

United Nations

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

Nations Unies

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

UNRESTRICTED 59

E/ICEF/SR.48
24 March 1949

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

EXECUTIVE BOARD

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York

On Wednesday, 9 March 1949, at 10.30 a.m.

Contents: Future Programmes in China; Utilization of New Resources

Chairman:	Dr. L. RAJCHMAN	(Poland)
Members:	Mr. E. J. R. HEYWARD	(Australia)
	Mr. R. de OLIVEIRA CAMPOS	(Brazil)
	Mrs. A. SINCLAIR	(Canada)
	Mr. T. Y. WU	(China)
	Mr. de HOLTE CASTELLO	(Colombia)
	Mr. V. HOUDEK	(Czechoslovakia)
	Mr. T. B. FRIIS	(Denmark)
	Mr. A. MENESES	(Ecuador)
	Dr. L. BUGNARD	(France)
	Mr. S. J. PESMAZOGLU	(Greece)
	Mr. N. A. UMOVRI	(Iraq)
	Miss M. Z. N. WITTEVEEN	(Netherlands)
	Miss H. N. HAMPTON	(New Zealand)
	Mr. E. NORD	(Norway)
	Mr. J. A. ENCINAS	(Peru)
	Mr. C. I. WOLLIN	(Sweden)
	Mr. B. G. FOURIE	(Union of South Africa)
	Mr. V. KOBUSHEKO	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
	Mr. R. T. D. LEDWARD	(United Kingdom)
	Miss Katherine LENROOT	(United States of America)
	Mr. M. LEVI	(Yugoslavia)

/Specialized Agencies

Specialized Agencies

	Dr. F. CALDERONE	World Health Organization
	Dr. Fred SOPER	Pan-American Sanitary Board
	Miss M. SCOTT)	Food and Agriculture Organization
	Dr. R. T. ALLMAN)	
UNICEF	Mr. M. PATE	(Executive Director)
	Dr. M. JUNOD	(UNICEF Mission Chief China)
	Mr. M. SCHMITTLINGER	(Programme Co-ordinator)
	Dr. P. Z. KING	(UNICEF Medical Consultant)
	Mr. J. CHARNOW	(Committee Secretary)

The agenda for the session of the Board beginning 9 March 1949 was adopted as follows:

- (a) Report of the Executive Director;
- (b) Programme in China;
- (c) Utilization of new resources;
- (d) Other business.

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Executive Board to three reports submitted to the Programme Committee by the Executive Director: Report of the Executive Director to the seventy-seventh meeting of the Programme Committee (E/ICEF/101); report on 1948 Summer Camps Programmes in European UNICEF Receiving Countries (E/ICEF/102); Summarized Plans for Feeding Operations in Europe (E/ICEF/104). These reports were briefly noted. The Executive Director reported on several new developments in the Far East Mission. The Committee proceeded to discuss the next item on the agenda, the proposed programme for China.

PROGRAMME FOR CHINA

Mrs. SINCLAIR (Chairman, Programme Committee) presented that section of the report of the Programme Committee relating to the proposed programme for China (E/ICEF/106, paragraphs 4 to 8). Mrs. Sinclair explained that in order to get a programme in China under way as quickly as possible, the Programme Committee has asked the Board to review and approve proposals which the UNICEF Mission Chief will discuss with the Chinese Government for the utilization of funds already allocated to China. This general proposal should be discussed with the joint UNICEF/WHO Committee on health policy and the recommendations of that committee be made known to the Chief of Mission prior to discussion of the programme with the Chinese Authorities.

Mrs. Sinclair pointed out that there was some question concerning the ability of the Chinese Authorities to meet local expenses of the programme.

/It was

It was envisaged, therefore, that UNICEF might have to review the manner in which this programme can be put into effect when the programme is finally established. The Programme Committee was reluctant to authorize deviation from the policy of requiring that each country meet the local expenses of UNICEF programmes.

Dr. CALDERONE (WHO) said that in his opinion the Executive Board was approving a very large sum of money to be utilized in a programme for China, without having carefully studied the actual formulation of the programme.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) explained that he would abstain from voting on the programme since the outline was extremely general, and since the document had been circulated only a short time before the meeting.

Mr. HEYWARD (Australia) pointed out that the Programme Committee had asked that the plan for a programme in China be approved subject to the recommendations of the Joint UNICEF/WHO Committee on Health Policy. The Administration must have guidance in discussing a plan with the Chinese Authorities. It was essential that the Chief of Mission know that objections would not be raised either by the Executive Board or the Joint Committee to the general form of the programme.

Dr. BUGNARD (France) and Miss LENROOT (United States of America) agreed with the representative of Australia, indicating that the programme was subject to review by the Joint Committee.

Mr. WU (China) addressed himself to the question raised by Dr. Calderone stating that he was concerned with the fact that this programme had not been discussed with the Chinese Government. Since he was anxious, however, to see a programme under way, he felt that the action of the Programme Committee in referring this matter to the Board, with the reservation that the plan be discussed with the Joint Committee and with his Government, was in the interest of saving time.

Dr. CALDERONE (WHO) suggested that the Executive Board delay action on the programme for China until the meeting of the Joint UNICEF/WHO Committee on 12 April. In reply to a question put by the Chinese representative asking the reason the Joint Committee had not met before the Board meeting as originally planned, Dr. Calderone said that it had been impossible for WHO representatives to travel from Geneva to Lake Success in time for such a meeting.

Dr. RAJCHMAN (Chairman), referring to the resolution of the Programme Committee, paragraph 8 of the document before the Board (E/ICEF/106), pointed out that the Committee had clearly recommended that the programme

/for

for China be discussed with the Joint Committee and with the Chinese authorities. This procedure was adopted to avoid delay. He reminded Dr. Calderone that the Executive Board was deliberating on policy. There was no reason to imply that the Board did not intend to seek the views of the Joint Committee.

The Board voted to adopt the recommendation of the Programme Committee (E/ICEF/106, paragraph 8), approving the general outline of a programme for China (E/ICEF/103) for discussion with the Chinese Authorities, subject to the reservation that the medical programmes be discussed with the Joint UNICEF/WHO Committee on Health Policy. The vote was 16 for the recommendation of the Programme Committee, none against, and four abstentions.

The representative of China stated that he was abstaining because the plan had not been discussed with his Government.

UTILIZATION OF NEW RESOURCES

Mrs. SINCLAIR (Chairman of Programme Committee) introduced the revised budget of operations for 1949 and proposed new allocations recommended by the Programme Committee. New allocations were to be made out of an amount of \$23.8 million, the extent of the Fund's resources on hand or pledged. Attention was drawn to paragraph 15 of the Programme Committee's Report to the Executive Board in which the Committee noted the principles guiding the Executive Director in making his recommendations for new allocations. These principles were (a) that first priority be given to the continuity of existing programmes for a minimum period of time; and (b) that flexibility in country allocations be maintained to allow the countries, in accordance with usual Board procedures, to use a portion of their allocation for food, medical programmes, or other priority items, as the circumstances may necessitate.

Mrs. Sinclair explained that the representative of the United Kingdom had indicated in the Programme Committee the opposition of his delegation to the detailed recommendations as recommended by the Committee. She assumed that the representative of the United Kingdom would explain the views of his delegation to the Board.

Conditions in Greece remain serious, Mrs. Sinclair explained, and it was the hope of the Administration that a way would be found to increase the number of children being reached within the next few months. At the request of the governments of France, Finland, and Hungary, the Administration has recommended no further assistance in food supplies.

Mr. LEINARD (United Kingdom) stated in detail the views of his delegation concerning the Administration's proposals for new allocations.

/The Executive

The Executive Board, Mr. Ledward said, was responsible for seeing that the resources placed at UNICEF's disposal were spent where and when the needs of children were the greatest. While the Executive Board may be led into some long term commitments out of a desire to bring a durable benefit to the countries assisted, it was the view of the United Kingdom delegation that the Fund must perform primarily an emergency function. The contributions made to the Fund are not committed in advance to be spent for assistance to any group of countries but may be spent at the discretion of the Executive Board within the limits imposed by the Fund's terms of reference. He was therefore surprised when the view was expressed in the Programme Committee that funds had been solicited from both governments and private donors on the basis of continuation of feeding programmes in a particular group of countries. This group of countries, Mr. Ledward said, were those countries in Europe which were assessed at the end of the war as having suffered most from the hostilities in Europe. These countries received assistance in the form of food, while countries outside of Europe which had suffered equally from the war could not be provided food since it was argued that the children to be protected were too numerous and a similar programme of child feeding too expensive. It was possible that training and medical schemes were a better way of spending the money which the Fund is allocating to these countries outside Europe, Mr. Ledward felt, but there was no reason why the European countries, especially those where an emergency no longer exists, should be particularly privileged.

Mr. Ledward pointed out that in the view of his delegation, except in the case of Greece, an emergency no longer exists in those European countries in which the Administration has recommended the continuation of feeding programmes for children. The Board has been asked to continue feeding not because there is a proven emergency need, but because this programme has now become an accepted pattern. This point of view departs from the line of responsibility to the children of the world.

Mr. Ledward referred to the data presented by the Administration in support of the continuation of feeding programmes in Europe, pointing out that the statements made were general and referred to the area as a whole. The situation in each specific country should be reviewed, he said. In Greece his delegation was convinced that the Fund should undertake to provide 600,000 child units subject to the Greek Government sharing in the programme. In Bulgaria, Roumania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, however, the same need could not be established. The Greek allocation should be stepped up and the Czechoslovakian and Polish allocations should be reduced.

/Areas outside

Areas outside of Europe where needs were more urgent, should receive a considerably larger share of the Fund's resources.

Mr. Ledward said that he did not propose at this time to raise objections to the continuation of feeding in Albania, Yugoslavia, Austria, or Italy. The Administration, however, should observe conditions in these countries with an eye to the future. The recommendation which he was making at this time was to effect a sizeable reduction in the feeding programmes of four countries: Bulgaria, Roumania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland.

In Bulgaria milk consumption per head amounted 61.3 kilogrammes in 1947/48 as compared with 73 kilogrammes in the four years immediately preceding the war. This meant that in the winter following a drought year fresh milk consumption in Bulgaria was back to 84 per cent of pre-war levels. Bulgaria had a net export of cheese. Although the latest figures were not available, it could be assumed that milk consumption should now be back to normal levels.

The situation in Roumania was similar; milk consumption per head was 87.5 kilogrammes in 1947/48, as compared with 100 before the war. Since there had been a good harvest, it could be assumed that conditions now approximate pre-war consumption.

Estimates made by the FAO showed that liquid milk, fats and oils in Bulgaria and Roumania would be considerably above 1938 levels in the year 1950. In Bulgaria liquid milk production was estimated to reach a level 5 per cent higher in the year 1950/51 than in the years 1934 to 1938 and in the case of Roumania, roughly 8 per cent higher. The fat and oil situation was estimated to be improving in similar proportions. Although it might be pointed out that pre-war conditions in Bulgaria and Roumania were extremely low in comparison with the rest of Europe, they were not in any way as chronically low as conditions in any part of Asia or in some parts of Latin America. Chronically poor food conditions were not the concern of this Fund, the object of which was to meet emergency conditions.

In the case of Czechoslovakia and Poland the general levels of milk and fat production before the war were higher than those in Bulgaria and Roumania. From FAO reports, Mr. Ledward concluded that liquid milk production in Czechoslovakia in the year 1950/51 would be more than 40 per cent above pre-war levels. He noted that this estimate had been criticized as too high, but there was new evidence to show that there was already in Czechoslovakia as much milk available per human head as before the war. Figures on fat and oil supplies per head in Czechoslovakia for 1950 were calculated as between 35 and 40 per cent above pre-war levels.

/This approached

This approached the figures for the United Kingdom. In Poland fats and oils would return to pre-war levels in the year 1950/51. Food supplies had recovered so well that Poland abolished food rationing, a step which had been judged imprudent to take in the United Kingdom.

The United Kingdom has made every effort to assist these countries to bring back their feeding situation to a healthy level. The United Kingdom went on giving to UNRRA funds for these and allied purposes after many other countries, including the United States, had stopped. The United Kingdom was responsible for giving 15.5 per cent of the UNRRA funds which UNICEF has inherited. The United Kingdom has also contributed to UNICEF and the people of the United Kingdom and more than nineteen dependent territories gave generously to UNAC.

It was unreasonable, Mr. Ledward said, to expect them to go on doing so indefinitely, especially to feed people in countries for which there is evidence to show that conditions have recovered to pre-war levels.

In the Economic and Social Council on 23 February, Mr. Ledward pointed out, the representative of Poland drew attention to the increase in food production that had occurred in his country in the year 1948. Mr. Ledward quoted an extract from the speech of the Polish representative. Agreements have been reached between Poland and the United Kingdom under which Poland will export considerable quantities of bacon and eggs to the United Kingdom.

If the feeding programmes in these countries were not ended this summer UNICEF would be pressed to make further allocations for the winter of 1949 or 1950. It would be wiser, therefore, for the Czechoslovakian and Polish feeding programmes to end this summer.

Mr. Ledward felt that the continuation of non-food programmes for Europe on the scale recommended by the Administration could not be justified. European countries should not be given preference in allocating funds for such programmes. Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia in particular, have almost invariably come first on the list of applicants for special projects and have received generous assistance outside of the country allocations made by the Board. The countries of Asia and Latin America should now be given greater attention and the recommendation that \$4.2 million for non-food programmes be allocated to eleven countries in Europe should not be accepted. The allocation recommended for Poland was \$756,000, for Yugoslavia \$648,000, Roumania \$400,000, and Hungary \$346,000. The Hungarian allocation was increased over the allocation for the first half of 1949 in an amount equivalent to all of the monies that were ever voted for Burma. Mr. Ledward pointed out that the Hungarian Government had requested the American Quaker Relief Mission to leave the country because the government was no longer in need of foreign aid. In the light of this action it seemed incongruous that the Board should vote the considerable sum of \$346,000 to provide medical equipment for a country which presumably did not need it. /The allocations

The allocations for these non-feeding programmes would have to be reduced, Mr. Ledward said, if the Board were to face the emergency needs of children in countries in which emergencies did exist, such as Greece, India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, and Southeast Asia. In these areas, and especially in Burma, the needs for child welfare activities were outstanding. The allocations made by the Board last summer provided the basis for planning on the part of governments. This was true of the United Kingdom Far Eastern territories who shared a national allocation of \$250,000 under the 1948 allocations. Plans were made to spend \$550,000 on special programmes between November 1948 and June 1949. Delay in agreeing to these plans of operations was caused by the failure of the Administration to appoint a Chief of Mission for areas in Asia outside of China, until last December. The choice of Dr. Watt, made available through the generosity of the New Zealand Health Services, was worth waiting for. Nevertheless, Mr. Ledward could not understand why India, Pakistan, Ceylon and other countries of Southeast Asia should be penalized in consequence of this delay.

The United Kingdom delegation was glad that the Administration had decided to carry on in China despite unsettled conditions there and was grateful to the Administration for its fine work among the Palestine refugees. They welcome the fact that an allocation had been recommended for Latin America and wished that the figure were larger. They were also glad to see that something would at last be done for the children of Korea, but the delay which the Administration has caused in order to ensure efficient future operations in Asia has been used as a reason for allocating the major part of the Fund's new resources to countries which have been helped in the past, many of which were now back to pre-war levels. Allocations for Europe were stepped up so high that reserves were down to a mere \$800,000. The argument used by the majority in the Programme Committee for spending the money immediately was one that the United Kingdom delegation cannot accept since it entailed an unjust distribution of the Fund's resources away from emergency needs.

The Executive Board, Mr. Ledward said, was like a man with a bag of candies which he wanted to distribute fairly between two children, one of whom was lame and the other active. The active child came running for the candy. Mr. Ledward did not feel that the man would give a major share of the candies to the active child but would hold back the major share for the lame child. That, in effect, was what his delegation was asking the Board to do in allocating these monies.

/In conclusion,

In conclusion, Mr. Ledward reserved the position of his delegation to submit amendments at a later stage regarding specific allocations and regarding the budget as a whole.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) asked the Administration to present data on infant mortality rates and child welfare in reports relating to the need for new allocations.

Mr. PATE (Executive Director) agreed that in the future where such data were available they should be assembled and presented to the Board.

Mr. HEYWARD (Australia) commented on the statements of the representative of the United Kingdom. Members of the Board were in the position of trustees, he said, and as Board members, it was their duty to allocate funds received for the improvement of child health conditions in such a way as to achieve positive results. Quite apart from the question of these particular allocations, of which he was in favour, the Board should consider very carefully the general trend of the statements made by the representative of the United Kingdom. Conditions were improving in Europe, of course, and UNICEF must adjust its contribution to the actual need. Throughout the world over a two-year period, 1945/46, UNRRA distributed \$3 billion worth of supplies. The Children's Fund was distributing supplies amounting to about 3 per cent of the operation conducted by UNRRA. He emphasized the continuance of the need in Europe and pointed out that UNICEF had assisted only 6 per cent of eligible recipients in receiving countries in Europe. The amount of milk which was to be supplied through the allocations under discussion was relatively very small, only about five shiploads of 6,000 tons each.

Mr. Heyward noted that the United States Army was making a gift of \$44 million to supply a daily noon meal to children in the United States and United Kingdom Zones and possibly the French Zone of Germany. There seemed to be no doubt about the need for assistance to Germany, although there had been considerable talk about recovery there. He felt it was clear from the history of UNRRA and UNICEF that the United Nations had not intended that conditions in previous enemy territory should be raised beyond the standard of recovery reached in countries which had been victims of aggression.

Milk was determined to be the most significant contribution that the Fund could make to the welfare of children in Europe. Milk production has always lagged behind increases in agricultural and industrial production. Up to the present time, improved conditions in agriculture have not included the widespread production of fodder for animals. Even bread stuff consumption was still below pre-war levels. Milk production cannot be

/expected

expected to recover quickly. The various targets and programmes for 1950 milk production, did not mean that production had recovered for the period of the year which UNICEF had under consideration.

Referring to the statement made by the United Kingdom representative regarding arguments against feeding programmes in Asia, Mr. Heyward pointed out that while effective child feeding programmes for Asia might be beyond the resources of the Fund, the principle argument was that UNICEF undertakes operations which fit into local conditions. All of the Fund's programmes have been established with a view to developing projects of a permanent nature which might be carried on for the benefit of children by the receiving government.

With regard to the statement that emergency needs no longer existed in Europe, with the exception of Greece, examination of the facts would show that this was wrong. Actually one-third of the resources of the Fund under previous decisions of the Board have been allocated to Eastern Europe, and of the proposed allocation under discussion, one-fourth of the \$23 million was allocated for that region. It was true, he said, that statistics were out of date, but for the area under discussion they were far more detailed than for Asia and Latin America. It was necessary of course to take into account the statistics available for whatever part of the world the Board was discussing. There were countries for which no statistical data was available which should in his opinion be considered favourably for increased allocations at the appropriate time.

Coming to the four specific countries which the representative of the United Kingdom had stressed (Bulgaria, Roumania, Poland and Czechoslovakia). Mr. Heyward said that he had not seen any statistics later than the figures given by the Administration. Milk production statistics were more reliable than figures on consumption. The United Kingdom representative said that the Fund might be in danger of raising standards in Bulgaria and Roumania. The fact that production was 15 per cent below pre-war levels suggested that this was not likely with the Fund's present resources. The same argument could be used regarding milk consumption in Italy, where pre-war levels of consumption were very low. Regarding the argument that Poland had abolished food rationing, Mr. Heyward pointed out that the Polish government had introduced a special programme to provide milk and fats to children and mothers. Nearly all of the countries which the Fund was helping except Czechoslovakia had abolished food rationing or had no food rationing. Without a discussion of the administrative arrangements required if food rationing was to be a success, it would be useless to

/attach any

69

In conclusion, Mr. Ledward reserved the position of his delegation to submit amendments at a later stage regarding specific allocations and regarding the budget as a whole.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) asked the Administration to present data on infant mortality rates and child welfare in reports relating to the need for new allocations.

Mr. PATE (Executive Director) agreed that in the future where such data were available they should be assembled and presented to the Board.

Mr. HEYWARD (Australia) commented on the statements of the representative of the United Kingdom. Members of the Board were in the position of trustees, he said, and as Board members, it was their duty to allocate funds received for the improvement of child health conditions in such a way as to achieve positive results. Quite apart from the question of these particular allocations, of which he was in favour, the Board should consider very carefully the general trend of the statements made by the representative of the United Kingdom. Conditions were improving in Europe, of course, and UNICEF must adjust its contribution to the actual need. Throughout the world over a two-year period, 1945/46, UNRRA distributed \$3 billion worth of supplies. The Children's Fund was distributing supplies amounting to about 3 per cent of the operation conducted by UNRRA. He emphasized the continuance of the need in Europe and pointed out that UNICEF had assisted only 6 per cent of eligible recipients in receiving countries in Europe. The amount of milk which was to be supplied through the allocations under discussion was relatively very small, only about five shiploads of 6,000 tons each.

Mr. Heyward noted that the United States Army was making a gift of \$44 million to supply a daily noon meal to children in the United States and United Kingdom Zones and possibly the French Zone of Germany. There seemed to be no doubt about the need for assistance to Germany, although there had been considerable talk about recovery there. He felt it was clear from the history of UNRRA and UNICEF that the United Nations had not intended that conditions in previous enemy territory should be raised beyond the standard of recovery reached in countries which had been victims of aggression.

Milk was determined to be the most significant contribution that the Fund could make to the welfare of children in Europe. Milk production has always lagged behind increases in agricultural and industrial production. Up to the present time, improved conditions in agriculture have not included the widespread production of fodder for animals. Even bread stuff consumption was still below pre-war levels. Milk production cannot be

/expected

expected to recover quickly. The various targets and programmes for 1950 milk production, did not mean that production had recovered for the period of the year which UNICEF had under consideration.

Referring to the statement made by the United Kingdom representative regarding arguments against feeding programmes in Asia, Mr. Heyward pointed out that while effective child feeding programmes for Asia might be beyond the resources of the Fund, the principle argument was that UNICEF undertakes operations which fit into local conditions. All of the Fund's programmes have been established with a view to developing projects of a permanent nature which might be carried on for the benefit of children by the receiving government.

With regard to the statement that emergency needs no longer existed in Europe, with the exception of Greece, examination of the facts would show that this was wrong. Actually one-third of the resources of the Fund under previous decisions of the Board have been allocated to Eastern Europe, and of the proposed allocation under discussion, one-fourth of the \$23 million was allocated for that region. It was true, he said, that statistics were out of date, but for the area under discussion they were far more detailed than for Asia and Latin America. It was necessary of course to take into account the statistics available for whatever part of the world the Board was discussing. There were countries for which no statistical data was available which should in his opinion be considered favourably for increased allocations at the appropriate time.

Coming to the four specific countries which the representative of the United Kingdom had stressed (Bulgaria, Roumania, Poland and Czechoslovakia). Mr. Heyward said that he had not seen any statistics later than the figures given by the Administration. Milk production statistics were more reliable than figures on consumption. The United Kingdom representative said that the Fund might be in danger of raising standards in Bulgaria and Roumania. The fact that production was 15 per cent below pre-war levels suggested that this was not likely with the Fund's present resources. The same argument could be used regarding milk consumption in Italy, where pre-war levels of consumption were very low. Regarding the argument that Poland had abolished food rationing, Mr. Heyward pointed out that the Polish government had introduced a special programme to provide milk and fats to children and mothers. Nearly all of the countries which the Fund was helping except Czechoslovakia had abolished food rationing or had no food rationing. Without a discussion of the administrative arrangements required if food rationing was to be a success, it would be useless to

/attach any

attach any weight to the argument that allocations should not be approved for countries in which food rationing was not in effect.

Regarding column 2 of table 4 (E/ICEF/100), Mr. Heyward said that a considerable part of the allocation would be taken up by supplying "other foods". Italy, for example, was interested in obtaining meat and several countries were asking for food or additional milk under this allocation. The allocation was insufficient to continue the feeding programmes at the present level for the rest of the year. For the first six months of 1949, the Fund allocated \$21 million to Europe; it was now proposing to allocate \$13.5 million. If resources were available, he would be glad to see the present programme extended to the end of the year, as well as to increase other items in the budget. The Fund had been told by the United Kingdom representative to face the improvement in European production; it was his hope, Mr. Heyward said, that the Fund would be able to see improvements in the production of milk as the result of the milk conservation programme which would come into full operation by June 1950. Since the Fund was never able to reach more than 6 per cent of the children in European receiving countries, the time to review milk production figures would be June 1950.

With regard to Asia, Mr. Heyward pointed out that Dr. Holm had recommended that of the \$2 million set aside for BCG outside Europe, \$1 million should go to India, Pakistan and Ceylon. It was not appropriate to place large amounts of money in reserve at this time since as much as six months elapses before children can be assisted through the money allocated by the Board. New resources would be made available, he felt, for additional programmes and could be allocated for work in Asia as operations got under way. It was impractical, on the other hand, to make plans for feeding operations in Europe for less than a six months' period.

His delegation was glad to see the allocation to Latin America. Mr. Heyward thanked Dr. Calderone and Dr. Soper for the interesting and practical suggestions which were made to the Programme Committee regarding a programme for Latin America.

The Board recessed for lunch at 1.00 p.m.
