

*executive committee of
the directing council*



PAN AMERICAN
SANITARY
ORGANIZATION

*working party of
the regional committee*

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



INDEXED

16th Meeting
Washington, D. C.
21-30 April 1952

CEL6/11 (Eng.)
26 March 1952
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Topic 20: FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION OF FRANCE, THE NETHERLANDS AND THE UNITED KINGDOM, ON BEHALF OF THEIR DEPENDENT TERRITORIES IN THE REGION OF THE AMERICAS, IN THE BUDGET OF THE PAN AMERICAN SANITARY BUREAU

Background

The Directing Council at its V Meeting adopted a resolution (XV) modifying the basis for the participation in the meetings of the Council of Member States of the World Health Organization not having their seats of government within the Western Hemisphere. Through this resolution, France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom were granted the right to vote on budget matters of the Pan American Sanitary Organization on behalf of their dependent territories in the Region of the Americas. Since the vote thus granted was made contingent upon equitable contribution being made by the above-mentioned States to the budget of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, the Director submitted to the Directing Council a document (CD5/57) reviewing the action taken up to that time and suggesting a basis for the contributions. As a result of the discussion of document CD5/57, the Directing Council adopted Resolution XL which provides:

"1. To instruct the Director to compute the annual contributions in respect to the territories of France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom in the Western Hemisphere, on the following basis:

- "a) for each group of territories select the Member State whose capacity-to-pay is most comparable to that of the group;
- "b) divide the amount assessed the most comparable Member State by its total population;
- "c) multiply the per capita assessment of the most comparable Member State (derived in step b) by the total population of the respective groups of territories, the resulting sum being the amount of the contribution for the group.

"2. To instruct the Director to consult each Representative State in the selection of the Member State whose capacity-to-pay is most comparable to the group of territories which it represents.

"3. To instruct the Director to inform the Executive Committee annually of the manner in which the most comparable Member State was selected."

In compliance with Resolution XL, the Director wishes to inform the Executive Committee of the results of the computation made to determine the Member Country most comparable to each group of territories.

Report

Numerous statistical publications were consulted, data was furnished by the International Monetary Fund, and discussions were held with officers of the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the Pan American Union.

The factors used in arriving at comparability were population, area per square kilometer, government revenue, exports, imports, and usable land. No one country was, of course, found to be exactly comparable in the various factors, so for each case the nearest figures were used. In no case was the same Member Country closest in comparability in all the factors used. It was necessary, therefore, to select the Member Country having approximate comparability in the highest number of factors.

The most nearly comparable Member Country for the French territories was Panama, and the amount of the contribution \$3,462. For the Netherland territories, the Member Country was Cuba, and the contribution \$1,821.

In the case of the territories of the United Kingdom two countries, Ecuador and Uruguay, emerged in an equal number of factors. The factors showing comparability with Ecuador were non-financial in nature, whereas the comparability with Uruguay showed close similarity in the financial aspects. The selection of Ecuador left reasonable doubt as to whether the comparability was in keeping with the resolution of the Directing Council, which provides that the criterion should be one of ability to pay. The selection of Uruguay raised the question as to whether it was clearly more comparable than Ecuador since both countries were comparable in an equal number of factors. In the case of Ecuador the contribution in behalf of the United Kingdom territories would be \$6,552, and with the selection of Uruguay the amount would be \$21,340.

Letters have been addressed to the respective Governments informing them of the results of the computation and the amounts arrived at as a basis for consultation in accordance with paragraph 2 of the Resolution under reference. With respect to the United Kingdom, the final decision as to the amount of the contribution was left open for discussion in view of the circumstances. A schedule of the results follows:

SCHEDULE OF COMPARISON

	Popula- tion	Area (Sq.Kil.)	Government Revenue	Exports	Imports	Usable Land (Hectares)	Government Assessment or Contribution
France	578,000	94,322	\$ 4,600,000	\$43,100,000	\$67,000,000	7,225	\$3,462
Panama	746,000	74,000	\$33,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$63,600,000	Not Available	\$4,470
Netherlands	336,000	143,769	\$41,000,000	\$420,920,000	\$480,140,000	9,496	\$1,821
Cuba	5,162,000	114,000	\$224,000,000	\$709,500,000	\$527,000,000	8,892	\$27,989
United Kingdom	3,120,000	282,300	\$89,217,300	\$228,582,000	\$333,180,000	24,641	(\$6,552 Ecuador)
Ecuador	3,124,000	275,000	\$28,490,000	\$46,100,000	\$ 49,700,000	24,773	(\$21,340 Uruguay)
Uruguay	2,329,000	186,926	\$128,390,000	\$179,000,000	\$200,400,000	14,736	\$6,997
							\$15,938