

that the one-third ceiling and the per capita ceiling should both apply in normal times. This demonstrates that the per capita principle was adopted as a means of achieving an equitable relationship between the United States contribution and those of other members. However, under the Committee on Contributions' new interpretation, Canada's per capita contribution not only continues at a higher level than the United States per capita contribution but the disparity would be widened.

My Government also regrets that it must disagree with the Committee on Contributions on another point. The Committee observes - in paragraph 16 of its Report - that unless there are reasons other than economic which, in the view of the General Assembly would justify the per capita ceiling principle this criterion of assessment should be reconsidered. The Committee justifies this observation on the grounds that differences in the growth of national populations will increase the number of members subject to the per capita principle and result in an automatic shift of the burdens - other things being equal - from countries with high per capita incomes to countries in the middle or low per capita income groups. However, the United Nations' own estimates of population growth show that this is unlikely to occur. Barring a drastic shift in relative national incomes or a change in rates of population growth that would invalidate current United Nations population projections, the only members that will be affected by the principle during the next 25 years are Canada, New Zealand and Sweden - the same countries that are now protected by the principle. Furthermore, since the populations of Canada and New Zealand are growing more rapidly than that of the United States, the per capita contributions of these countries will be reduced to the level of the United States approximately by 1970. If new members are admitted, these processes will be accelerated.

Another important consideration is that an Assembly decision to abandon the per capita principle would mean that Canada would be the only member to be assessed on the basis of its full national income. It is a strongly held Canadian view that the practice of granting exemptions of up to 50 per cent in the assessable incomes of all members with a per capita income of less than \$1,000 a year, the one-third ceiling and the per capita principle are designed to apportion the Organization's expenses in a manner that will receive the widest measure of support. Working within this framework for the past six years, the Committee on Contributions has gradually removed maladjustments with a view to adopting a three-year scale as envisaged in its original terms of reference. The abandonment of any of the basic principles of assessment at this late stage would only lead to further delays before the United Nations can achieve its objective of a more permanent scale.

For these reasons, my delegation believes that it would be fully justified in requesting this Assembly to reject the Committee on Contributions' interpretation of the per capita principle and asking them to draft a new scale based on the seventh assembly decision.