

formed the subject of separate correspondence¹⁹¹ and it does not, of course, concern the other matters of UNRRA.

6. It was arranged by private negotiation between the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada on the one hand and the U.S.S.R. on the other that the U.S.S.R. should withdraw its request for \$700,000,000, which would be replaced by two requests from the Ukrainian and Byelo Russian Republics for \$125,000,000 each. After taking these into account, the smallest sum with which UNRRA could be expected to complete its work on an unambitious scale appeared to be an equivalent of the first contribution, namely 1% of the national income of those countries which could afford such a contribution and smaller contributions by other countries. The recommendation providing for these funds was formulated by consultation among the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada. The United Kingdom was very reluctant to make so large a contribution but was under some pressure from the United States to do so on the ground that a Congressional vote would be hard to obtain if the United States were bearing more than 75% of the total cost of UNRRA. It was an unfortunate coincidence that this pressure on the United Kingdom to contribute, if not foreign exchange, at least goods and services which could easily be converted into foreign exchange, came at a time when Lend-Lease shipments were terminated. However, the United Kingdom did agree to the larger contribution largely because it was recognized that even on a country-to-country basis (supposing that UNRRA came to an end), the United Kingdom would have to contribute a very large sum. The Canadian contribution was made conditional on contributions by the United Kingdom, the United States and other countries, and the attention of UNRRA was called to the fact that, if the assumption of relief burdens in Italy were to be postponed, the Canadian Government might have to deduct from its contribution to UNRRA whatever sums it was compelled to pay for relief in Italy after the termination of military relief there. It was rather disappointing that no fourth country was in a position to promise, even conditionally, a contribution of 1%. The Australians and New Zealanders, who did not participate in the debate, hoped that such a contribution might be authorized by their Governments but felt that it would be extremely difficult to make it because they had no foreign exchange available and it was difficult to find commodities acceptable to UNRRA. A large number of countries, most of them Latin-American, explained that they would do their best, although they thought it very unlikely that they would be in a position to make so large a contribution as 1%. It should, perhaps, be added that the United States in pledging 1% insisted on choosing the same base year as before, thereby saving \$200,000,000. The reason for this choice was not an inability to make the same percentage contribution as other countries but the belief that Congress could be persuaded to repeat its former contribution but could not be persuaded to enlarge it merely because the national income had increased.

¹⁹¹Voir les documents 1134 à 1136.

See Documents 1134 to 1136.