

United Nations
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

Nations Unies
CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

UNRESTRICTED

E/ICEF/SR.60
28 November 1949

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDRENS EMERGENCY FUND

EXECUTIVE BOARD

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTIETH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,
on Friday, 4 November 1949, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Report of Programme Committee Session held 2-3 November 1949

(Summary of recommendations; E/ICEF/W.72; E/ICEF/W.83; E/ICEF/W.85;
E/ICEF/W.73/Add.3)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Dr. RAJCEMAN	Poland
<u>Members:</u>	(Absent)	Argentina
	Mr. JOCKEL	Australia
	Mr. ALMEIDA	Brazil
	(Absent)	Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic
	Mrs. SINCLAIR	Canada
	Mr. TSAO	China
	Mr. CARRIZOSA	Colombia
	Mr. NCSEK	Czechoslovakia
	Mrs. WRIGHT	Denmark
	Mr. CORREA	Ecuador
	Mr. AUJALEU	France
	Mr. THEODOROPULOS	Greece
	Mrs. AL-KHOJA	Iraq
	Baron van HEEMSTRA	Netherlands
	Mr. SUTCH	New Zealand
	Mr. NORD	Norway
	Mr. JOSE ENCINAS	Peru
	Mr. WOLLIN	Sweden
	Mr. WAGNIERE	Switzerland
	(Absent)	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
	Mr. HAHN	Union of South Africa
	Mr. KOBUSHKO	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. LEDWARD	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Members: Miss LENROOT)
(Cont'd) later Mr. L. HYDE) United States of America

Mr. LEVI Yugoslavia

Also present: Mr. McDOUGALL Food and Agriculture Organization

REPORT OF PROGRAMME COMMITTEE SESSION HELD 2-3 NOVEMBER 1949 (SUMMARY
OF RECOMMENDATIONS (E/ICEF/W.72, E/ICEF/W.83, E/ICEF/W.85, E/ICEF/W.73/Add.3))

1. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) asked whether the Chairman of the Programme Committee could begin her summary of the Committee's recommendations with the question of the new allocations.

2. Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada), Chairman of the Programme Committee, said that the new allocations were dealt with in paragraph C of the summary report. They were based on the Executive Director's recommendations, contained in document E/ICEF/W.85. Since the first allocation recommended was 1,000,000 dollars for the Children's Centre in Paris, conditional upon approval by the Executive Board of an agreement with the French Government regarding the Centre, she suggested that she should deal first with the other allocations.

3. The new allocations recommended had been made possible by additional resources which had recently become available. The first was 1,000,000 dollars for the programme in the Middle East, conditional upon continuing support for the UNRPR by the General Assembly. The second was 4,000,000 dollars for Europe, to extend the feeding programme for a further two months. The third was 2,000,000 dollars for the total Asiatic programme, not broken down into countries. The fourth differed from the Executive Director's proposal in recommending a total of 840,000 dollars rather than 500,000 dollars for Latin America. In making that change, the Programme Committee had adopted an amendment submitted by the representative of Ecuador. The increase of 340,000 dollars represented the amount allocated for the emergency programme in Ecuador, since it had been felt that that sum should not be deducted from the Latin American allocation. The Executive Director's recommendation of 800,000 dollars for freight charges on the new allocations had been accepted by the Committee. The total recommended allocation had thus been increased to 9,640,000 dollars and the balance of the unallocated reserve reduced to 547,000 dollars.

4. Mr. ALMEIDA (Brazil) thanked the Chairman of the Programme Committee for her summary but felt that it was not possible to vote on the new allocations at that meeting. The Brazilian delegation had assumed that the Programme Committee would make substantial changes in the recommendations in E/ICEF/W.85 and had not therefore given particular consideration to the contents of that document. Contrary to the expectations of his delegation, the new allocations did not give priority to countries outside Europe. He wished therefore to submit certain amendments to those recommendations and requested that the vote on the new allocations should be postponed.

5. His first reaction to the Programme Committee's recommendations had been one of surprise and disappointment. The original purpose of the Fund had been relief for the children of war-devastated Europe and secondarily the improvement of child health in general. In the first stages, its operations had been concentrated in Europe. Prompt action in the face of war damage had given quick results. The Fund's attention should now be directed elsewhere. In its third year of operations it should extend help to Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America, as well as Europe. The criterion should be the maximization of child welfare throughout the world.

6. It had been agreed at the seventh session of the Economic and Social Council that the Fund should in future give priority to areas outside Europe. The proportion of the total resources available to be allocated to Europe should have been progressively reduced to 30 per cent. In spite of that decision, however, Europe, excluding Germany, had received 47 per cent of the total, while only 3.6 per cent had been allocated to Latin America.

7. The Brazilian representative had protested against that situation at the meeting of the Executive Board in Paris and the evidence he had given there had not been refuted. The current situation in Latin America and in Asia was worse than in Europe. The stage of diminishing returns had been reached in Europe and effort expended in the under-developed countries would yield a proportionately greater profit. Conditions in Europe had improved greatly since the war. Evidence had been given that the Far East and Latin America had great need of assistance. He was not suggesting that aid to European children should be cut off, but he did object to any increase over the 30 per cent allocated to Europe in the target budget. If the 1,000,000 dollars proposed for the Paris Centre was added to the 4,000,000 allocated to Europe, it would be seen that that continent was receiving 52 per cent of the new funds available. Latin America was to receive 500,000 dollars, or less than 5 per cent. The

/extra

extra allocation of 340,000 dollars was for the emergency in Ecuador and should be left out of the reckoning. It was impossible to claim that areas outside Europe were receiving the priority that the Executive Board had decided they should be granted, and his delegation was unable to accept the new pattern of allocations proposed. He proposed therefore that the vote on the recommended allocations should be postponed for at least twenty-four hours, to enable delegations to submit amendments.

8. Miss LENROOT (United States of America) sympathized with the Brazilian representative's desire to see more funds allocated to the under-developed areas. There was, however, already an unprogrammed balance of more than 1,000,000 dollars allocated to Latin America, and although it was possible that it would soon be used, the question of any further increase needed careful consideration in view of the fact that the Fund's resources were limited. She was unwilling to see existing programmes discontinued in order to increase the balance available for future programmes. The Administration stated that the money for Europe was to be used to continue the feeding programme; she would like to know whether the supplementary bloc allocation proposed was also required for the continuation of existing services.

9. Mr. HEYWARD (Deputy Director, ICEF) said that the bloc allocation was needed to continue current operations. Part was to be spent on foods other than milk and fats, part on streptomycin, part on penicillin for the VD programmes and the remainder on further medical supplies.

10. Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the allocation of 4,000,000 dollars to Europe and on the supplementary allocation. That abstention had been consistent with its earlier attitude on the Executive Board. He did not consider that the statistical evidence put forward by the Administration for the continuation of the feeding programmes in Europe justified such an allocation. Conditions had changed but the Administration had failed to produce new statistics.

11. He was in sympathy with the Brazilian proposal for a postponement which would give delegations time to consider the new allocations. There had been no time to refer the new proposals to Governments and give them an opportunity to decide how far the new allocations complied with previous decisions.

12. In the Programme Committee he had complained about the relative smallness of the allocation for Asia, and in connexion with that point he wished to draw the Board's attention to document E/ICEF/W.89, which was a comparison of the UNICEF target and the allocations made to date. He noted that the allocation for Asia fell short of the target budget by a greater amount than any other area or item. For Europe, the deficit against the target was 1,700,000 dollars, while for Asia the deficit was 8,900,000 dollars. He wished to emphasize that large discrepancy. The argument of the Administration had been that programmes for Asia were not fully prepared; their attitude seemed to be that money allocated had to be spent immediately. He asked whether it would not be possible and advisable to build up a reserve for Asia. At the preceding meeting the Board had heard an account of the plans being prepared for Asia and an explanation of the necessary delay in putting them into effect. He considered that when those plans were developed, the results would be both excellent and lasting.

13. He would therefore support the Brazilian proposal to postpone consideration of the new allocations in order to provide an opportunity for the submission of amendments.

14. Mr. TSAO (China) said that his delegation had reluctantly voted for the Executive Director's recommendations in the Programme Committee. After the statement by the Brazilian representative, however, it was convinced that there should be an opportunity for amendments and he would therefore support the Brazilian proposal.

15. Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) said that his government had contributed a great deal to the Children's Fund. That contribution had been based on the provisions of resolution 57(I), which established the Fund and regulated its utilization and administration. Briefly, that resolution stated that the Fund was to be administered for the benefit of children in ex-UNRRA countries and in countries which had been the victims of aggression. Child health purposes generally came third in the list of

/objectives.

objectives. The New Zealand delegation had been in a difficult position whenever the question of increased allocations for Latin America had been brought up. Being fully aware of the need in that continent, it had not objected too loudly to allocations approved by the majority. Similarly, it had not been able to give full support to the allocations proposed for Germany. It was impossible to extend the Fund's operations much further, and the children of countries which had been victims of aggression were still in great need. When emergencies arose, as in Palestine and Ecuador for example, the New Zealand delegation had offered no opposition, but otherwise it was convinced that the provisions of resolution 57(I), with its main emphasis on victims of aggression, should be respected.

16. He agreed that the proposed allocation for Asia seemed small in view of the undoubted need in that area. The amounts already set aside, however, had not yet been spent or programmed. Although the Programme Committee had been right to recommend the allocation of the additional amount of 2,000,000 dollars, it would be difficult to argue in favour of increasing the allocation still further until a larger percentage of the funds were programmed. The new allocation for the Middle East covered a period not yet considered by the General Assembly. The Programme Committee had probably been warranted in its assumption that the Assembly would wish to continue the programme in Palestine, but any further increase would again be inadvisable.

17. In view of the restrictions imposed by resolution 57(I), the Fund had been generous to Latin America. The Programme Committee's recommendations had the backing of the Administration and he considered that they should be voted on immediately. He therefore urged the Board to consider those proposals without further delay.

18. Mr. THEODOROPoulos (Greece) said that he was grateful to the representative of New Zealand for his views, since he himself, as a member of a European recipient country, was not able to speak freely on the subject. He sympathized with the desires of the Brazilian representative, but wished to remind the Board that there were still areas in Europe where fighting continued and where the consequences of the war were still visible. The emergency situation in Greece continued to exist and the need for continued UNICEF assistance could not be doubted.

19. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) said that the Brazilian delegation had a number of amendments which it was unable to submit to the current meeting. Further consideration of the Programme Committee's recommendations would tend to prejudge the Brazilian amendments and it would be better procedure to wait until those amendments had been submitted to the Executive Board. He therefore suggested that the discussion should be adjourned and asked the Executive Board to give the Brazilian delegation an opportunity of presenting its amendments.
20. Mr. HYDE (United States of America) said that it would be a pity not to accede to the request of a member of the Board for time to submit new material. The time at the Board's disposal was, ^{however,} limited and the General Assembly was in session. If the Brazilian representative would be ready to submit his amendments at the next meeting, he would be willing to support the proposal for adjournment.
21. Mr. HAHN (Union of South Africa) wished to associate himself with the views expressed by the United Kingdom representative.
22. He felt that the allocations now suggested in some respects reflected anew the marked deviation from the first principles of emergency aid which had characterized certain previous allocations. The agreement to give priority to areas outside Europe had apparently not been complied with in framing the new allocation. He fully agreed that the continuation of aid in certain European areas -- particularly Greece -- was essential and said that there was no question of the total diversion of the allocation for Europe.
23. It might, however, be possible to arrange a partial diversion and he would therefore support the Brazilian proposal to postpone the vote.
24. The CHAIRMAN said that it would not be necessary to discontinue the debate on the Programme Committee's proposals, since the discussion could not prejudice any amendments submitted by Brazil, if the proposal to postpone the vote was adopted.
25. Mr. CORREA (Ecuador) said that as a representative of Latin America on the Programme Committee he had on the preceding day asked the Administration whether any programmes were pending for Latin America. When the Administration had said that there were none, he had drawn the

Committee's attention to an extensive programme that was to be submitted by Brazil. He wished to recall that point and thought that since there was still information outstanding, it would be better to wait before taking a final vote on the new allocations recommended by the Programme Committee.

26. Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada) wondered whether the Brazilian representative could give some indication of the deductions he wished to make in the proposed allocations, since it would inevitably be necessary to deduct from some before increasing others. The need for assistance was universal but good reasons should be advanced for any change in existing programmes.

27. Mr. HEYWARD (Deputy Director, ICEF), replying to the Ecuadorean representative's question concerning what further requirements were under consideration in connexion with the Latin American allocation, stated that expected additional requirements included 250,000 dollars for insect control in Central America and 90,000 dollars for BCG in Mexico. Other expenses in connexion with BCG were expected to amount to a further 200,000 dollars. Further expenditure was also expected on equipment recommended for the emergency in Ecuador. A definite request from Brazil had not yet been received.

28. Mr. AIMEIDA (Brazil) said that he wanted to make changes in the new allocations recommended because he did not understand the pattern of those allocations. Mortality rates showed that conditions in Europe had improved. The situation in Greece was the exception, but generally speaking, there was no emergency. Europe should not be regarded as having an acquired right to larger allocations simply because its plans for expenditure were already prepared. Those plans were not directly related to European needs, which did not justify a larger share of available resources. The remedy was to speed up the plans for areas outside Europe and not to leave European expenditure unabated. Asia and Latin America were slow in formulating their requests but their needs were greater.

29. The representative of New Zealand had said that within the limits of resolution 57 (I), the Fund had been generous to Latin America. Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Germany and Japan, however, did not come under the provisions of resolution 57 (I) and their quotas greatly exceeded the assistance afforded to Latin America. It seemed strange that former aggressors should be entitled to priority.

30. He would be able to submit his delegation's amendments to the Executive Board at the end of the meeting.

31. Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) wished to point out, in reply to the Brazilian representative, that his delegation had not been in favour of allocating funds to Germany and Japan.

32. The CHAIRMAN, speaking in his capacity as Polish representative, said he was glad that it had been possible to confirm plans for some Latin American countries. Had his delegation voted in the Programme Committee, it would have supported the larger allocation for Latin America.

33. He was unable to agree, however, that Europe was better off than before the war. He invited the Brazilian representative to consider document E/ICEF/W.89 and compare the figure of 42,000,000 dollars for the target budget with the allocations to date and the recommended additional allocations. Delegations sometimes seemed to act on the assumption that the Fund was assured of a permanent revenue. On the contrary, unceasing efforts had to be made to obtain resources and Government support.

34. With regard to Germany, the Polish delegation had at first been opposed to the idea of granting assistance. Later, however, it had agreed ^{to} that when more funds were available and the programmes in countries of first priority had got under way. He would answer his Brazilian colleague's question as to why Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania had been included. It was because the children in those countries had felt the full impact of war. Let Mr. Almeida journey through European countries -- he would see the effects of the war. They were long-lasting. The emergency was by no means ^{over}.

35. He agreed that every effort should be made to utilize the unprogrammed allocations for Asia and was glad that a further allocation had been proposed. That did not mean that he was willing to accept the Brazilian argument that needs in Europe had already been covered and that complete priority should be given to the Far East and Latin America.

36. Mr. CORREA (Ecuador) made a formal proposal that the discussion of the Programme Committee's recommendations regarding new allocations should be adjourned. That proposal took precedence over the Brazilian motion to postpone the vote on the recommendations and would give delegations an opportunity to submit amendments.

The proposal to adjourn the debate to the following meeting was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

37. Mrs. SINCLAIR (Chairman of the Programme Committee) drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 27, page 11, of document E/ICEF/129, dealing with the programme in Albania. She recalled that on the recommendation of the Administration, the Board had approved allocations to Albania for 1950, subject to the satisfactory settlement of the differences between the Albanian Government and UNICEF. Conversations had been held with the Albanian Government to enable UNICEF to continue sending supplies. She noted that no supplies had been sent since April. The Programme Committee was aware that the need of Albanian children was still great. On the other hand, there were agreements between the Fund and various Governments, and the Programme Committee had to be sure that all the terms of those agreements were carried out.

38. She drew attention to paragraph 8 of the Executive Director's Note, which stated that "In view of the repeated declarations of the Government of Albania that it accepts the Agreement, the Committee may wish to consider, if the Government of Albania desired it, that the Fund should make a new start by shipping in two months' supplies concurrently with the arrival of a Mission Chief and Secretary on the prior understanding that there would be a visit and report by a representative of the Fund..."

39. The Programme Committee had received various suggestions for a new Mission Chief. Mr. Chmielewski had been proposed, and the Albanian Government was willing to accept him as Mission Chief. The Programme Committee would like to request that the programme be resumed, if the further condition regarding Doctor Egger and a secretary could be met.

40. Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) thought it unfortunate that the subject had come up before the Board. The Board should realize that in passing that paragraph as it now stood, it was preventing the Albanian Government from receiving supplies.

41. He had been present at the meeting of the Programme Committee, when the Albanian representative had stated that his Government considered that the application of the Agreement was the essential question. The paragraph, however, referred to a regrettable incident, in which UNICEF had not played a diplomatic part. He regretted that UNICEF should engage in disputes with sovereign States.

42. Mrs. SINCLAIR (Chairman of the Programme Committee) remarked that there were certain questions of principle involved, concerning the responsibilities of the Fund for its operations. She hoped that, even if the Albanian Government considered that a visitor from Headquarters was superfluous, it would take into consideration the fact that the new Mission Chief had not previously worked for the Fund, and that in those conditions, a visitor from the outside was indicated. Her delegation felt that any country accepting the aid of UNICEF should understand that it had responsibilities with regard to its terms of reference.
43. Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) stated that Mrs. Sinclair's explanation had made the situation clear. Since it was a question of the normal procedure of a representative from Headquarters visiting an area in order to report on the progress of the work, there was a possibility of future good relations.
44. Mrs. LENROOT (United States of America) thought that the question before the Committee was to make possible the resumption of aid to the needy children of Albania. The proposal before the Board was most reasonable, and her delegation would support it warmly.
45. The CHAIRMAN asked Mrs. Sinclair and the representative of the Administration whether it was intended, as a normal procedure, to send a representative of Headquarters in addition to the Mission Chief.
46. Mrs. SINCLAIR (Chairman of the Programme Committee) replied that the time element referred to the past situation in Albania, and that a member of the staff should be sent in order to help solve certain problems which had arisen at that time. Generally, a member from Headquarters should be able to visit a Mission.
47. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that his delegation had already had occasion to state its position at a meeting of the Programme Committee, and that it would continue to vote against the report, since it confirmed the position taken by the Administration, which could only be qualified as discrimination against the children of Albania.

48. He regretted that the Administration had not set forth all the facts of the question relating to Albania, and also that the Programme Committee had failed to show what the actual state of affairs was. By the Administration Albania had been made to appear as violating an agreement, and as a result, the children of Albania had been deprived of supplies.

49. With regard to the alleged act of violation on the part of the Albanian Government, he stated that a careful perusal of the documentation contained in the Executive Director's Note would show that the agreement had been violated, not by the Albanian Government, but by the Administration. The Administration had suspended deliveries without informing the Programme Committee of all the facts of the dispute with the Albanian Government. In accordance with article 9 of the agreement, that question should have been raised in the Programme Committee. And yet the Albanian Government was being accused of having violated the agreement.

50. He wished to discuss some of the official statements of the Administration concerning the Albanian programme. The question was being currently discussed, because the Albanian Government had supposedly failed to carry out its obligations with regard to the programme. Yet in his letter of 27 February 1949, the Head of UNICEF in Albania stated that he was satisfied with the way in which the programme was being put into effect. Moreover, Mr. Davidson, the Director of European Headquarters, had visited Albania and had stated that he was pleased with the fulfilment of programme and he had received a warm welcome. At the same time it could not therefore be alleged that the Albanian Government did not permit representatives to visit the country.

51. It was also superfluous to state in the report that a secretary should be sent with the Mission Chief, especially in view of the fact that Mr. Chmielewski was a man of great experience who had worked with the Red Cross and who was, moreover, a doctor. And since the Administration knew that Albania considered that it was superfluous to send three persons from UNICEF, the Administration's insistence on that point would appear to indicate that they intended to discontinue sending supplies to Albania.

52. Mr. Kobushko then read excerpts from Mr. Davidson's report of his field trip, in which he had stated that the nurseries he had visited were exemplary, as was the kindergarten in Tirana. He had also noted the high level of educational services and had, in the same document, expressed praise of the activities of the Albanian Government. The document also refuted the charge that information concerning UNICEF had not been disseminated.

53. With regard to the further charge that the representatives of UNICEF had not had an opportunity to visit various places in Albania, Mr. Davidson had clearly stated in the same report that he had visited many parts of the country. Those accusations were therefore also incorrect.

54. Other charges against the Albanian Government were contained in the letter of 3 May by Mr. Davidson, but they were neither solid nor well founded. They had been made by the Head of the Mission, who after giving a highly laudatory report on the actions of the Albanian Government, had made unofficial accusations against the same Government, which could not be considered valid, since his previous statements had refuted them.

55. In another letter of 20 March, Mr. Walling, the UNICEF representative in Albania, had noted with satisfaction the activities of the Albanian Government. He had praised the co-operation between the Fund and the Government, and had praised the interest shown by the Government in the work of the Fund, and the extent of the financial contribution it had made. That letter was an official document which refuted the statement later made by Mr. Davidson orally. Those accusations should therefore be withdrawn, and supplies should no longer be withheld from Albania.

56. Further, the supplies of the Fund had failed to reach Albania on time, and when the Albanian Government had pointed out that fact, the Administration had failed to give any explanation of its action. The Albanian Government therefore maintained that UNICEF had failed to adhere to the provisions of the agreement.

57. Moreover, it had been surprising that Mr. Walling had taken with him the car belonging to UNICEF when he left Albania, and had left other UNICEF material at foreign legations in Tirana. As the Albanian Government stated, it would appear that preparation for the suspension of supplies had been carefully carried out.

58. The Administration was still violating the agreement by demanding the acceptance of three persons by Albania. The Administration had earlier proposed an Englishman as Mission Chief, and it had not then insisted on either a representative of the Administration or a secretary.

59. The letter dated 24 April, 1949, (Annex 7) explained the conditions for the issuance of visas, and the letter of 11 July, 1949, (Annex 15) informed the Administration of the Albanian Government's agreement with the Fund.

60. With regard to the accusations that mail had not been received within a reasonable time, the Albanian Government could hardly be blamed for that delay. The letters had probably been sent from abroad, and it was impossible to know where they might have been retained.

61. The allegation that the Mission Chief was not free to observe the distribution of UNICEF supplies was also unfounded. In Mr. Walling's report dated 20 March 1949, he mentioned that he had visited seven different places.

62. Concerning the distribution of cod-liver oil, Mr. Kobushko would make no comment, since he did not have detailed documentation on the subject. But he was unable to understand why the point had not been raised directly by Mr. Walling with the Albanian Government.

63. Finally, with regard to the accusation that the recipients of UNICEF's assistance had not been informed of the source of that aid, he stated that the Government, in accordance with the agreement, had afforded all the information on the source and supply of children's food.

Mr. Davidson himself had noted that Albanians were informed of the source.

64. In conclusion therefore, not only had the Administration violated its agreement and accused the Albanian Government on the basis of Mr. Davidson's unofficial report, but it was persisting in its discriminatory methods by insisting on unacceptable conditions. In the document submitted at the current meeting, the Board had excluded Albania from its allocations. Albania should be included in the list of countries for which additional funds were set aside. The Soviet Union therefore proposed that Albania should be included in UNICEF's table of distributions, and that the Administration should immediately resume shipment of supplies to Albania.

65. Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) asked that the Administration be given an opportunity to reply to the remarks that had been made regarding its role in the Albanian situation.

66. Mr. JCKEL (Australia) wished to suggest certain amendments in the Programme Committee's recommendation regarding the Albanian programme. He proposed that the words "on the development of the programme" should be inserted after the word "report" in line 6. The last sentence, explaining the purpose of the report, could then be deleted. The first two lines of the recommendation should also be deleted.

/It was

It was not necessary for the Committee to explain its recommendation and the wording of those first two lines might be regarded as invidious. The Committee's recommendation would then read: "The Committee recommends that the Executive Board authorize a new start in the programme by shipping in two months' supplies concurrently with the arrival of a Mission Chief and secretary, on the prior understanding that there would be a visit and report on the development of the programme by a representative of the Fund from UNICEF Headquarters or European Headquarters within six weeks."

67. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of the USSR to suggest a definite form of words to replace the Programme Committee's recommendation.

68. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the essence of the recommendation should be the immediate resumption of supplies simultaneously with the departure for Albania^{of} a Chief of Mission. He therefore proposed the following text in place of the Programme Committee's wording: "The Executive Board recommends that the administration renew shipments to Albania without delay. At the same time, the administration should settle all pending questions by negotiation with the Albanian Government."

69. Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) expressed his appreciation of the changes suggested by the Australian representative. The new wording was more diplomatic than the Programme Committee's original recommendation. He wondered, in view of the administration's attitude and the fact that such details were worked out in consultation with governments, whether it would not be possible to also delete the words "and secretary". The provision of subordinate staff was not one with which the Executive Board had concerned itself.

70. Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada) (Chairman of the Programme Committee) said that there had been much discussion on that point in the Programme Committee. The administration had felt that it was particularly important to have an experienced staff member accompanying a new Chief of Mission. In her capacity of Canadian representative, she supported the changes suggested by Australia but did not agree with the deletion of the words "and secretary" proposed by New Zealand.

71. Miss LENROOT (United States of America) supported the amendments suggested by the Australian representative. On the other hand, she felt that the words "and secretary" should be retained.

72. The CHAIRMAN stated that he was anxious to see the resumption of the programme in Albania. It was most important that the Mission Chief should be sent to Albania and that supplies should be continued.

73. He felt that the question of sending a secretary could hardly be considered a matter of principle and that the shipment of supplies under the Agreement could surely not be conditional on the presence of a secretary with the Mission Chief. It would be an entirely different matter if the Albanian Government were to propose amendments to the Agreement which would infringe its basic principles.

74. Miss LENROOT (United States of America) remarked that the question of principle was whether the Administration was being maintained in a situation in which it could continue operations. The Government of Albania had specifically declined to give a visa to a secretary.

75. The CHAIRMAN understood that Mr. Pate had said that he would settle the question of a secretary, and he felt strongly that the Executive Board should not make the resumption of sending supplies conditional upon the sending of a secretary.

76. Mrs. SINCLAIR (Chairman of the Programme Committee) agreed with the United States representative that a question of principle was involved. It was for the Board to make amendments to the resolution. Every effort had been made to reach an agreement. The Fund had definite responsibilities in the terms of its trusteeship. She felt, moreover, that the Administration was asking only for a minimum.

77. Mr. KOBUSEKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he was surprised to hear the last statement, in view of the fact that the Albanian Government had indicated that it would adhere to the Agreement. What was essential was that the phrase should contain no ultimatum.

/78. Mr. LEDWARD

78. Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) formally proposed the closure of the debate.

The proposal was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

79. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of the USSR amendment, which read as follows:

"The Executive Board recommends that the Administration renew shipments to Albania without delay."

The first part of the USSR amendment was rejected by 14 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

80. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second part of the USSR amendment, which read as follows:

"At the same time the Administration should settle all pending questions by negotiation with the Albanian Government."

The second part of the USSR amendment was rejected by 13 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

81. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Australian amendments, beginning with the proposal to delete the first phrase of paragraph (a): "In view of the repeated declarations of the Government of Albania that it accepts the Agreement and wishes a resumption of the programme, the Committee recommends that".

The proposal to delete the first phrase of paragraph (a) was adopted by 19 votes to 2.

82. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal to insert the words "on development of the programme" after the word "report".

The proposal to insert those words was adopted by 17 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

83. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal to delete the last sentence of paragraph (a).

The proposal to delete the last sentence of paragraph (a) was adopted by 18 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

84. On the suggestion of Yugoslavia, the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the phrase:

"The Executive Board authorize a new start in the programme by shipping in two months' supplies concurrently with the arrival of a Mission Chief."

That phrase was adopted by 20 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

85. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the words "and secretary".
Those words were adopted by 11 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

86. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the phrase:
"on the prior understanding that there would be a visit and
and report on development of the programme by a representative of
the Fund from UNICEF Headquarters or European Headquarters within
six weeks."
That phrase was adopted by 16 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.