particularly to developing countries whose contributions had increased since their admission to the Organization. The Committee had examined this suggestion at its 1968 session and again wishes to express the opinion that it would be inappropriate and not in line with the basic principle of capacity to pay to introduce criteria of this character since increases in the scale reflect primarily changes in the relative economic situation of Member States.

28. In connexion with the position taken by the Committee in its report to the twenty-third session on the possibility of giving consideration to the criteria applied to "highly industrialized" countries with per capita income below \$1,000, 11/ it was pointed out in the Fifth Committee that the difficulties involved in classifying Member States with per capita income below \$1,000 as "developed" or "highly industrialized" and "developing" might be overcome through the use of formulas relying on a selection of statistical indicators in addition to net national product and per capita product data.

29. The Committee at this session undertook a detailed examination of the relative ranking of Member States on the basis of criteria selected for the purpose of study. These criteria, other than the per capita net national product, were: per capita energy consumption, per capita food consumption - daily calorie intake, percentage of gross domestic product originating in manufacturing, percentage of economically active population in non-agriculture, number of infant

---

10/ Ibid., para. 31.

11/ Ibid., para. 35.

survivals per 1,000 births, number of physicians per 1,000 inhabitants. This examination was limited to countries with more than \$300 per capita income and less than \$1,000 on the basis of provisional national income estimates for 1967.

30. In evaluating the results of this examination, it became clear that, although the establishment of a dividing line between "developed" and "developing" countries would be possible, the issue still raised serious difficulties, since there was no general agreement as to the choice of indicators for this purpose. Aware of these difficulties, the Committee was further guided by the consideration that it had already manifested its preference for keeping the level of \$1,000 for the concession of relief, and that it could be envisaged that in the next scales the changes in the national economies of countries in that category would lead to largely reducing the practical significance of the proposed distinction. The Committee therefore agreed that while it would bear in mind the results of its study in the review of the scale of assessments, its past practice of applying the same relief formula to all Member States below \$1,000 per capita should be continued, with special individual adjustments for countries with very low per capita income.

(ii) Temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War

31. In its report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, the Committee stated:

"The factor of 'temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War' was important in the early stages of the Committee's work, but no specific allowance has been made for this factor in arriving at the scale for many years. In its 1967 report, the Committee confirmed its previous conclusion that it was not necessary to make any special allowance for this factor, particularly in view of the time that had elapsed since the Second World War." 12/

This conclusion was endorsed by the General Assembly.

(iii) The ability of Members to secure foreign currency

32. Again in its report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, the Committee explained the difficulties in devising any systematic and sound way of taking payment difficulties into account in the determination of contribution rates for all Member States. In the course of the debate in the Fifth Committee at the twenty-third session, the existence of such difficulties was recognized. It was suggested, however, that certain easily identifiable elements such as the external debt of a country could be taken into account in making allowance for that factor. Other criteria mentioned were the effect of discriminatory practices in commercial activities, the application of the most-favoured-nation clause, and the artificially fixed price of gold in the United States market, which complicated the payment of contributions of certain countries.

---

12/ Ibid., para. 36.

33. The Committee re-examined the problem involved in the light of the Fifth Committee's debate but again failed to find a formula for making a systematic allowance for this factor. The Committee will, however, continue to take this factor into account as seems necessary in arriving at individual rates of assessment.

#### Ceiling and per capita ceiling principles

34. In the Committee's original terms of reference, the General Assembly had provided that "if a ceiling is imposed on contributions, the ceiling should not be such as to seriously obscure the relation between a nation's contributions and its capacity to pay". In the first report submitted by the Committee on Contributions (A/80), the rate of assessment for the largest contributor in the scale recommended was 49.89 per cent - something of a ceiling according to the records. The Assembly, at the second part of its first session, following a review of the scale by a sub-committee of the Fifth Committee, adopted scales for 1946 and 1947 in which the rate of assessment of the largest contributor was established at 39.89 per cent. In 1948, the Assembly, in resolution 238 A (III), accepted the principle of a ceiling to be fixed on the rate of contributions of the Member States bearing the highest assessment. At the same time, the Assembly recognized that "in normal times no one Member State should contribute more than one-third of the ordinary expenses of the United Nations for any one year". In compliance with this directive the United States assessment was gradually reduced from 39.89 per cent to 35.12 per cent in the 1953 scale. In resolution 665 (VII) of 5 December 1952, the General Assembly decided that "from 1 January 1954 the assessment of the largest contributor shall not exceed one-third of the total assessments against Members".

35. In resolution 1137 (XII) of 14 October 1957, referring to the increase in membership, the General Assembly decided that:

"In principle, the maximum contribution of any one Member State to the ordinary expenses of the United Nations shall not exceed 30 per cent of the total."

At the same time, the Assembly gave the Committee certain specific directives with regard to the steps to be taken in preparing the scale for 1958 and subsequent years. In accordance with these directives, the assessment of the largest contributor was reduced to 32.51 per cent in the scale for 1958. The further reductions in the assessment of the largest contributor were made in accordance with the directives of the General Assembly in paragraphs 3 (b), (c) and (d) of resolution 1137 (XII), which provide as follows:

"(b) During the three-year period of the next scale of assessments (1959-1961), further steps to reduce the share of the largest contributor shall be recommended by the Committee on Contributions when new Member States are admitted;

"(c) The Committee on Contributions shall thereafter recommend such additional steps as may be necessary and appropriate to complete the reduction;



"(d) The percentage contribution of Member States shall not in any case be increased as a consequence of the present resolution."

36. In its report to the twenty-third session, the Committee had explained in detail the procedure followed by it in gradually reducing the assessment of the largest contributor from 32.51 per cent in the 1958 scale to 31.57 in the scale adopted by the Committee for 1968, 1969 and 1970, which it considered was in accord with the directives given by the General Assembly (paragraph 35 above).

37. The Committee at its current session considered again the question of the ceiling in the light of the views summarized in paragraph 10 (f) and (1) above. In the scale for 1968-1970, if the rate of assessment of the United States was assessed solely on the basis of the principle of relative capacity to pay as evidenced by its net national product, the rate of assessment would be considerably higher than the present rate of 31.57 per cent. On the basis of the 1963-1965 national income statistics adjusted for low per capita income, the rate would have been 39.48 per cent. In connexion with the level of the ceiling, reference had been made by the Assembly to the increase in membership of the Organization. The Committee considered the change in membership and in the size of the budget as illustrated by the following figures:

	Contribution of largest contributor (per cent)	<u>Number of Members</u> (on 1 January)	Gross amount of United Nations regular budget  (in millions)
1946	39.89	51	\$ 19.4
1948	39.89	57	34.8
1954	33.33	60	47.8
1957	33.33	80	50.8
1962	32.02	103	82.1
1969	31.57	126	154.9

38. The Committee considered that it should not pronounce itself on the appropriateness of the ceiling principle which, like other principles and criteria, is a matter for decision by the General Assembly. It wishes to note, however, that in the light of other directives of the Assembly, further reductions in the assessment of the largest contributor from 31.57 per cent to reach the level of 30 per cent prescribed under its present terms of reference may not be appropriate in the present circumstances. Taking into account the considerations referred to in paragraphs 22 (c) and (d), some Members noted that some upward adjustment in the present rate of assessment might be envisaged.

#### Per capita ceiling principle

39. When the General Assembly in 1948, in resolution 238 A (III), recognized that in normal times no Member State should contribute more than one-third of the ordinary expenses of the United Nations for any one year, it also recognized that "in normal times the per capita contribution of any Member State should not exceed the per capita contribution of the Member which bears the highest assessment". This principle was gradually implemented in the scale. When the

Assembly decided that from 1 January 1954 the assessment of the largest contributor should not exceed one-third of the total assessments of all Member States, it also instructed the Committee on Contributions "to defer further action on the per capita ceiling until new Members are admitted or substantial improvements in the economic capacity of existing Members permits the adjustments to be gradually absorbed in the scale". Following the admission of sixteen new Members in 1955, the per capita ceiling principle was fully implemented in the revised scale for 1956, and has been fully implemented in all subsequent scales.

40. In the Fifth Committee the view was expressed that the per capita ceiling principle was difficult to justify since it provided for possible reduction in the assessments of the countries with the highest per capita incomes. The Committee considered this question in the light of the views expressed in the Fifth Committee and agreed that it should not pronounce itself on the appropriateness of the per capita ceiling principle, which is a matter for decision by the General Assembly. The Committee on Contributions noted, however, that the only Member States that have at any time been affected by this principle are Canada, Kuwait, New Zealand and Sweden, which over the years in certain scales have received relatively small reductions in their assessments through the application of the per capita ceiling principle. In the present scale, the principle affects only one Member State, Kuwait, by reducing its assessment rate by a small amount.

#### Floor

41. During the debates in the Fifth Committee, it was indicated that the Committee on Contributions should keep under study the minimum rate of assessment, since some countries assessed at the floor rate of 0.04 per cent might find the cost of participating in the United Nations a heavy burden. The Committee, in its report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, expressed the following views on the subject:

"The General Assembly, in the scale it adopted at the second part of its first session (resolution 69 (I)), introduced the minimum rate of 0.04 per cent, which has been maintained in all subsequent scales. Following a suggestion in the Fifth Committee at the twelfth session of the General Assembly, the Committee on Contributions in 1958 made a detailed study of the possibility of a reduction in the minimum assessment. The study was concerned mainly with the economic benefits that a Member State derived from membership in the United Nations, such as the reimbursement of travel of delegations to sessions of the General Assembly, and from the expenses that were undertaken by the United Nations for the benefit of all Member States alike, such as maintenance of the Headquarters building, translation and documentation. The minimum rate supersedes the usual criteria for capacity to pay, and other considerations enter into the decision as to the appropriateness of a minimum rate and the minimum amount that any Member State should be obliged to contribute to the United Nations. While recognizing that the small, newly independent countries are faced with many financial and economic problems, the Committee reiterates its views that the grounds for maintaining the minimum rate in the past are equally valid now." 15/

---

15/ Ibid., para. 44.

At its twenty-ninth session, after reviewing once more the question of the minimum rate of assessment, the Committee saw no reason for changing its views as expressed above, but this, too, was a matter for decision by the General Assembly.

#### Other pertinent factors

42. Under its terms of reference, the Committee is given discretion to consider all data relevant to the capacity to pay and all other pertinent factors in arriving at its recommendations. Under this provision, the Committee as mentioned in earlier reports takes into account temporary dislocation of economies resulting from national catastrophies, such as earthquakes, floods, and other causes.

#### Permanent membership of the Security Council

43. In the course of the debate in the Fifth Committee, the possibility was mentioned "that in the next scale of assessments, if based on present criteria, a non-permanent member of the Security Council might be required to pay a larger contribution than a permanent member. A General Assembly directive to prevent such an occurrence might be called for or perhaps the question could be resolved by the Committee on Contributions itself". The Committee recognized that this matter did not fall within its terms of reference and that it should not therefore express any views on the subject.

#### Consultations

44. In connexion with the views expressed in the Fifth Committee at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly that the Committee on Contributions should be under obligation to consult in advance the Member States whose assessments it proposed to increase substantially, the Committee wishes to confirm the views it expressed in its report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, which read as follows:

"One of the suggestions made during the Fifth Committee's discussion was that the Committee on Contributions should consult in advance with the Member States whose assessments it proposed to raise, or to raise by a substantial percentage, a suggestion which was also made in some of the representations submitted to the Committee for consideration at its current session. The Committee recognized the importance of having information as complete as possible from Member States. It noted, however, that the existing arrangements already gave Governments the possibility of submitting to the Committee the statistical data and all other relevant information they might wish the Committee to take into account in arriving at its recommendations, a fact that had also been pointed out by other delegations in the Fifth Committee.

"The adoption of a system of advance consultations with Governments whose assessments were to be increased would clearly raise problems with respect to the relationship of the Committee with the General Assembly. Such consultations would also be inconsistent with the position taken by the Fifth Committee at the eighth session of the

General Assembly, when a similar proposal was made by a delegation, that it would be improper for the Committee to act as a negotiating committee. The Committee considered, therefore, that it could not lend its support to the suggestion of advance consultations with any Member States concerning its rate of assessment." 14/

The Committee's conclusion was also supported in the Fifth Committee when it was stated that since the responsibilities of the Committee on Contributions were solely to the General Assembly, consultation with individual States might lead to constitutional difficulties.

#### Statements requested by the Fifth Committee

45. The Fifth Committee, at the twenty-third session, requested the Secretary-General 15/ to submit to the Committee on Contributions at its twenty-ninth session and subsequently to the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly a report listing for the financial years 1967 and 1968 the actual cash payments made by each Member State to the regular budgets of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, to all programmes and trust funds of the United Nations family of organizations financed by assessed or voluntary contributions and to the United Nations Force in Cyprus. The Fifth Committee also requested the Secretary-General to prepare, for consideration by the Committee on Contributions and by the Fifth Committee, a statement presenting, in a concise form, statistical and other relevant information on the changes which have occurred in the past ten years in the economy of Member States, particularly with respect to changes - expressed in terms of national per capita income figures - which took place in the economy of the economically less developed Member States in relation to the highly industrialized Member States.

46. The two reports of the Secretary-General are annexed to the present report (annexes II and III).

#### C. General conclusions

47. The Committee has tried in the present report to provide the General Assembly with a critical survey of its terms of reference and the criteria used in establishing the scale of assessments. In the process, the Committee on Contributions has reviewed not only the basic rules by which it works but also the techniques it employs in the application of those rules. In general, the Committee is satisfied that the various guidelines laid down for it by the General Assembly have withstood the test of time and permit the establishment of a balanced and equitable scale based primarily on the principle of capacity to pay. The departures from that principle which impose certain restraints on the scale were authorized by the Assembly as deliberate acts of policy.

---

14/ Ibid., paras. 47 and 48.

15/ A/7451, paras. 16 and 17.

48. In the course of its work, the Committee has again been impressed by the interrelationship between the various criteria and terms of reference. The Committee has always considered that the intention of the General Assembly was to establish a coherent set of rules to be observed jointly and simultaneously by the Committee. It believes that it is important for this coherence to be preserved. But within this framework there is room for genuine differences of opinion about both the relative importance of the various factors and the interpretation of the General Assembly's wishes. The Committee has not attempted to conceal such differences as have emerged during its discussions. Instead, it has endeavoured to describe the different points of view in sufficient detail to enable the Assembly to be fully seized of, and form a proper judgement of, the issues involved.

49. In its report to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session, the Committee on Contributions stressed that when undertaking the triennial reviews of the scale it exercises the discretion given to it by the Assembly; the modifications which it then makes require an element of judgement which is not capable of definition in a precise formula. In the course of the present review the Committee was again confronted with several questions whose character and complexity are such as to call for the exercise of discretion by the Committee. These included evaluations of the implications of inflation and devaluation, the mitigation of sharp changes from one scale to the next and the interpretation of statistical data. The Committee was therefore amply confirmed in its conclusion that it is in the exercise of this discretion that it has proved and will continue to prove its usefulness as an expert body of the General Assembly.

50. Finally, the Committee would caution against the hope that a scale of assessments can be devised which will meet completely all the views expressed by Member States. Those views are too diverse and too divergent to be encompassed in a single formula. Nevertheless, the Committee believes that working under the general guidance of the General Assembly and keeping abreast of new statistical techniques, it can, by the judicious use of its discretion, establish a scale of assessments which both holds an equitable balance between the interests of the Member States and reflects the realities of their economic situation. That has been and will be the constant endeavour of the Committee.

#### IV. OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE

##### Collection of contributions

51. The Committee took note of a report of the Secretary-General which showed that, at the time of the conclusion of its meeting, nine Member States, namely, Bolivia, Burundi, Dahomey, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Haiti, Senegal, Uganda and Yemen were in arrears in the payment of their contributions to the United Nations regular budget within the terms of Article 17 of the Charter. The Committee decided to authorize the Chairman to issue, at a later date if necessary, an addendum to the present report on this question.

Scales of contributions for specialized agencies

52. The General Assembly, in its resolution 311 B (IV) of 24 November 1949, authorized the Committee "to recommend or advise on the scale of contributions for a specialized agency if requested by that agency to do so". No request for advice on their scales was received from any of the specialized agencies.

Date of next meeting

53. The Committee decided to open its next session on 4 May 1970 at United Nations Headquarters.

## ANNEXES

### ANNEX I

#### TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE

##### A

##### Original terms of reference

The original terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions are contained in chapter IX, section 2, paragraphs 13 and 14, of the report of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations a/ and in the report of the Fifth Committee of 11 February 1946, b/ and were adopted at the first part of the first session of the General Assembly on 13 February 1946 (resolution 14 A 3 (I), paragraph 3).

The relevant paragraphs of the report of the Preparatory Commission incorporating the amendments of the Fifth Committee are as follows:

##### "The apportionment of expenses

"13. The expenses of the United Nations should be apportioned broadly according to capacity to pay. It is, however, difficult to measure such capacity merely by statistical means, and impossible to arrive at any definite formula. Comparative estimates of national income would appear prima facie to be the fairest guide. The main factors which should be taken into account in order to prevent anomalous assessments resulting from the use of comparative estimates of national income include:

"(a) Comparative income per head of population;

"(b) Temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War;

"(c) The ability of Members to secure foreign currency.

"Two opposite tendencies should also be guarded against: some Members may desire unduly to minimize their contributions, whereas others may desire to increase them unduly for reasons of prestige. If a ceiling is imposed on contributions the ceiling should not be such as seriously to obscure the relation between a nation's contributions and its capacity to pay. The

---

a/ Report of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations (PC/20).

b/ Official Records of the General Assembly, First part of the first session, Plenary meetings, annex 19 (A/44).

Committee should be given discretion to consider all data relevant to capacity to pay and all other pertinent factors in arriving at its recommendations. Once a scale has been fixed by the General Assembly it should not be subjected to a general revision for at least three years or unless it is clear that there have been substantial changes in relative capacities to pay.

"14. Other functions of the Committee would be:

- "(a) To make recommendations to the General Assembly on the contributions to be paid by new Members;
- "(b) To consider and report to the General Assembly on appeals by Members for a change of assessment; and
- "(c) To consider and report to the General Assembly on the action to be taken if Members fall into default with their contributions.

"In connexion with the latter, the Committee should advise the Assembly in regard to the application of Article 19 of the Charter."

B

Resolution 238 A (III) adopted by the General Assembly  
on 18 November 1948

"The General Assembly,

"Recognizing

- "(a) That in normal times no one Member State should contribute more than one-third of the ordinary expenses of the United Nations for any one year,
- "(b) That in normal times the per capita contribution of any Member should not exceed the per capita contribution of the Member which bears the highest assessment,
- "(c) That the Committee on Contributions needs for its work more adequate statistical data,

"Accordingly

"1. Reaffirms the terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions accepted by the General Assembly in its resolution of 13 February 1946 (resolution 14 A (I), paragraph 3);

"2. Calls upon Member States to assist the Committee on Contributions by providing the available statistics and other information essential to its work;

"3. Accepts the principle of a ceiling to be fixed on the percentage rate of contribution of the Member State bearing the highest assessment;



"4. Instructs the Committee on Contributions, until a more permanent scale is proposed for adoption, to recommend how additional contributions resulting from (a) admission of new Members, and (b) increases in the relative capacity of Members to pay, can be used to remove existing maladjustments in the present scale or otherwise used to reduce the rates of contributions of present Members;

"5. Decides that when existing maladjustments in the present scale have been removed and a more permanent scale is proposed, as world economic conditions improve, the rate of contribution which shall be the ceiling for the highest assessment shall be fixed by the General Assembly."

C

Resolution 665 (VII) adopted by the General Assembly  
on 5 December 1952

"The General Assembly,

"...

"1. Notes with satisfaction the action taken by the Committee on Contributions to implement the recommendations of General Assembly resolution 582 (VI) of 21 December 1951 by giving additional recognition to countries with low per capita income, and urges the Committee to continue to do so in the future;

"2. Instructs the Committee on Contributions to defer further action on the per capita ceiling until new Members are admitted or substantial improvement in the economic capacity of existing Members permits the adjustments to be gradually absorbed in the scale;

"3. Decides that from 1 January 1954 the assessment of the largest contributor shall not exceed one-third of total assessments against Members;

"..."

D

Resolution 876 A (IX) adopted by the General Assembly  
on 4 December 1954

"The General Assembly

"1. Reaffirms the decision (resolution 665 (VII)) of the General Assembly at its seventh session to defer further action on the per capita ceiling until new Members are admitted or substantial improvement in the economic capacity of existing Members permits the adjustments to be gradually absorbed in the scale of assessments;

"2. Reaffirms resolution 582 (VI) of 21 December 1951, by which the Committee on Contributions was requested to give additional recognition to countries with low per capita income, and instructs the Committee to continue to do so in the future;

"3. Instructs the Committee on Contributions to apply the decision referred to in paragraph 1 above to future scales of assessments, so that the percentage contributions of those Members subject to the per capita principal will be frozen against any increase over the level approved for the 1955 budget until they reach per capita parity with the highest contributor and that downward adjustments will occur when the conditions cited in resolution 665 (VII) of 5 December 1952 have been fulfilled or changes in relative national incomes warrant lower assessments."

E

Resolution 1137 (XII) adopted by the General Assembly  
on 14 October 1957

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling its resolutions 14 (I) of 13 February 1946, 238 (III) of 18 November 1948 and 665 (VII) of 5 December 1952, regarding the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations among its Members and the fixing of the maximum contributions of any one Member State,

"Noting that, when the maximum contribution of any one Member State was fixed at 33.33 per cent effective 1 January 1954, the United Nations consisted of sixty Member States,

"Noting further that, since 1 January 1954, twenty-two States have been admitted to membership in the United Nations,

"Recalling its resolution 1087 (XI) of 21 December 1956, whereby the percentage contributions of the first sixteen new Member States admitted since 1 January 1954 were incorporated into the regular scale of assessments for 1956 and 1957 and were applied to reduce the percentage contributions of all Member States except that of the highest contributor and those of the Member States paying minimum assessments,

"Noting that there are now six new Member States - Ghana, Japan, Malaya (Federation of), Morocco, Sudan and Tunisia - whose percentage contributions have not yet been fixed by the Committee on Contributions or incorporated into the 100 per cent scale of assessments,

"Decides that:

"1. In principle, the maximum contribution of any one Member State to the ordinary expenses of the United Nations shall not exceed 30 per cent of the total;

"...

"3. The Committee on Contributions shall take the following steps in preparing scales of assessment for 1958 and subsequent years;

"(a) The percentage contributions fixed by the Committee on Contributions for Ghana, Japan, Malaya (Federation of), Morocco, Sudan and Tunisia for 1958 shall be incorporated into the 100 per cent scale for 1958; this incorporation shall be accomplished by applying the total amount of the percentage contributions of the six Member States named above to a pro rata reduction of the percentage contributions of all Members except those assessed at the minimum rate, taking into account the per capita ceiling principle and any reductions which may be required as a result of a review by the Committee on Contributions, at its session commencing 15 October 1957, of appeals from recommendations made previously by that Committee;

"(b) During the three-year period of the next scale of assessments (1959-1961), further steps to reduce the share of the largest contributor shall be recommended by the Committee on Contributions when new Member States are admitted;

"(c) The Committee on Contributions shall thereafter recommend such additional steps as may be necessary and appropriate to complete the reduction;

"(d) The percentage contribution of Member States shall not in any case be increased as a consequence of the present resolution."

F

Resolution 1927 (XVIII) adopted by the General Assembly  
on 11 December 1963

"The General Assembly,

"...

"2. Requests the Committee on Contributions, in calculating rates of assessment, to give due attention to the developing countries in view of their special economic and financial problems;

"...

G

Resolution 2118 (XX) adopted by the General Assembly  
on 21 December 1965

"The General Assembly,

"...

"2. Notes with appreciation the action taken by the Committee on Contributions to meet the request made in General Assembly resolution 1927 (XVIII) with respect to the attention due to the developing countries, and requests the Committee, in calculating rates of assessments, to continue its efforts to give due attention to the situation of those countries in view of their special economic and financial problems."

## ANNEX II

### STATEMENTS LISTING FOR THE FINANCIAL YEARS 1967 AND 1968 ASSESSMENTS AND VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS PAID BY MEMBER STATES

#### Report of the Secretary-General

1. The Fifth Committee at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General a/ to submit to the Committee on Contributions at its 1969 session a report listing for the financial years 1967 and 1968 the actual cash payments made by each Member State to the regular budgets of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, to all programmes and trust funds of the United Nations family of organizations financed by assessed or voluntary contributions and to the United Nations Force in Cyprus.

2. In compliance with this request, two statements are appended listing for the financial years 1967 and 1968 the cash payments made by Member States to:

- I. The regular budgets of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency; and
- II. The United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Middle East, the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the World Food Programme, the General Fund of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the United Nations Emergency Force Special Account, the United Nations Force in Cyprus, the United Nations Institute for Training and Research and other United Nations trust funds.

---

a/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Annexes, agenda item 77, document A/7451, para. 16.

APPENDIX I  
CASH PAYMENTS MADE BY MEMBER STATES  
FOR THE FINANCIAL YEARS 1967 AND 1968

MEMBER STATE	YEAR	United Nations	ILO	FAO	UNESCO	WHO	ICAO	UPU	ITU b/	WMO	IMCO	IAEA	YEAR	TOTAL PER YEAR	MEMBER STATE
Afghanistan	1967	103,475	51,793	16,681	29,917	-	5,952	4,138	5,000	1,875	-	-	1967	218,831	Afghanistan
	1968	42,235	-	16,452	-	55,610	-	4,112	5,278	-	-	-	1968	123,687	
Albania	1967	34,338	-	-	10,680	-	-	4,138	5,000	2,169	-	3,532	1967	59,857	Albania
	1968	38,376	-	-	13,373	44,490	-	4,112	5,278	2,309	-	4,136	1968	112,074	
Algeria	1967	100,156	26,967	30,979	54,180	47,960	11,674	1,379	30,000	1,875	4,000	7,945	1967	317,115	Algeria
	1968	120,426	29,805	35,646	-	51,818	11,582	1,371	31,667	4,809	-	9,306	1968	296,428	
Argentina	1967	-	681,111	551,853	-	-	53,366	34,485	150,000	20,073	471	-	1967	1,499,359	Argentina
	1968	690,839	643,395	576,686	255,720	911,699	51,841	34,271	158,333	46,870	14,770	85,756	1968	3,470,180	
Australia	1967	1,658,866	411,245	495,664	440,219	751,430	117,851	34,485	180,000	37,968	4,976	124,988	1967	4,257,692	Australia
	1968	1,732,915	454,500	556,626	445,480	816,880	115,264	34,271	190,000	44,456	5,661	146,755	1968	4,542,808	
Austria	1967	556,456	80,900	166,810	148,182	250,470	30,019	6,897	10,000	11,250	-	42,620	1967	1,303,604	Austria
	1968	658,844	86,926	186,456	152,182	272,300	29,781	6,854	10,556	4,283	-	49,675	1968	1,457,857	
Barbados	1967	4,532	17,467	-	-	21,320	4,818	1,379	2,083	1,250	-	-	1967	52,849	Barbados
	1968	88,231	27,320	13,363	-	23,170	7,170	1,371	5,278	2,259	-	-	1968	168,167	
Belgium	1967	1,207,403	303,377	428,856	265,899	543,580	78,382	20,691	50,000	26,251	5,504	90,460	1967	3,020,403	Belgium
	1968	1,251,452	335,287	358,322	380,466	590,940	76,659	20,563	52,778	31,631	6,286	106,479	1968	3,210,863	
Bolivia	1967	56,590	599	12,457	-	-	-	4,138	30,000	-	-	-	1967	103,724	Bolivia
	1968	-	-	-	-	3,034	-	4,112	31,667	-	-	-	1968	38,813	
Botswana	1967	46,528	-	10,485	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1967	57,013	Botswana
	1968	46,235	-	10,968	-	-	-	1,371	3,958	2,490	-	-	1968	65,022	
Brazil	1967	1,644,437	416,930	297,875	262,078	452,990	81,717	34,485	50,000	32,000	7,116	78,896	1967	3,358,524	Brazil
	1968	1,542,241	327,836	167,262	269,198	492,450	79,968	34,271	52,778	30,016	-	87,648	1968	3,083,668	
Bulgaria	1967	-	42,697	-	47,520	-	4,169	6,897	10,000	7,592	-	13,761	1967	132,636	Bulgaria
	1968	219,723	47,188	73,424	48,686	166,850	9,927	6,854	10,556	1,874	7,736	15,490	1968	608,308	
Burma	1967	62,995	31,461	19,076	12,807	26,640	7,227	4,138	10,000	5,625	2,000	4,380	1967	186,349	Burma
	1968	69,351	27,320	20,849	16,713	28,970	7,170	4,112	10,556	6,778	2,000	5,044	1968	198,863	
Burundi	1967	60,116	47,285	8,943	12,240	-	-	1,379	5,000	-	-	-	1967	134,763	Burundi
	1968	45,688	18,576	11,444	12,027	44,490	-	1,371	5,278	-	-	-	1968	138,874	
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	1967	581,907 $\frac{8}{11}$	101,126	-	117,045	-	-	6,897	10,000	9,128	-	41,461	1967	867,564	Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic
	1968	512,043 $\frac{8}{11}$	111,762	-	144,480	-	-	6,854	10,556	13,555	-	48,591	1968	847,841	
Cambodia	1967	-	-	67	-	-	-	1,379	10,000	-	-	-	1967	11,446	Cambodia
	1968	99,680	-	9,471	-	20,920	-	1,371	10,556	1,698	-	-	1968	143,696	
Cameroon	1967	41,996	26,967	9,532	12,080	21,320	7,227	1,379	5,000	1,875	3,873	3,532	1967	134,781	Cameroon
	1968	45,652	27,320	10,968	11,935	23,170	7,106	1,371	5,278	4,809	2,000	4,136	1968	143,745	
Canada	1967	3,328,230	755,072	993,711	889,342	1,508,180	226,807	34,485	180,000	58,981	12,500	251,316	1967	8,238,624	Canada
	1968	3,431,210	834,492	1,115,994	889,341	1,633,760	221,152	34,271	190,000	65,080	14,514	294,695	1968	8,722,509	
Central African Republic	1967	41,996	26,967	9,532	11,873	21,320	7,227	1,379	5,000	-	-	-	1967	125,294	Central African Republic
	1968	9,127	27,320	10,894	12,008	23,170	7,170	1,371	5,278	2,259	-	-	1968	98,597	
Ceylon	1967	85,994	26,967	23,879	18,059	37,300	7,227	6,897	10,000	5,789	-	6,146	1967	226,258	Ceylon
	1968	61,351	29,803	20,943	21,641	40,560	5,738	6,854	10,556	4,922	-	-	1968	202,368	
Chad	1967	75,619	20,400	8,964	5,037	6,146	7,227	1,379	5,000	2,803	-	-	1967	132,575	Chad
	1968	-	33,833	12,000	18,968	-	7,138	1,371	5,278	2,259	-	-	1968	80,847	
Chile	1967	292,374	9,936	116,768	57,970	-	15,663	6,897	30,000	18,980	-	6,623	1967	555,211	Chile
	1968	-	121,459	80,000	60,000	176,420	-	6,854	31,667	4,115	-	4,606	1968	487,821	
China	1967	-	450,000	-	-	100,000	37,245	34,485	150,000	104,762	7,080	-	1967	883,572	China
	1968	6,200,000	200,000	-	1,505,000	100,000	36,951	34,271	158,333	102,022	7,534	-	1968	8,344,111	
Colombia	1967	52,669	51,373	60,973	31,559	111,910	21,124	6,897	30,000	7,407	-	19,265	1967	393,177	Colombia
	1968	245,473	90,151	71,473	93,112	111,826	20,406	6,854	31,667	-	-	21,693	1968	692,655	
Congo (Brazzaville)	1967	109,437	-	9,544	11,964	21,320	7,227	1,379	5,000	-	-	-	1967	165,871	Congo (Brazzaville)
	1968	85,373	54,198	10,875	12,103	22,290	7,170	1,371	5,278	-	-	-	1968	198,658	
Congo (Democratic Republic of)	1967	-	26,967	151	-	-	7,227	4,138	10,000	7,501	-	4,435	1967	60,419	Congo (Democratic Republic of)
	1968	197,818	27,320	32,982	30,081	55,610	-	4,112	10,556	-	-	5,109	1968	363,386	

MEMBER STATE	YEAR	UNITED NATIONS		ILO	FAO	UNESCO	WHO	ICAO	UPU	ITU	WHO	IMCO	IAEA	YEAR	TOTAL PER YEAR
		1967	1968												
Costa Rica	1967 1968	- 74,603	- -	- -	9,599 -	- -	- -	- -	4,138 4,112	5,000 5,278	2,767 -	- -	- -	1967 1968	21,504 83,993
Cuba	1967 1968	179,693 -	59,025 -	59,025 -	62,164 14	- 189	96,567 -	11,674 -	4,138 4,112	10,000 10,556	5,694 -	2,992 -	- -	1967 1968	335,529 111,249
Cyprus	1967 1968	41,996 23,118	26,967 27,320	26,967 27,320	9,532 10,968	11,890 12,177	21,320 23,170	7,227 7,170	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	1,875 2,259	- -	3,670 4,136	1967 1968	130,856 116,967
Czechoslovakia	1967 1968	956,291 1,090,908	208,993 228,492	208,993 228,492	- -	156,307 469,773	527,600 573,560	60,593 60,114	20,691 20,563	30,000 31,667	20,625 24,853	2,264 2,356	91,740 103,423	1967 1968	2,075,104 2,605,709
Dahomey	1967 1968	21,088 9,320	20,342 -	20,342 -	19,064 2,577	9,250 4,039	9,340 5,330	5,808 -	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	1,878 -	- -	- -	1967 1968	93,149 27,915
Denmark	1967 1968	650,948 716,636	157,307 173,852	157,307 173,852	195,406 219,360	172,450 174,560	293,110 318,640	42,248 41,565	13,794 13,708	50,000 52,778	19,491 18,981	13,355 13,743	49,544 57,922	1967 1968	1,657,653 1,803,563
Dominican Republic	1967 1968	30,431 34,954	20,000 -	20,000 -	129 -	- -	- -	- -	4,138 4,112	30,000 31,667	- -	- -	- -	1967 1968	84,698 70,723
Ecuador	1967 1968	35,202 32,601	33,663 31,023	33,663 31,023	25,261 2,184	- 4,418	- -	- -	4,138 4,112	10,000 10,556	1,851 2,278	- -	- -	1967 1968	110,115 87,172
El Salvador	1967 1968	- -	22,421 24,405	22,421 24,405	67 -	- -	- 21,320	- -	4,138 4,112	30,000 31,667	- -	- -	- -	1967 1968	56,626 81,504
Ethiopia	1967 1968	41,996 46,235	26,967 27,320	26,967 27,320	9,532 10,968	11,890 12,177	21,320 23,170	7,227 7,170	4,138 4,112	10,000 10,556	3,750 9,618	- -	- 4,161	1967 1968	148,972 143,310
Finland	1967 1968	451,465 566,374	67,417 74,508	67,417 74,508	135,831 150,810	57,741 182,822	202,510 220,150	26,683 25,921	13,794 13,708	30,000 31,667	11,250 13,556	6,112 6,851	34,604 40,357	1967 1968	1,037,407 1,326,724
France	1967 1968	5,863,086 6,380,134	1,364,074 1,507,550	1,364,074 1,507,550	1,908,783 2,144,244	1,671,036 1,749,344	2,893,790 3,140,060	398,580 388,808	34,485 34,271	300,000 316,667	97,502 117,484	25,039 29,429	483,616 566,649	1967 1968	15,039,991 16,374,640
Gabon	1967 1968	76,499 46,235	26,912 27,445	26,912 27,445	9,532 10,968	- 4,997	19,320 25,170	7,227 7,114	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	1,898 4,134	- -	- 4,136	1967 1968	147,767 136,848
Gambia	1967 1968	12,000 41,996	- -	- -	9,532 10,968	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	1967 1968	21,532 52,964
Ghana	1967 1968	- 83,994	27,212 29,803	27,212 29,803	22,421 17,648	14,682 27,373	2,050 41,968	7,227 7,170	4,138 4,112	10,000 10,556	4,200 5,332	2,516 2,526	- 7,232	1967 1968	94,446 237,714
Greece	1967 1968	517,379 335,201	47,192 52,156	47,192 52,156	78,501 87,706	30,790 107,623	117,240 127,460	16,677 -	6,897 6,854	10,000 10,556	11,319 -	30,651 35,892	15,722 22,577	1967 1968	882,368 786,025
Guatemala	1967 1968	41,996 53,792	26,967 27,320	26,967 27,320	8,565 11,934	11,829 12,119	21,320 23,170	7,227 7,170	4,138 4,112	10,000 10,556	1,875 2,259	- -	- -	1967 1968	133,917 152,463
Guinea	1967 1968	63,736 -	925 -	925 -	67 -	- 23,913	4,515 17,021	- -	4,138 4,112	5,000 5,278	1,898 -	- -	- -	1967 1968	80,279 50,324
Guyana	1967 1968	46,528 46,235	26,967 27,320	26,967 27,320	1,906 20,530	- -	21,320 23,170	5,420 7,170	1,379 1,371	4,167 5,278	1,852 2,259	- -	- -	1967 1968	109,539 133,303
Haiti	1967 1968	29,167 35,005	- -	- -	17,884 10,968	- -	- 2,985	- -	4,138 4,112	10,000 10,556	- -	- -	- -	1967 1968	61,189 63,566
Honduras	1967 1968	36,373 27,000	34,511 27,320	34,511 27,320	9,532 9,599	12,104 11,861	21,320 23,060	7,227 7,170	4,138 4,112	5,000 5,278	2,099 1,623	2,500 2,500	- -	1967 1968	134,804 119,523
Hungary	1967 1968	501,958 513,138	77,600 102,621	77,600 102,621	211,788 -	22,500 -	15,394 254,813	- -	13,794 13,708	10,000 10,556	17,504 -	- -	- -	1967 1968	636,259 1,129,124
Iceland	1967 1968	41,996 46,235	26,967 27,320	26,967 27,320	9,532 10,968	11,720 12,360	21,320 23,170	7,227 7,170	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	1,875 4,809	2,536 2,606	3,532 4,136	1967 1968	133,084 145,423
India	1967 1968	1,811,905 2,105,257	653,947 712,795	653,947 712,795	576,739 652,184	507,600 524,904	879,330 955,920	116,183 113,264	34,485 34,271	130,000 137,222	48,751 58,742	9,180 10,604	146,750 172,546	1967 1968	4,914,870 5,477,709
Indonesia	1967 1968	547,906 -	96,136 106,795	96,136 106,795	121,533 137,100	- 216,720	186,520 -	21,124 20,406	20,691 20,563	10,000 10,556	51,188 -	9,228 4,845	30,694 -	1967 1968	1,095,020 516,985
Iran	1967 1968	- 209,983	60,675 67,037	60,675 67,037	61,958 453	- 69,318	73,340 17,580	11,674 11,582	6,897 6,854	10,000 10,556	5,625 -	4,000 -	- -	1967 1968	239,169 393,383
Iraq	1967 1968	77,568 302,882	26,967 29,803	26,967 29,803	46,262 213	- 20,591	37,300 40,560	- -	1,379 1,371	10,000 10,556	- -	- -	6,146 7,232	1967 1968	205,622 413,208

MEMBER STATE	YEAR	UNITED NATIONS	FAO	UNE SCO	WHO	ICAO	UPU	ITU	WHO	IMCO	IAEA	YEAR	TOTAL PER YEAR	MEMBER STATE
Ireland	1967 1968	167,987 196,497	51,686 57,123	44,529 45,730	74,610 81,110	14,453 14,339	13,794 13,708	30,000 31,667	5,625 6,778	2,596 2,652	- -	1967 1968	455,323 507,186	Ireland
Israel	1967 1968	30,000 216,486	25,967 29,803	47,749 48,160	79,940 86,910	22,792 -	4,138 4,112	10,000 10,556	5,625 5,969	8,976 5,137	13,278 15,516	1967 1968	302,073 475,441	Israel
Italy	1967 1968	3,192,099 2,934,680	530,349 583,648	554,771 872,256	1,001,969 1,511,771	172,329 176,480	34,485 34,271	100,000 105,556	48,751 -	60,023 32,356	202,938 236,926	1967 1968	6,693,889 7,296,644	Italy
Ivory Coast	1967 1968	76,503 88,231	26,967 27,320	11,873 12,194	21,320 23,170	7,227 7,170	1,379 1,371	10,000 10,556	1,832 2,259	2,000 -	3,670 4,136	1967 1968	172,303 187,375	Ivory Coast
Jamaica	1967 1968	46,496 63,792	26,967 27,320	14,842 -	26,640 28,970	7,227 7,170	1,379 1,371	10,000 10,556	1,875 2,259	- -	4,587 5,170	1967 1968	156,694 163,060	Jamaica
Japan	1967 1968	2,908,264 4,369,173	453,942 496,722	770,625 791,424	1,316,330 1,430,990	156,764 169,862	34,485 34,271	200,000 211,111	48,751 58,742	63,071 80,980	221,016 257,738	1967 1968	7,040,660 8,874,423	Japan
Jordan	1967 1968	118,499 46,235	32,838 27,552	11,711 12,369	21,320 23,170	7,227 4,700	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	2,013 2,121	- -	- -	1967 1968	209,539 133,764	Jordan
Kenya	1967 1968	41,996 46,235	26,967 27,320	18,878 5,202	21,320 23,170	7,227 -	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	2,436 2,373	- -	3,670 4,136	1967 1968	138,451 126,053	Kenya
Kuwait	1967 1968	62,995 80,911	26,967 27,320	14,844 15,243	26,640 28,970	7,227 7,170	1,379 1,371	10,000 10,556	4,311 2,373	- 5,153	4,449 5,177	1967 1968	177,876 206,180	Kuwait
Laos	1967 1968	77,519 40,976	26,967 27,320	- -	21,320 23,170	7,227 7,170	1,379 1,371	5,600 5,278	1,875 2,259	- -	- -	1967 1968	153,845 118,512	Laos
Lebanon	1967 1968	52,496 57,792	26,967 27,320	7,540 22,389	26,640 28,970	11,118 -	1,379 1,371	5,000 10,556	1,875 -	3,456 9,107	4,414 5,170	1967 1968	157,566 179,727	Lebanon
Lesotho	1967 1968	- 92,763	- -	- -	- -	- -	1,379 1,371	3,333 5,278	- -	- -	- -	1967 1968	14,244 110,380	Lesotho
Liberia	1967 1968	76,781 46,235	51,372 27,320	24,080 -	21,320 -	7,227 2,356	1,379 1,371	10,000 10,556	- -	123,253 -	3,670 -	1967 1968	328,614 87,905	Liberia
Libya	1967 1968	76,503 88,231	26,967 27,320	24,050 -	21,320 23,170	- -	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	1,875 -	- -	4,136 -	1967 1968	166,626 160,474	Libya
Luxembourg	1967 1968	52,496 57,792	26,967 27,320	14,773 15,172	26,640 28,970	7,227 7,170	4,138 4,112	5,000 5,278	1,875 2,259	- -	4,414 5,081	1967 1968	160,211 169,606	Luxembourg
Madagascar	1967 1968	41,996 46,335	26,967 27,320	11,855 12,212	21,320 23,170	7,227 7,170	4,138 4,112	10,000 10,556	1,875 2,259	2,000 2,000	3,670 4,136	1967 1968	140,580 150,238	Madagascar
Malawi	1967 1968	41,996 46,235	26,967 27,320	12,080 11,935	21,320 23,170	7,227 7,170	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	1,875 2,259	- -	- -	1967 1968	127,376 135,706	Malawi
Malaysia	1967 1968	125,991 123,115	44,945 47,188	30,057 36,143	49,920 63,730	7,227 7,170	4,138 4,112	30,000 31,667	5,694 14,663	- -	- -	1967 1968	336,100 368,948	Malaysia
Maldives Islands	1967 1968	- 40,785	- -	- -	21,320 23,170	- -	1,379 1,371	4,583 5,278	- -	1,167 -	- -	1967 1968	28,449 70,604	Maldives Islands
Mali	1967 1968	- 164,734	- 78,553	- 2,917	- 44,490	7,227 2,388	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	6,429 2,259	- -	- -	1967 1968	20,102 324,943	Mali
Malta	1967 1968	41,996 46,235	26,967 27,320	12,080 12,000	21,320 23,170	7,227 7,170	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	- -	3,137 2,237	- -	1967 1968	128,638 135,749	Malta
Mauritania	1967 1968	86,326 -	18,359 44,978	11,986 12,094	21,320 7,350	4,474 -	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	2,656 -	5,977 2,420	- -	1967 1968	159,439 80,801	Mauritania
Mongolia	1967 1968	36,998 45,059	- 16,471	11,880 12,187	21,320 23,170	- -	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	1,875 2,259	- -	- -	1967 1968	78,452 103,775	Mongolia
Morocco	1967 1968	115,491 111,586	31,461 34,770	29,656 30,456	53,290 57,940	7,227 7,170	13,794 13,708	10,000 10,556	3,750 4,519	2,224 2,296	8,725 10,321	1967 1968	308,980 221,710	Morocco
Nepal	1967 1968	41,996 34,314	- -	- 24,080	- 21,320	- -	4,138 4,112	5,000 5,278	636 2,764	- -	- -	1967 1968	61,472 101,334	Nepal
Netherlands	1967 1968	1,165,405 1,340,804	253,938 280,648	309,429 313,040	527,600 573,560	115,071 112,506	20,691 20,563	80,000 84,444	22,500 27,112	21,919 25,359	88,529 103,442	1967 1968	2,953,000 3,270,842	Netherlands
New Zealand	1967 1968	398,968 408,112	105,620 116,729	103,980 105,350	181,190 196,980	22,792 22,060	34,465 34,271	50,000 52,778	- 13,556	2,976 2,989	29,879 35,129	1967 1968	1,049,040 1,122,312	New Zealand
Nicaragua	1967 1968	8,195 35,563	24,405 24,405	- 19,734	21,320 -	- -	4,138 4,112	10,000 10,556	- -	- -	- -	1967 1968	85,921 94,370	Nicaragua
Mexico	1967 1968	850,431 829,877	154,568 154,568	220,782 228,727	214,549 407,200	56,702 38,841	20,691 20,563	50,000 52,778	30,861	3,224 3,224	64,622 75,512	1967 1968	2,065,702 2,020,478	Mexico



MEMBER STATE	YEAR	UNITED NATIONS		ILO	FAO	UNESCO	WHO	ICAO	UPU	ITU	WHO	IMCO	IAEA	YEAR	TOTAL PER YEAR	MEMBER STATE
Niger	1967	41,487	9,343	26,967	11,947	17,490	-	-	1,379	5,000	-	-	-	1967	113,613	Niger
	1968	40,555	11,156	27,320	12,120	23,170	-	-	1,371	5,278	-	-	-	1968	124,956	
Nigeria	1967	-	75,403	43,120	9,670	79,940	11,118	6,897	6,897	20,000	5,857	2,269	13,105	1967	267,379	Nigeria
	1968	178,486	60,385	50,989	64,000	86,910	11,030	6,854	6,854	21,111	6,920	2,272	15,484	1968	504,441	
Norway	1967	461,963	138,214	114,609	108,452	207,840	33,910	13,794	13,794	50,000	13,125	67,682	35,281	1967	1,244,870	Norway
	1968	472,727	153,552	126,664	136,959	225,950	33,090	13,708	13,708	52,778	15,815	85,815	41,352	1968	1,358,410	
Pakistan	1967	441,981	113,111	132,191	-	137,156	25,571	34,485	34,485	30,000	11,250	-	28,928	1967	954,673	Pakistan
	1968	427,670	-	141,975	209,685	126,650	24,818	34,271	34,271	31,667	13,500	7,813	17,041	1968	1,035,070	
Panama	1967	41,996	9,599	-	-	20,626	-	4,138	4,138	5,000	399	24,416	-	1967	106,174	Panama
	1968	-	-	59,844	9,575	-	-	4,112	4,112	5,278	2,259	22,171	501	1968	103,740	
Paraguay	1967	-	22,268	-	-	-	-	4,138	4,138	10,000	-	-	-	1967	36,406	Paraguay
	1968	91,110	-	-	-	2,190	-	4,112	4,112	10,556	1,247	-	-	1968	109,215	
Peru	1967	-	218	56,111	-	-	-	6,897	6,897	20,000	-	-	-	1967	83,226	Peru
	1968	20,000	37,999	-	-	4,470	-	6,854	6,854	21,111	8,314	-	-	1968	98,748	
Philippines	1967	183,735	109,618	83,148	91,786	165,210	16,677	1,379	1,379	10,000	11,250	5,007	27,162	1967	704,972	Philippines
	1968	741,159	123,390	91,893	100,192	179,600	16,545	1,371	1,371	10,556	13,556	-	32,015	1968	1,310,277	
Poland	1967	1,111,647	455,153	280,905	362,562	687,470	79,494	20,691	20,691	30,000	26,251	6,436	120,179	1967	3,180,788	Poland
	1968	1,433,105	497,000	307,967	440,000	747,360	78,865	20,563	20,563	31,667	31,631	7,517	120,278	1968	3,715,953	
Portugal	1967	138,085	47,660	58,428	42,140	13,342	13,794	13,794	13,794	30,000	8,719	-	12,325	1967	364,493	Portugal
	1968	312,620	52,098	59,606	42,140	144,600	13,256	13,708	13,708	31,667	11,297	-	13,254	1968	694,226	
Romania	1967	234,135	109,618	96,631	99,114	165,210	20,568	20,691	20,691	10,000	9,376	2,624	27,438	1967	895,405	Romania
	1968	246,000	123,390	106,795	99,330	179,600	20,466	20,563	20,563	10,556	11,297	3,117	32,066	1968	853,120	
Rwanda	1967	82,781	9,532	26,967	9,676	340	7,227	1,379	1,379	5,000	-	-	-	1967	142,902	Rwanda
	1968	46,235	10,968	27,320	14,391	44,150	7,170	1,371	1,371	5,278	4,134	-	-	1968	161,017	
Saudi Arabia	1967	144,867	21,447	-	-	31,970	7,227	1,379	1,379	10,000	2,436	-	5,297	1967	224,623	Saudi Arabia
	1968	66,192	24,678	-	-	34,760	7,170	1,371	1,371	10,556	-	-	6,204	1968	150,931	
Senegal	1967	-	9,532	27,165	23,909	21,320	7,227	4,138	4,138	10,000	1,875	2,000	3,497	1967	86,754	Senegal
	1968	100	10,919	27,111	23,909	23,170	-	4,112	4,112	10,556	3,748	-	795	1968	104,420	
Sierra Leone	1967	63,329	11,859	27,235	20,651	21,320	7,227	1,379	1,379	5,000	-	-	-	1967	158,000	Sierra Leone
	1968	38,970	8,218	23,311	3,429	19,200	7,170	1,371	1,371	5,278	-	-	-	1968	114,425	
Singapore	1967	-	-	26,967	12,040	21,320	7,227	1,379	1,379	10,000	3,750	-	3,670	1967	86,353	Singapore
	1968	99,788	-	27,320	12,040	23,170	7,170	1,371	1,371	10,556	-	4,000	4,065	1968	189,480	
Somalia	1967	55,420	19,989	51,051	11,884	-	-	1,379	1,379	10,000	3,445	-	-	1967	153,168	Somalia
	1968	46,235	11,127	27,641	12,183	44,490	-	1,371	1,371	10,556	-	-	-	1968	153,603	
South Africa	1967	495,792	-	-	-	36,134	36,134	34,485	34,485	80,000	18,093	-	41,426	1967	705,930	South Africa
	1968	551,559	-	-	-	35,296	35,296	34,271	34,271	84,444	22,593	-	48,585	1968	776,748	
Spain	1967	766,438	228,739	233,713	201,600	346,400	50,031	34,485	34,485	30,000	20,625	9,399	57,821	1967	1,979,251	Spain
	1968	-	257,875	-	207,096	-	49,084	34,271	34,271	31,667	7,728	15,292	-	1968	603,013	
Sudan	1967	168,337	151	26,967	-	-	-	1,379	1,379	10,000	3,750	-	4,380	1967	187,997	Sudan
	1968	116,787	40,849	-	-	26,640	-	1,371	1,371	10,556	-	-	-	1968	223,170	
Sweden	1967	1,322,893	395,578	355,064	349,128	596,880	78,938	20,691	20,691	100,000	30,001	19,599	99,323	1967	3,368,095	Sweden
	1968	1,440,832	444,404	392,410	358,568	648,870	77,210	20,563	20,563	105,556	36,149	23,134	116,819	1968	3,664,315	
Syria	1967	-	19,726	-	14,724	55,610	7,227	1,379	1,379	10,000	3,750	-	4,414	1967	61,220	Syria
	1968	145,710	16,552	54,287	15,124	-	7,170	1,371	1,371	10,557	4,519	4,000	5,170	1968	320,070	
Thailand	1967	146,988	44,945	44,945	29,818	63,950	10,006	4,138	4,138	20,000	7,501	-	11,408	1967	381,648	Thailand
	1968	146,262	49,672	49,672	47,814	69,520	9,927	4,112	4,112	21,111	9,038	-	13,430	1968	420,242	
Togo	1967	41,996	9,532	27,026	11,861	21,320	7,227	1,379	1,379	5,000	3,773	-	-	1967	129,114	Togo
	1968	46,235	10,968	26,566	12,206	23,170	-	1,371	1,371	5,278	2,279	-	-	1968	128,073	
Trinidad and Tobago	1967	41,996	9,532	26,967	11,874	21,320	7,227	1,379	1,379	10,000	1,875	2,082	-	1967	134,252	Trinidad and Tobago
	1968	87,020	10,968	27,320	12,194	23,170	7,170	1,371	1,371	10,556	2,259	2,000	-	1968	184,028	
Tunisia	1967	59,881	16,681	26,967	14,787	26,640	7,227	6,897	6,897	20,000	1,875	2,000	4,213	1967	157,168	Tunisia
	1968	42,235	16,452	27,320	15,109	28,970	7,170	6,854	6,854	21,111	1,698	2,000	4,370	1968	175,289	
Turkey	1967	-	102,350	150,565	76,441	165,210	18,901	20,691	20,691	20,000	11,250	-	27,162	1967	592,649	Turkey
	1968	772,095	181,376	134,115	147,111	179,600	18,751	20,563	20,563	21,111	13,568	4,560	32,015	1968	1,495,467	
Uganda	1967	41,996	7,111	26,967	23,983	21,320	4,216	1,379	1,379	5,000	2,436	-	-	1967	134,408	Uganda
	1968	-	7,112	27,320	84	23,170	-	1,371	1,371	5,278	2,373	-	-	1968	66,708	

MEMBER STATE	YEAR	UNITED NATIONS	ILO	FAO	UNESCO	WHO	ICAO	UPU	ITU	WFO	IMCO	IAEA	YEAR	TOTAL PER YEAR	MEMBER STATE
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	1967 1968	2,801,795 <sup>a/</sup> 1,936,880 <sup>a/</sup>	231,466 293,066	- -	437,717 544,810	- -	- -	20,691 20,563	30,000 31,667	28,908 42,924	- -	156,062 182,982	1967 1968	3,706,639 3,052,892	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1967 1968	11,925,393 <sup>a/</sup> 18,876,716 <sup>a/</sup>	2,283,196 2,483,609	- -	3,317,528 4,123,700	7,087,930 7,699,520	- -	34,485 34,271	300,000 316,667	185,617 275,613	47,967 69,699	1,184,156 1,388,438	1967 1968	26,366,272 35,568,233	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Arab Republic	1967 1968	211,482 377,856	80,900 86,926	71,490 -	61,009 63,311	111,910 115,870	18,901 14,000	20,691 20,563	50,000 52,778	25,868 14,235	6,152 3,076	19,265 -	1967 1968	707,668 748,615	United Arab Republic
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1967 1968	7,569,886 7,415,831	2,053,977 2,270,018	2,259,084 2,536,350	1,993,418 2,046,898	3,426,720 3,719,410	495,307 484,217	34,485 34,271	300,000 316,667	129,377 155,893	90,165 103,016	571,025 670,769	1967 1968	18,923,444 19,753,340	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United Republic of Tanzania	1967 1968	- 95,810	26,967 27,320	9,532 10,968	11,874 12,195	17,410 6,227	7,227 -	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	2,436 2,373	- -	- -	1967 1968	81,825 161,540	United Republic of Tanzania
United States of America	1967 1968	37,536,827 41,062,673	5,618,100 6,209,022	7,604,153 8,749,722	8,847,425 9,085,501	16,627,320 18,075,620	1,738,855 1,725,092	34,485 34,271	300,000 316,667	513,761 619,051	78,185 117,710	2,812,719 3,294,182	1967 1968	81,711,830 89,289,511	United States of America
Upper Volta	1967 1968	- 32,480	51,282 27,030	9,592 9,853	9,878 10,044	21,320 21,320	7,227 6,717	1,379 1,371	5,000 5,278	1,875 2,259	- -	- -	1967 1968	107,553 116,332	Upper Volta
Uruguay	1967 1968	284,358 -	101,652 -	34,890 100	- -	- -	- -	4,138 4,112	10,000 10,556	7,501 -	- -	- -	1967 1968	442,539 14,768	Uruguay
Venezuela	1967 1968	- 524,938	112,362 124,180	157,278 175,488	139,099 142,859	239,820 260,710	32,242 -	4,138 4,112	90,000 31,667	11,250 13,884	- -	1,657 46,510	1967 1968	727,846 1,324,368	Venezuela
Yemen	1967 1968	34,170 34,955	- -	14,566 -	- -	- 21,320	- -	1,379 1,371	10,000 10,556	- -	- -	- -	1967 1968	60,115 68,202	Yemen
Yugoslavia	1967 1968	300,000 540,316	89,889 99,344	112,024 25	98,295 105,699	170,540 185,390	19,457 -	20,691 20,563	10,000 10,556	11,250 13,416	6,316 7,453	28,149 33,067	1967 1968	866,611 1,015,829	Yugoslavia
Zambia	1967 1968	41,996 46,235	26,967 27,320	9,532 10,968	11,371 11,151	21,320 23,170	7,227 7,170	4,138 4,112	10,000 10,556	3,796 4,473	- -	- -	1967 1968	136,347 145,155	Zambia

<sup>a/</sup> In accordance with their announced policies, the Governments of Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have additionally made available for United Nations account during the financial years 1967 and 1968, the equivalent in their national currencies of \$66,515, \$1,977, \$1,907,962, respectively, on account of their assessed share of the appropriations for technical assistance as provided for in part V of the United Nations regular budget.

<sup>b/</sup> Converted from Swiss Franc at the rate of 4.32 Swiss Franc to one United States dollar.

## APPENDIX II

## CASE PAYMENTS MADE BY MEMBER STATES FOR THE FINANCIAL YEARS 1967 AND 1968 TO

MEMBER STATE	YEAR	UNICEF	UNRWA	H.C.F.	General Fund of UNRWA		UNEP	UNEP/UNEP	UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR CHILDREN	YEAR	TOTAL	REMARKS
					World Food Programme	IDA						
Argentina	1967	150,831	5,000	-	1,332	-	2,110	-	-	1967	167,673	
Argentina	1968	-	2,000	-	668	-	-	-	-	1968	2,000	
Algeria	1967	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1967	1,000	
Algeria	1968	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	1,000	
Algeria	1967	200,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1967	200,000	
Algeria	1968	200,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	200,000	
Argentina	1967	99,159	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1967	99,159	
Argentina	1968	111,999	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	111,999	
Australia	1967	922,092	997,741	150,000	300,000	30,000	314,735	225,000	-	1967	2,961,175	
Australia	1968	1,171,315	645,101	201,600	-	-	-	273,000	-	1968	2,090,016	
Austria	1967	625,300	116,768	30,000	-	9,600	106,645	300,000	5,000	1967	1,177,713	
Austria	1968	1,560,770	116,768	20,000	-	5,600	-	106,000	-	1968	1,803,138	
Barbados	1967	7,500	1,000	-	-	-	209	-	-	1967	8,500	
Barbados	1968	-	1,000	-	-	-	1,669	-	-	1968	1,669	
Belgium	1967	1,325,000	200,000	150,000	60,365	10,000	138,078	221,094	50,213	1967	2,095,752	
Belgium	1968	1,325,000	200,000	150,000	119,635	-	-	19,767	69,632	1968	2,095,034	
Bolivia	1967	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1967	30,000	
Bolivia	1968	1,170	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	1,170	
Bolivia	1967	1,170	1,391	500	-	-	1,898	-	-	1967	3,059	
Bolivia	1968	5,600	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	5,600	
Brazil	1967	900,000	62,693	10,000	-	3,400	40,102	-	2,000	1967	1,016,195	
Brazil	1968	107,262	55,141	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	1968	162,403	
Bulgaria	1967	50,000	17,094	-	-	5,000	-	-	12,000	1967	72,094	
Bulgaria	1968	31,010	17,094	-	-	1,000	2,532	-	-	1968	48,104	
Burkina Faso	1967	75,000	56,007	-	-	-	-	-	-	1967	131,007	
Burkina Faso	1968	75,000	47,996	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	122,996	
Burundi	1967	13,130	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1967	13,130	
Burundi	1968	32,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	32,000	
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	1967	150,000	62,000	-	-	-	-	-	1,500	1967	212,000	
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	1968	150,000	62,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	212,000	
Cambodia	1967	10,714	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	1,571	1967	12,714	
Cambodia	1968	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	-	
Cameroon	1967	15,108	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	1967	55,108	
Cameroon	1968	21,854	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	41,854	
Canada	1967	19,965,380	590,128	324,074	2,891,666	27,000	634,268	27,555	23,146	1967	24,097,755	
Canada	1968	-	931,268	324,074	2,891,666	27,000	-	27,555	5,259	1968	4,175,971	
Central African Republic	1967	-	15,275	1,800	1,405	-	-	-	-	1967	16,680	
Central African Republic	1968	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	15,000	
Ceylon	1967	150,000	15,702	-	-	2,100	3,376	-	2,100	1967	171,178	
Ceylon	1968	175,000	11,301	-	-	2,100	-	-	-	1968	188,401	
Chad	1967	103	20,108	-	-	-	1,674	-	-	1967	20,211	
Chad	1968	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	-	
Chile	1967	159,158	120,000	-	47,959	5,000	-	-	-	1967	327,117	
Chile	1968	283,384	120,000	-	27,859	-	-	-	-	1968	403,113	
China	1967	27,000	30,000	5,000	-	5,000	-	5,000	-	1967	67,000	
China	1968	171,000	40,000	5,000	-	5,000	-	-	-	1968	216,000	
Colombia	1967	111,072	119,805	-	-	3,900	9,709	-	-	1967	223,786	
Colombia	1968	109,140	119,805	-	-	-	1,542	-	-	1968	228,945	
Congo (Brazzaville)	1967	3,900	14,486	-	-	-	-	-	-	1967	18,386	
Congo (Brazzaville)	1968	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	-	
Congo (Democratic Republic of)	1967	-	1,300	-	-	1,000	-	-	-	1967	1,300	
Congo (Democratic Republic of)	1968	-	47,280	-	-	1,000	-	-	-	1968	48,580	
Costa Rica	1967	10,000	-	-	1,500	-	-	-	-	1967	11,500	
Costa Rica	1968	6,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	6,500	
Cuba	1967	70,000	70,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	1967	140,000	
Cuba	1968	70,000	70,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	140,000	
Cyprus	1967	14,000	3,018	280	420	280	1,639	140,017	279	1967	154,263	
Cyprus	1968	13,159	3,284	240	-	-	-	139,591	713	1968	150,883	
Czechoslovakia	1967	227,756	69,114	-	-	13,839	-	-	2,000	1967	296,869	
Czechoslovakia	1968	59,016	69,114	-	-	20,533	-	-	69,252	1968	128,130	
Denmark	1967	-	6,934	500	-	-	813	-	-	1967	7,137	
Denmark	1968	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	-	
Dominican Republic	1967	8,222,563	434,442	101,346	964,111	11,200	122,092	120,000	230,311	1967	10,785,116	
Dominican Republic	1968	10,400,000	405,647	202,333	990,869	11,200	-	405,000	133,613	1968	13,441,035	
Ecuador	1967	5,000	-	-	333	-	-	-	-	1967	5,333	
Ecuador	1968	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	15,000	
El Salvador	1967	67,690	16,639	-	334	-	-	280	-	1967	84,329	
El Salvador	1968	91,368	15,871	-	-	-	-	138	-	1968	107,239	
Finland	1967	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	1967	20,000	
Finland	1968	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	-	
France	1967	61,250	18,136	-	-	-	1,689	-	-	1967	80,075	
France	1968	15,136	15,136	-	-	-	-	-	-	1968	30,272	
Germany	1967	500,000	83,333	15,000	-	7,500	86,036	150,000	60,000	1967	746,869	
Germany	1968	1,400,000	220,000	10,000	-	12,000	-	150,000	60,000	1968	1,902,000	







# ANNEX III

## DEVELOPMENT OF NET NATIONAL PRODUCT, POPULATION AND PER CAPITA PRODUCT FOR VARIOUS GROUPS OF COUNTRIES

### A. Countries with 1967 per capita products over \$1,000 (at 1963 prices)

	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967
NNP (\$US1,000 million)	846	863	910	951	984	1,042	1,087	1,156	1,225	1,298	1,347
Population (millions)	611	620	629	637	647	656	665	673	681	689	696
Per capita NNP (\$US)	1,385	1,393	1,448	1,492	1,521	1,588	1,635	1,717	1,797	1,885	1,936
NNP as per cent of world total	73.7	73.2	73.3	72.8	72.3	72.6	72.5	72.1	72.6	72.7	72.0
Population as per cent of world total	22.9	22.9	22.8	22.7	22.6	22.5	22.4	22.2	22.1	21.9	21.7

### B. Countries with 1967 per capita products between \$300 and \$1,000 (at 1963 prices)

	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967
NNP (\$US1,000 million)	122	127	134	146	160	168	179	197	208	224	243
Population (millions)	324	329	334	339	344	349	354	360	366	371	377
Per capita NNP (\$US)	376	385	402	431	465	482	506	547	570	605	645
NNP as per cent of world total	10.6	10.8	10.8	11.2	11.7	11.7	11.9	12.3	12.4	12.5	13.0
Population as per cent of world total	12.2	12.1	12.1	12.0	12.0	11.9	11.9	11.9	11.8	11.8	11.7

### C. Countries with 1967 per capita products below \$300 (at 1963 prices)

	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967
NNP (\$US1,000 million)	180	189	197	209	218	226	235	250	254	264	281
Population (millions)	1,727	1,763	1,799	1,837	1,876	1,915	1,956	1,998	2,045	2,088	2,134
Per capita NNP (\$US)	104	107	110	114	116	118	120	125	124	126	132
NNP as per cent of world total	15.7	16.0	15.9	16.0	16.0	15.7	15.6	15.6	15.0	14.8	15.0
Population as per cent of world total	64.9	65.0	65.1	65.3	65.4	65.6	65.7	65.9	66.1	66.3	66.6

Notes: 1. The national product and per capita data are expressed in constant prices of the year 1963.

2. World total comprises total for all Member States.

3. The three groups into which the Member States are classified (with per capita products over \$1,000, between \$300-\$1,000 and below \$300) are based on 1967 per capita net national product in 1963 prices. It is emphasized that the selection of an earlier year for the determination of this grouping would have led to a different composition of the groups because of the fact that each of the three groups of countries has shown an expansion of per capita products over the ten-year period covered by the table.

#### **HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS**

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

#### **COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

#### **COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.