

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 712th
MEETING**

Saturday, 10 December 1960,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

<i>Agenda items 28, 30, 31 and 32:</i>	
<i>Progress and operations of the Special Fund (continued)</i>	
<i>Programmes of technical assistance:</i>	
(a) <i>Report of the Economic and Social Council: (continued);</i>	
(b) <i>United Nations assistance in public administration: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Opportunities for international co-operation on behalf of former Trust Territories and other newly independent States: reports of the Economic and Social Council and of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Question of assistance to Libya: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued).....</i>	415

Chairman: Mr. Janez STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEMS 28, 30, 31 AND 32

Progress and operations of the Special Fund (A/4415, A/4491, E/3398, E/3401 and Corr.1, SF/L.24 and Corr.1) (continued)

Programmes of technical assistance:

- (a) Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/4415) (continued);
- (b) United Nations assistance in public administration: report of the Secretary-General (A/4589, E/3370 and Corr.1) (continued)

Opportunities for international co-operation on behalf of former Trust Territories and other newly independent States: reports of the Economic and Social Council and of the Secretary-General (A/4415, A/4585) (continued)

Question of assistance to Libya: report of the Secretary-General (A/4575, A/4576) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.529 AND CORR.1) (continued)

1. Mr. HERZI (Somalia) said that, as a recipient of United Nations technical assistance, his country was gratified that technical assistance services to African countries were to be increased without any curtailment of assistance to other countries. The needs of new States were particularly urgent, and it was clearly impossible to meet the present immense demand for technical assistance with the funds available. His delegation would therefore support the draft resolution on contributions to the Special Fund and to

the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance (A/C.2/L.529 and Corr.1).

2. Mr. KAKITSUBO (Japan) said that his Government was in sympathy with the purpose of the draft resolution and recognized the urgent need for increasing the resources of the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund. Japan would triple its contribution to the two programmes in 1961. With regard to operative paragraph 2, however, he doubted the practical value of a target of \$150 million coupled with a fixed time-limit. Despite considerable efforts by the participating countries, the original target of \$100 million had not yet been reached and any future target should be set in the light of that fact. The draft also proposed separate targets for the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund but he thought that, in view of the voluntary nature of the programmes, contributing countries should be free to decide the ratio of their contributions to the respective programmes. His delegation would therefore support the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.2/L.539), which adopted a more realistic approach, and would also support the draft resolution if that amendment was incorporated.

3. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation shared the views expressed at the previous meeting by the representatives of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR. His country's contribution to the two programmes had not been fully utilized and he hoped that the situation would be rectified. When his delegation and that of Bulgaria had pressed an amendment at the previous session urging the Managing Director of the Special Fund to ensure the full utilization of all contributions,^{1/} many delegations had considered that move to be premature and unjustified, but subsequent developments had demonstrated the need for such a recommendation.

4. He noted with regret that the administrative costs of the Special Fund were out of all proportion to the limited scope of its activities. There had been a considerable increase in the administrative staff, and expenditure had risen from \$20,000 to about \$250,000. His delegation therefore supported the Ghanaian representative's suggestion that steps should be taken to effect substantial economies in the Fund's administrative budget. He failed to see the need for the extensive background information mentioned in annex A of the Managing Director's annual report (SF/L.28/Rev.1 and Corr.1) and believed that recipient Governments should not be burdened with the unnecessary task of furnishing it. The Special Fund's administration should also take into consideration the suggestion made by some under-developed countries that less emphasis should be placed on pre-investment

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 29, document A/4245, para. 5.

activities. The funds allotted for such activities had been increased by 40 per cent, a tendency which his delegation considered unwise.

5. Mr. APODACA (Mexico) said that his delegation would support the draft resolution and was in agreement with the amendments submitted by the United States and Argentine delegations. He regretted that his country could not undertake to increase the pledge to the Expanded Programme or Special Fund it had announced at the Pledging Conference.

6. Mr. SIRIWARDENE (Ceylon) said his Government recognized the importance of the work of the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund and had increased its contributions to the two programmes. Any acceleration of that work would require a corresponding increase in funds and his delegation agreed with the draft resolution on all counts. Although the United States amendment had been accepted by the representative of India on behalf of the sponsors of the draft (711th meeting), he hoped that the targets would be reached within the period specified in the original text.

7. Mr. SAMUEL (India) said that the sponsors were prepared to accept the Argentine amendment (A/C.2/L.545) but could not agree to the Brazilian amendment (A/C.2/L.544). The two programmes were designed for different purposes and they should have separate target figures; the Special Fund, which dealt with larger projects, should receive an appropriate share of the increased fund. The Byelorussian amendment (A/C.2/L.546) had not been incorporated and his delegation would vote against it for the reasons he had stated at the previous meeting. As the views of the sponsors had differed on two of the three amendments, they would vote on them according to their convictions.

8. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands) said that as an active participant of the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund and a member of their governing bodies, his country was entirely satisfied with the manner in which the two programmes were administered. In his address to the General Assembly (886th plenary meeting), the Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs had proposed that the target figure for contributions to the two programmes should be increased to \$125 million, and the Netherlands delegation was glad to be a sponsor of the draft resolution. He would vote against the Byelorussian amendment, since it had political implications which could not properly be discussed in the Second Committee. He would abstain on the Brazilian amendment, as he preferred separate target figures for the two programmes. He wished to correct the mistaken belief that the separate target figures in the resolution meant that Governments would have to contribute to the two programmes in the ratio of 2:1. That was not so. Governments were free to apportion their contributions as they wished, or to pledge a single contribution to be apportioned on subsequent instructions.

9. Mr. ERHARDT DEL CAMPO (Argentina) withdrew his amendment (A/C.2/L.545), as it had been incorporated in the draft.

10. Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil) said that he would maintain his amendment, and requested a vote by roll-call.

11. Mr. ERROCK (United Kingdom) stated that he wished to maintain his amendment, as modified at the

previous meeting, since he believed it would facilitate the resolution's unanimous adoption.

12. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he would maintain his amendment. Offered contributions had in fact been rejected and the adoption of his amendment would be in the interests of the under-developed countries.

13. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution because he believed that Governments should be informed of the increasing scope and financial needs of the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme, but that some kind of relative priority should be established for the two programmes. He therefore could not accept the Brazilian amendment.

14. Mr. HAJOUJI (Morocco) wished to express his country's appreciation to the Managing Director of the Special Fund for its generous response to Morocco's requests for assistance in the establishment of a civil aviation training school and the economic development of the Rif region. The Fund had contributed \$702,800 to the latter project, which figured largely in his Government's present five-year economic development plan. Soil erosion was a major problem in the western Rif, which covered an area of 1,800,000 hectares and had a population of about one million, and measures were urgently needed to conserve the soil, reduce unemployment and increase production. The project would enable Moroccans to receive training and gain valuable experience. His delegation would therefore support the draft resolution, which was entirely in accordance with the interests of countries like his own, and hoped that every effort would be made to provide the Special Fund with sufficient resources for the successful accomplishment of its task.

15. Mr. FLERE (Yugoslavia) agreed with other delegations that a substantial increase in the funds available for United Nations technical assistance programmes was essential in order to achieve one of the basic objectives of the United Nations. His delegation therefore attached great importance to the draft resolution. He could not agree to the United Kingdom amendment. He also would not support the Brazilian amendment, since he believed that there were real advantages in setting separate target figures for the two programmes, as had been indicated by the Managing Director of the Fund and the Executive Chairman of TAB (694th meeting). He wished to emphasize that there was no question of the compulsory apportionment of contributions between the two programmes. His delegation's attitude to the substance of the Byelorussian amendment remained unchanged.

16. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, which it regarded as constructive. It felt that the establishment of targets was a safeguard against complacency and hoped that contributions to the two programmes would continue to increase and would be made in convertible currencies. He would have welcomed a more extensive explanation of the Brazilian amendment (A/C.2/L.544), and in that connexion, he would ask the Secretariat to comment on its interpretation of the wording proposed in the amendment and its views on the difficulties, if any, that the adoption of the amendment would create in the operation of the two programmes. Pending such an explanation, his

delegation considered that the adoption of separate targets for the programmes would be an expression of the Assembly's confidence in the continued growth of both. It would support the view of the United Kingdom amendment taken by the sponsors of the draft resolution and would abstain on the Byelorussian amendment, which introduced a political question, although it hoped that the United Nations would one day become a truly universal body.

17. Mr. OMEISH (Libya) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution and wished to announce that his Government had decided to increase its contribution to both programmes by 25 per cent.

18. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that the adoption of the Byelorussian amendment would have the effect of modifying the Special Fund's statute, since the resolution under which the Fund had been established provided that participation in it should be open to States Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies. Moreover, the issue raised by the amendment was a political matter, which should not be taken up by the Second Committee.

19. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that his delegation was in full agreement with the purpose of the draft resolution, which was to raise the target for contributions to the two programmes, and was grateful to the sponsors for accepting its amendment. In its view, the amended draft no longer envisaged any specific year for the attainment of the target. His Government could not make a commitment to increase its contribution or to guarantee any matching pledge it might be called on to make in the future. His delegation would vote in favour of the Brazilian amendment, because it considered that the question of the division of their contributions should be left to the judgement of Governments. It would oppose the Byelorussian amendment for the reasons given by the Netherlands and the Italian representatives, and would be unable to support the draft resolution if the amendment were adopted.

20. Mr. ABDEL-GHANI (United Arab Republic) said that although his Government had for the last three years made its contribution to the two programmes in the proportion recommended in the draft resolution, it would vote in favour of the Brazilian amendment as an expression of its support for both programmes.

21. Mr. DANGEARD (France) considered that it would be unwise to take a decision on the division of contributions between the two programmes—particularly in the very unequal proportions recommended in the draft resolution—without a thorough discussion of the substance of the question and a comparison of the needs of the two programmes with the resources now available to them. For those reasons, it would vote in favour of the Brazilian amendment. It would also support the United Kingdom amendment, which seemed a more logical approach to the question of targets, and against the Byelorussian amendment, which was not a matter for the Second Committee to decide.

22. Mr. MAHDAVI (Iran) said that his delegation would be unable to support the amendment of the Byelorussian SSR for legal reasons. General Assembly resolution 1240 (XIII), under which the Special Fund had been established, provided in paragraph 7 of part B that participation in the Special Fund should be open to any States Members of the United Nations

or members of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The representative of Italy had also referred to that resolution. His delegation would also be unable to support the United Kingdom amendment in view of the provision in paragraph 1 (a) in part B of resolution 1240 (XIII) that the Special Fund should be a separate fund. The same objection would apply to the Brazilian amendment. However, his delegation would in any case support the draft resolution as a whole.

23. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), referring to the legal objections to his delegation's amendment put forward by some representatives, said that Council resolution 222 (IX), under which the Expanded Programme had been established, specifically stated that all States might participate in the Programme, although the provision had been ignored after the resolution's adoption. The delegations which did not wish all States to contribute to the two programmes should say so plainly, without falling back on legal arguments of doubtful validity.

24. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation attached great importance to the Byelorussian amendment for reasons of principle. It continued to feel that all countries which were ready and able to contribute to the programmes should be allowed to do so, and that, in view of the sharply increased need for assistance, it was high time to put an end to the discriminatory practice of excluding certain States. His delegation regretted that a number of representatives who, during the discussion of the proposed capital development fund, had expressed their desire for an increase in assistance from all sources, were now taking a different position. The rules under which the programmes operated allowed them to accept contributions from all sources, even private groups and individuals; there was therefore no reason to bar contributions from such countries as the German Democratic Republic, which wished to foster the development of the underdeveloped countries. His delegation would therefore support the Byelorussian amendment.

25. Mr. ERROCK (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would vote against the Byelorussian amendment for the reasons given by the Italian representative and also because article 13 of Council resolution 222 A (IX), which the Byelorussian representative had cited in support of his argument, made it clear that the intent of that resolution had been to limit participation in the Expanded Programme to Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies. Moreover, the amendment was exclusively political in character, as the Byelorussian representative himself had made clear.

26. The CHAIRMAN appealed to members to confine themselves to the matter immediately before the Committee.

27. Mr. FRANZI (Italy), exercising his right of reply, said that the question he had raised in his earlier statement had been juridical and not political.

28. Mr. SULE (Nigeria) said that his delegation had decided to abstain on the Byelorussian amendment because of the technical and political difficulties it raised, although it would like to see many more countries contributing to the two programmes than were now doing so. His delegation would prefer that the targets for contributions to the two programmes

should be given separately in the draft resolution, and felt that such a separation would in no way constitute pressure on States to divide their contributions in any fixed proportion. However, it would abstain in the vote on the United Kingdom and Brazilian amendment in the hope that the principle involved would be unanimously accepted at some future date. It hoped, in any case, that the draft resolution as a whole would receive unanimous support.

29. Mr. GEORGIEV (Bulgaria) said it was his delegation's view that the legal arguments put forward against the Byelorussian amendment were without foundation, since the rules for the organization of the two programmes had been established by the General Assembly and could be modified by the Assembly at will. His delegation would accordingly support the Byelorussian amendment.

30. Mr. HOFFMAN (Managing Director, Special Fund), replying to the Sudanese representative's questions, said that he and the Executive Chairman of TAB felt that it was inappropriate for any members of the Secretariat to advise Governments as to whether the targets for contributions to the two programmes should be kept separate or combined.

At the request of the United States representative, a vote on the Byelorussian amendment (A/C.2/L.546) was taken by roll-call.

Cambodia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Cambodia, Ceylon, Chad, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Poland, Romania, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: Canada, Chile, China, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

Abstaining: Cameroun, Central African Republic, Gabon, India, Israel, Liberia, Nepal, Nigeria, Portugal, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, United Arab Republic, Afghanistan, Burma.

The Byelorussian amendment was rejected by 40 votes to 23, with 16 abstentions.

The United Kingdom amendment (A/C.2/L.539), as further amended, was rejected by 25 votes to 16, with 35 abstentions.

At the request of the Brazilian representative, a vote was taken by roll-call on the Brazilian amendment (A/C.2/L.544).

Cameroun, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Gabon, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain,

Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

Against: Cameroun, Central African Republic, Chad, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan.

Abstaining: Ceylon, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia.

The Brazilian amendment was adopted by 34 votes to 14, with 31 abstentions.

31. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 2, as amended.

Operative paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted by 67 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole (A/C.2/L.529 and Corr.1), as amended, was adopted by 75 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

32. Mr. HARLAND (New Zealand) explained that he had voted for the joint draft resolution as a whole as a recognition that increased resources would be required for the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund if the needs for assistance under these programmes were to be met. His delegation had acknowledged this in its general statement (695th meeting) and had announced that the New Zealand contributions to the two programmes would be increased in 1961 by 50 per cent, two-thirds to go to EPTA and one-third to the Special Fund.

33. He had also voted for the United Kingdom amendment, and regretted that it had not been accepted, because it would have made the draft resolution more realistic. He assumed that the resolution as adopted would entail no commitments by Governments as to the amount, timing and division of their contributions to the two programmes. In any case, the New Zealand delegation could undertake no such commitment. The needs of the less developed countries would, however, be taken fully into account in determining the level of future New Zealand contributions.

34. Miss HARELI (Israel) said that she had voted against the United Kingdom amendment because her delegation, while agreeing that the target figure should be \$150 million, nevertheless felt that it should be fixed now rather than in 1961. She had voted for the Brazilian amendment on the grounds that a joint target was more likely to facilitate an increase in the resources contributed to the two programmes and also because the time was not yet ripe for deciding in what proportions the joint amount should be split up.

35. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he had voted for the joint draft resolution on the understanding that it involved no kind of financial commitment. The Soviet Union had always advocated the principle of voluntary contributions and felt that the figure of \$150 million was not to be taken as a compulsory target for whose attain-

ment contributions would have to be correspondingly increased. He regretted that the Byelorussian amendment had been rejected and that certain countries were still maintaining an unjustified attitude of discrimination against the proposal to increase the total funds available by allowing some countries, who were quite willing to do so, to contribute.

36. Mr. ERROCK (United Kingdom) wished to explain why he had abstained on the joint draft resolution as a whole. The Committee either had adopted a resolution which constituted an airy appeal to goodwill which was, in any case, not lacking, or it had adopted a resolution which, strictly interpreted, would represent a firm commitment to increase contributions made at the next Pledging Conference by 50 per cent. At the moment, few delegations contributed sums corresponding to their quota of the United Nations budget. The United Kingdom was the second largest contributor to both programmes and had increased its voluntary contribution to a point where it represented 8.8 per cent of the total sum pledged and exceeded, proportionately, the United Kingdom quota of the United Nations budget. However, the unofficial target of \$100 million set for the current year had not been reached and in view of the attitude of certain large industrialized countries it would probably not be reached the following year. It was unrealistic to fix an even higher target when the current target was not yet in sight. The United Kingdom would continue enthusiastically to support the two programmes to the best of its ability.

37. Mr. DEWULF (Belgium) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of the Brazilian amendment because the establishment of a joint target would allow more flexibility to Governments, and in favour of the United Kingdom amendment because it was more realistic. Although the United Kingdom amendment had not been included, he had voted for the draft resolution as a whole on the understanding that the target figure was intended only as a guide to Governments and did not involve a definite financial commitment. His delegation hoped that the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund would continue to bring increased assistance to the under-developed countries.

38. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it believed that a target might well encourage Governments to increase their contributions. He regretted, however, that the United Kingdom amendment had not been adopted, for it was unrealistic to anticipate a further increase in the target when seventy-four Member States still did not make contributions to the programmes corresponding to their share in the United Nations budget. The general responsibility of Member States for the two programmes was still not fully realized. If all Member States had made contributions corresponding to their share in the United Nations budget, the current figure of \$100 million would have been exceeded.

39. His support for the draft resolution did not constitute any present engagement by the Italian Government to increase its contribution for 1962.

40. Mr. ROBERTSON (Australia) explained that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because the setting of a new target for the two voluntary programmes could be considered as helpful. His vote,

however, in no way committed the Australian Government to any particular course of action with regard to the international aid section of its budget. He had also voted in favour of the United Kingdom amendment as constituting a more appropriate approach, given the fact that the current target had not been reached. Finally, he had cast an affirmative vote for the Brazilian amendment because the original form of the second operative paragraph, notwithstanding the arguments put forward by the Netherlands representative, implied some derogation from the sovereign right of Governments to decide in what manner their contributions should be divided. In addition, the rigidity of the 2 to 1 ratio tended to prejudice the future relative demands on the resources of the two programmes.

41. Mr. DOE (Liberia) said that his Government had been glad both to contribute to and receive assistance from the two programmes. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and was particularly appreciative of the fact that the recent Pledging Conference had been so successful. He had abstained on the Byelorussian amendment because his delegation preferred to remain neutral in the political issue involved.

42. Mr. SHAIKH (Pakistan) said that his country had benefited from the two programmes and believed that their importance could not be over-stated. His delegation was only too well aware of the restrictions that had had to be applied through lack of funds. The world could not live in peace if three-quarters of mankind were living in hunger and misery. It was a truism to state that either the economic level of the under-developed countries must rise or the forces of gravity would pull the world down into chaos. The developed countries had revealed their foresight and wisdom in increasing their contributions to the two programmes and their support of the draft resolution further testified to their awareness of the problem. The adoption of the draft resolution was a step in the right direction but of course the real results would depend on its actual implementation.

43. Mr. ZENKER (Austria) said that his delegation had been glad to vote for the draft resolution. Although Austria had increased its contribution to both programmes for 1961 and although its contribution was proportionate to its quota of the United Nations budget, it did not interpret the adoption of the draft resolution as imposing an additional financial commitment on Governments.

44. Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Chile) explained that in voting for the draft resolution he had not committed his Government to increasing its next contribution. In spite of the earthquake disasters, Chile had contributed at the last Pledging Conference a sum equivalent to \$220,000, which represented an increase of \$40,000 as compared with its 1959 pledge. While not committing itself at the present stage, Chile hoped that its contribution would be still further increased.

45. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that he had abstained on the Brazilian and United Kingdom amendments because he felt that Member States should remain free to contribute as much as they could and to state how their contributions should be divided between the two programmes. His affirmative vote on the draft resolution as a whole should not be interpreted as a financial commitment.

46. Mr. GARCIA TEJEDOR (Spain) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution but viewed it as a mere indication of the target to be aimed which did not compel Governments to increase their contributions. Spain would consider such an increase at a later stage. He had also voted in favour of the Brazilian amendment because it would make for greater flexibility and because, as the Italian representative had pointed out, the question of the proportion in which the funds should be divided between the two programmes required further study. His delegation recognized the validity and realistic aim of the United Kingdom amendment but, as the original draft resolution fixed an ideal rather than a rigid target, he had preferred to abstain on that amendment.

47. Mr. KAKITSUBO (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained during the separate vote on operative paragraph 2 as well as on the draft resolution as a whole because it could not accept the target figure of \$150 million. Japan understood the need for increasing contributions but his Government, which had considerably increased its 1960 pledge, could not commit itself to making another radical increase in the immediate future. It had abstained on the Brazilian amendment because, while approving the idea of a joint target, it did not agree with the actual target figure.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.