

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL
E/ICEF/SR.79 15
14 June 1951
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND
EXECUTIVE BOARD

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Flushing Meadow, New York,
on Tuesday, 22 May 1951, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Reports of the Executive Director; (b) special reports (E/ICEF/167, E/ICEF/171, E/ICEF/173, E/ICEF/174, E/ICEF/175, E/ICEF/172, E/ICEF/172/Corr.1, E/ICEF/R.195)

Reports of the Programme Committee; (a) part I - policy questions (E/ICEF/R.191, E/ICEF/R.191/Add.1, E/ICEF/168)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mrs. SINCLAIR	Canada
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. BRENNAN	Australia
	Mr. FENAUX	Belgium
	Mr. ITURRALDE	Bolivia
	Mr. de PAIVA LETTE	Brazil
	Mr. SHVETZOV	Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic
	Mr. FONSEKA	Ceylon
	Mr. TSAO	China
	Mr. de MARCHENA	Dominican Republic
	Mr. APUNTE	Ecuador

Members (continued):

Dr. BUGNARD	France
Mr. RAJAN	India
Mr. ABU HANIFAH	Indonesia
Mr. KHALIDY	Iraq
Mr. BAROR	Israel
Mr. ROBERTI	Italy
Mr. WEIR	New Zealand
Mr. LINDT	Switzerland
Mr. SUPHAMONGKHON	Thailand
Mr. SAVUT	Turkey
Mr. FOURIE	Union of South Africa
Mr. CHECHETKIN	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. LEDWARD	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Miss LIENROOT	United States of America
Mr. FABREGAT	Uruguay
Mr. PLEIC	Yugoslavia

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. LEWIS	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Mr. ARNALDO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
Dr. INGALLS	World Health Organization (WHO)

UNICEF:

Mr. PATE	Executive Director
Mr. HEYWARD	Deputy Executive Director
Mr. EGGER	Director, European and Middle East Regional Office
Dr. BORCIC	Medical Advisor
Mr. SCHMITTLINGER	Programme Co-ordinator
Mr. SAETN	Milk Conservation Advisor
Mr. CHARNOW	Secretary of the Executive Board

/REPORTS OF

REPORTS OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: (b) SPECIAL REPORTS (E/ICEF/167, E/ICEF/171, E/ICEF/173, E/ICEF/174, E/ICEF/175, E/ICEF/172, E/ICEF/172/Corr.1, E/ICEF/R.195)

Mr. ABU HANIFAH (Indonesia) observed that it was stated on page 28 of document E/ICEF/171 that the internal matching budget of Indonesia would be approximately U.S. \$263,000. That amount had proved inadequate, so that requests for supplementary budgets amounting to U.S. \$1,800,000 had been submitted for 1951. The Indonesian Government had had to budget for more money for feeding programmes (E/ICEF/171, page 30) in continuing its original plan because only a few areas, mainly on a single island, had as yet been provided for. To cover all the islands, the supply of skim milk would have to be brought up to 4,000 tons, which would mean an additional expenditure of about 4,000,000 guilders. At the moment that was not feasible.

Assisted programmes and projects in Europe and possibilities in the Middle East (E/ICEF/173, E/ICEF/R.195)

Mr. EGGER (Director, European and Middle Eastern Headquarters) said that the main point to be noted in the period reviewed in document E/ICEF/173 was that UNICEF food stocks were nearly consumed and the governments concerned were endeavouring to stretch their supplies until local milk could be produced through the UNICEF-assisted milk conservation projects to take over the feeding programmes. Two large-scale feeding projects were still under way, in Greece and Yugoslavia, on the basis of the previous winter's allocations. UNICEF had been the first organization to assist Yugoslavia after the 1950 summer drought. In Greece, UNICEF-aided feeding programmes had reached an average of 950,000 children in the past winter.

Document E/ICEF/175 on the plans and progress of operations in use of raw materials for shoes and clothing in Europe was the last of its kind that UNICEF would issue, as the programmes had been completed in most countries. Notable success had been achieved in the shoe programme in Italy, and the Italian Government should be commended for its share in processing, distribution and matching. In Germany, UNICEF's aid had been particularly valuable. Not only had refugee children been assisted, but work had also been provided for older refugees in workshops and factories engaged in processing the leather and hides supplied into shoes.

/In the medical

In the medical programmes for Europe, UNICEF had originally concentrated upon a few large-scale campaigns, particularly those against tuberculosis, V.D. and malaria. The campaigns had been completed, except for V.D. campaigns in Czechoslovakia and in Yugoslavia. UNICEF's policy was now to move away from mass anti-disease campaigns and concentrate its aid on overall maternal and child health programmes. Mobile clinics had been sent to Greece to assist children in rural areas with medical services, as well as with food. Institutions and centres were being set up to help governments to train staff in maternal and child welfare work. UNICEF had also helped governments to produce serums and vaccines against infantile maladies. Procurement was progressing for the handicapped children programmes. Another project of that nature was the provision of special equipment for premature babies, particularly in France. WHO was co-operating.

The Regional Headquarters' principal task was now to carry all those operations to completion, and then to evaluate them and make the conclusions available to those concerned. It was hoped that it might be possible to give additional help in maternal and child health on a small scale to governments which really needed it.

Milk conservation projects and possibilities in Europe and the Middle East

Mr. SABIN (Chief, Milk Conservation Division) presented documents E/ICEF/172 and E/ICEF/R.195. The milk conservation projects in Europe were being successfully concluded, except for the delays mentioned in the progress report and the governments concerned were beginning to put their own programmes into effect. In the Middle East the need for more and better milk was great, and was reflected in the appalling infant mortality rate. It was agreed, however, that supplies could be greatly increased and the quality improved in the Middle East by applying modern dairy techniques. No other food was as suitable as milk for meeting the children's needs in most of the area. Although there were very few trained dairy specialists the UNICEF and FAO representatives had found many officials and doctors who were greatly interested in developing a continuing supply of sanitary milk for the children.

/Mr. BUGNARD

Mr. BUGNARD (France) said that UNICEF assistance had been highly valued in France. The Administration was to be congratulated on its milk conservation programme. His Government would support the extension of that work in other areas.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay) asked whether milk must be imported into the Middle East and what was the relation between the production of milk and the cattle-breeding industry. The answer would throw some light on the whole problem of technical assistance.

Mr. SABIN (Chief, Milk Conservation Division) replied that the question had been thoroughly discussed with FAO. The conclusion had been that milk production could be increased through better breeding and feeding and the development of facilities for moving the milk into the cities. Mobility was the crux of the matter; in hot countries milk would remain safe only for a few hours, so that equipment for cooling and pasteurization was essential.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that that reply confirmed his assumption that milk conservation was intimately connected with technical assistance. He congratulated the Administration on its report.

Mr. de PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) observed that the milk programmes in under-developed areas were fully in accordance with the wishes of the General Assembly and fitted appropriately within the general framework of technical assistance. The collaboration between UNICEF and FAO, as depicted in document E/ICEF/R.195, was a good example of the way UNICEF should work. He hoped work along those lines would be further developed in Latin America.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) had been greatly impressed with the Administration's report and with the close connexion of milk with the problem of technical assistance. Visits such as that described in document E/ICEF/R.195 were to be welcomed. Personal contact was usually far more fruitful than correspondence.

/Mr. BAROR (Israel)

Mr. BAROR (Israel) said that his country had thought very highly of the paper reporting the results of the Working Party meeting in Beirut (E/ICEF/R.195), but drew attention to the fact that Israel was not mentioned as attending. He had received a satisfactory explanation of the circumstances which had made it difficult for Israel to take part in the Beirut meeting, but the Board should take note of Israel's view that it was essential that a country so intimately connected with the area should be given the opportunity to participate in such meetings. Israel had no milk conservation programme, as it had given first priority to continuing present child-feeding programmes, but it hoped to submit suggestions to the Board before the end of the year. He regretted the absence of a general progress report on the Middle East which would have enabled recipient governments to assess the results of the co-operation with UNICEF.

Mr. SCHMITTLINGER (Programme Co-ordinator), in reply to a question asked by the Byelorussian representative at the previous meeting, said that about 17,000 vials of stibinol would be sent to the mainland of China. Thirteen thousand vials had been sent already, and the balance would be sent in the current month.

Replying to a question from the Brazilian representative, he said that the degree of negotiation on tentative future requests with Latin American countries varied considerably. Insect control was being continued in six countries in Central America. An anti-malaria campaign was being considered by Bolivia in connexion with the teams already engaged in an anti-typhus campaign. Brazil and Peru might possibly request aid in their plans for production of insecticides. Brazil had requested assistance in anti-biotics production, and Chile was interested in expanding its production of penicillin. Brazil, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua and Uruguay were considering requesting UNICEF assistance in maternal and child health and training; and Brazil was interested in offering a regional training centre. Some countries in Central America, Brazil, Ecuador and Peru were interested in milk conservation projects. There were discussions going on in Mexico, Haiti and Chile on possible UNICEF assistance in feeding projects. Peru, Paraguay and Guatemala might ask for aid in BCG campaigns.

Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that all the representatives of the under-developed countries had expressed their satisfaction with the Fund's activities. The USSR delegation supported them. It also endorsed the Administration's view that the milk conservation and medical programmes for Europe should be continued.

/The general

The general progress report (E/ICEF/170, E/ICEF/Add.1), however, was not so satisfactory. Nearly 30 per cent of the supplies allocated to Eastern Europe had not been delivered, and the technical reasons advanced by the Administration were not convincing. The Administration appeared to be pursuing an unfair policy with regard to the people's democracies, particularly Albania.

Mr. PATE (Executive Director) said that the Administration would later make an analysis of the figures for shipments. It must be emphasized, however, that no pressure had ever been put on the UNICEF Administration and that the Fund had received the most complete co-operation from governments.

Mr. SHVETZOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, even if the Fund's policy had been liberal for four years, he could not help sharing the USSR representative's feeling that there was discrimination against the people's democracies.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the Administration merely carried out policies laid down by the Board.

REPORTS OF THE PROGRAMME COMMITTEE: (a) PART I -- POLICY QUESTIONS (E/ICEF/R.191, E/ICEF/R.191/Add.1, E/ICEF/168)

Mr. LINDT (Switzerland), speaking as Chairman of the Programme Committee, said that paragraph 3 in document E/ICEF/R.191/Add.1 should be taken together with the recommendations in paragraphs 8 to 18 in E/ICEF/R.191. The Programme Committee had believed that the new Board should review UNICEF's policies, which might have to be modified in the light of General Assembly resolution 417 (V), always bearing in mind that the greatest possible elasticity was required.

The Programme Committee suggested that the Fund should concentrate, as it had done in the past, on maternal and child welfare, training programmes and mass health campaigns. Real progress could be made if the lack of trained auxiliary personnel could be overcome. Mass health campaigns could be carried out relatively cheaply and provided valuable experience. Emergency measures had not been referred to, as the Programme Committee had thought that they would have to be left to the discretion of the Administration, for subsequent approval by the Board.

/He emphasized

He emphasized the importance of paragraph 18 and explained that the second phrase in sub-paragraph 7 meant that BCG vaccination, for example, should be completed before elaborate programmes of tuberculosis diagnosis were begun.

Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) thought that the Fund should place greater emphasis on training rather than on the provision of supplies, contrary to what was stated in the fourth paragraph of paragraph 3 (E/ICEF/R.191/Add.1). He recognized that training assistance in some instances required supplies.

Mr. de PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) said that General Assembly resolution 417 (V) laid stress on the provision of supplies. The Programme Committee had had to take into consideration the fact that governments could look to other specialized agencies for technical assistance.

Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) said that the provision of urgent supplies and training programmes had been regarded as two of the Fund's distinctive activities, while mass health campaigns were not only spectacular but were also precisely the most appropriate activities for UNICEF.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. LINDT (Switzerland), thought that the point made by the South African representative was sound, but that the basic principle was adequately covered by paragraph 18 of document E/ICEF/R.191.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the programmes would now be definitely related to the programmes developed by the countries themselves; that implied that training would be carried on.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay) believed that in public calamities, such as the earthquakes in Ecuador and El Salvador, the need was for supplies rather than training. One did not preclude the other; they were merely two aspects of assistance. The emphasis should, however, be laid on supplies.

Mr. BAROR

Mr. BAROR (Israel) said that the Programme Committee had made it clear that emergencies were in a different category from long-term policies and operations. While it was true that UNICEF in shipping supplies was doing something which no other specialized agency could do, such shipments were almost always co-ordinated with other assistance. The seventh paragraph in paragraph 3 (E/ICEF/R.191/Add.1) did not go far enough. In long-term projects most recipient countries were eligible for other forms of assistance, particularly technical assistance. In training auxiliary personnel, for instance, a great deal of assistance could be obtained from other agencies. Hence, the Board might recommend that UNICEF should give higher priority to a request if it could be shown that every effort had been made to obtain such assistance from other sources.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) thought that that proviso was covered by paragraph 11, sub-paragraph (e) (E/ICEF/R.191).

Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) thought that the main difficulty lay in the fact that the technical assistance a country was receiving might have nothing in common with maternal and child welfare. The recommendation should not, therefore, be too rigid.

The CHAIRMAN said that the problem raised by the Israel representative was normally met before it came to the Board by administrative means through arrangements with the specialized agencies.

Mr. BAROR (Israel) doubted whether all such work could be done administratively. He was currently negotiating with UNICEF and the Technical Assistance Administration, but the two bodies did not seem to have any integrated policy. The regional UNICEF personnel should advise governments what kind of assistance to request. The Board could not dictate priorities to governments, but it could adopt criteria for the Fund's policies.

Mr. HEYWARD (Deputy Executive Director) explained that the practice was for plans for requests and plans for operation to be prepared from the outset in collaboration with the specialized agencies concerned with the technical aspects. WHO, for example, was working out arrangements under which, governments' requests for health programmes would be dealt with by WHO on the technical assistance side, and by UNICEF in the matter of supplies.

/Mr. KHALIDY

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) proposed that the Board should adopt the papers before it as a whole (E/ICEF/R.191, paragraphs 1 to 18 and E/ICEF/R.191/Add.1, paragraph 3).

The Iraqi proposal was adopted.

Mr. LINDT (Switzerland), Chairman of the Programme Committee, then introduced the section on "Expenditure of Resources for Capital Investments" (E/ICEF/R.191, page 10). The Programme Committee had been in general agreement that it was sometimes better "to starve the present in order to feed the future," provided that programmes involving UNICEF assistance for local production were considered in the light of certain additional criteria listed in paragraph 20.

The additional criteria to be taken into account in the expenditure of resources for capital investments were approved (document No. E/ICEF/R.191, paragraph 20, sub-paragraphs a) to h) inclusive).

Mr. LINDT (Switzerland), Chairman of the Programme Committee, observed that the Yugoslav representative's paper outlining government, Executive Board and Administration responsibilities in the application of the internal (local) matching principle (E/ICEF/R.191, paragraph 22) shifted the emphasis somewhat in part C, "Administration Responsibility" but introduced no major modification in policy.

The Programme Committee recommended that the Yugoslav outline should be adopted.

Mr. HANIFAH (Indonesia) supported the Yugoslav outline except for the first sentence under the heading "Government Responsibility." The requirement that every request for assistance must be accompanied by a specific plan for matching UNICEF imports was impractical unless provision were made for modification of the original plan in the light of experience. If an original plan for matching proved quite inadequate, the additional appropriations needed might be so great as adversely to affect a country's budget.

Governments should have the right to review original plans that proved inadequate or impractical in conjunction with UNICEF and WHO, or any other agency concerned.

/Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay)

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay) thought that the formulation of the government's responsibility in sub-paragraph A of the Yugoslav outline was not very clear. He therefore in principle supported the Indonesian representative, but, since the question was one of principle that might affect the very heart of UNICEF's work, he would have to reserve his position.

The fact that a government was entirely without resources -- for a valid reason, such as some natural calamity -- might in itself induce it to turn to UNICEF for assistance.

Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia) replying to Dr. BUGNARD (France) said that the Yugoslav outline involved no change in established principles. The objections to sub-paragraph A were met by the provisions of sub-paragraph B (ii). If a government found itself in difficulty in carrying out its responsibilities, the periodic review by the Executive Board would discover that fact, and it would then be for the Board to assist the government. That was the positive and helpful sense of the paragraph, although it was true that it did stress the government's moral responsibility.

It had been suggested that the second sentence of sub-paragraph B (ii) might be interpreted as a threat of sanctions against a government that failed to match UNICEF imports. That had not been his intention, and he would welcome assistance in redrafting the sentence.

Mr. de PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) said that he was satisfied with the wording of sub-paragraph B (ii), in view of the fact that the Yugoslav representative's remarks would be a matter of record.

Some clarification was needed, however, of the relationship between sub-paragraph A (i) and B (i). Read together, they might be interpreted as requiring that the actual matching and the submission of requests should be simultaneous. That was not in accordance with the usual practice. To overcome the difficulty, he suggested that sub-paragraph A (i) should be amended to read:

"The specific measures by which the receiving government intends to match UNICEF imports should be indicated in all plans of operations;"

/Mr. de MARCHENA

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) shared the doubts expressed about the Yugoslav outline. It was difficult to accept sub-paragraph B (ii) even in principle. The Executive Board could not have the right to abrogate an agreement with a government on a programme by means of a simple majority which might be swayed by irrelevant political considerations. Further consideration of the section under discussion should be postponed until the next day, when a better draft could be worked out. It would be impossible for him to vote on the draft before the Board without consulting his Government.

Mr. ITURRALDE (Bolivia) also found paragraph 22 objectionable, as parts of it were not in harmony with UNICEF's fundamental purposes. It was just as much UNICEF's responsibility as that of the requesting government to suggest a plan of operations, but that was not stated in sub-paragraph A (1). In sub-paragraph B (ii), the intent was clear to modify or annul an agreed programme merely because certain difficulties might prevent a government from fulfilling certain responsibilities. That implied sanctions.

He supported the proposal of the representative of the Dominican Republic to postpone consideration to the next day.

Mr. BAROR (Israel) said that the matching principle was not new to UNICEF, and the Programme Committee's draft did not indeed go far enough. Under sub-paragraph C (iii) the Administration could have been called upon to publish reports on the extent of the participation of governments in UNICEF-assisted programmes. Those programmes had released enormous internal financial resources, and much of the matching that was taking place was known only to the governments themselves. It would be desirable to record that effect of UNICEF's operations fully.

/Mr. FOURIE

Mr. FOURIE (South Africa) thought it common sense that, if a programme was partly based upon matching funds at the outset, and if those funds were later not forthcoming, the programme should be re-examined.

He was convinced that in such a case the Executive Board would examine all the circumstances before taking any action.

Mr. FONSEKA (Ceylon) felt that, even if sanctions were not implied in sub-paragraph B (ii), it did contain a tone of reproach.

Mr. APUNTE (Ecuador) observed that, while his delegation supported the principle of internal matching, which it regarded as essential for the functioning of the Fund, the objections raised should nevertheless receive careful study. As the Uruguayan representative had pointed out, there might be cases where, because of a specific emergency, a country might not be in a position immediately to fulfil its matching obligations and nevertheless be one of the countries most in need of international aid.

Mr. LINDT (Switzerland), Chairman of the Programme Committee, observed that the principle of matching had been followed from the beginning, and the Yugoslav proposal had merely sought to emphasize it. If, however, it was felt that the draft could be improved, he suggested, as an amendment to the proposal of the representative of the Dominican Republic, that the draft should be referred back to the Programme Committee with a view to submitting a new draft to the Executive Board at its next session.

Mr. de MARCHEVA (Dominican Republic) accepted that amendment.

Mr. ITURRALDE (Bolivia) observed that, even though the matching factor was included in all contracts, the contracts were binding and could not be cancelled merely on account of a requesting government's delay in fulfilling its obligations. He suggested that the second sentence of sub-paragraph B (ii) should be omitted in any new draft.

Mr. de MARCHEVA (Dominican Republic) considered the Bolivian representative's legal argument well-founded. In most constitutional countries, agreements with UNICEF must be confirmed by a legislative body. The Yugoslav draft made it possible for a country to be confronted with cancellation of a programme after considerable difficulty had been experienced in obtaining legislative approval.

The Programme Committee should replace "matching" by a term that had some relation to established juridical concepts. The word was vague in English and meaningless in French and Spanish.

Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia) said that he had no objection to reference back to the Programme Committee, especially since the proposal was no longer his own but had been sponsored by the Committee. His own country would have expected, under the terms of sub-paragraph B(ii) to receive assistance in meeting its obligations, should circumstances render it necessary. The moral responsibility of matching UNICEF funds was paramount. If that principle, already set forth in paragraphs 171 and 172 of the Final Report of the First Executive Board (E/ICEF/160), were abandoned, everything else would fall.

It was, for instance, as a result of his Government's participation in UNICEF's milk programme in Yugoslavia that a permanent system of milk distribution to school children had been established -- something that would be of lasting benefit.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) supported the proposal that the matter should be referred back to the Programme Committee. However, she considered it essential that matching should be specifically reaffirmed as a fundamental principle, whether the word "matching", "equivalent additional internal resources" or some other formula was employed.

It should also be formally stated that the Fund had had from the beginning the implicit responsibility of seeing that obligations were fulfilled, although there, too, some happier wording could be found.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that, when there was urgent need for the humane services that were the basis of the Fund's existence, the principle under discussion became only a technical consideration. In view of the confusion that had been introduced into the debate, he could not vote on the proposed text, whether it reflected the past practice of the Fund or not.

/Dr. BUGNARD

Dr. BUGNARD (France) said that he was satisfied with the Yugoslav text as it stood, since it was in accordance with what had been done in the past. He supported the United States representative's suggestion that a text should be adopted containing an expression of the Board's determination to maintain the principle of equivalent internal funds.

Mr. de PAIVA LETTE (Brazil) supported the proposal to refer the question back to the Programme Committee. He disagreed with the United States representative on the need for mentioning the matching principle. It would be sufficient to note that paragraphs 21 and 22 had been referred back to the Programme Committee for redrafting. Some other principles of the Fund would not be mentioned and omission of reference to the matching principle would not necessarily mean that the Board no longer subscribed to it.

Mr. ROBERTI (Italy) supported the Brazilian representative's suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN observed that there was no conflict between the two proposals before the Board. It was clear that, in referring the question back to the Programme Committee, the Board desired a revised wording of the matching principle, as stated in the Yugoslav proposal. She suggested that that might be stated in the Board's report.

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) objected that use of the term "matching principle" in the report might lead to confusion. It was open to all kinds of misinterpretation.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay) suggested that, in preparing a new draft, the Programme Committee should take into consideration the views of all representatives as expressed in the current discussion.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) stated that she had been disposed to accept the Chairman's suggestion, but the question in her mind was whether some representatives were challenging a principle that had always

/guided

guided the Board in the past had been revived by the remarks just made. If the Board's report were to say merely that "the matter was referred back to the Programme Committee," that could be interpreted as raising a question concerning the matching principle. It would be bound to have the most serious repercussions on the Fund's work.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) agreed with the United States representative that an appearance of disagreement on the matching principle had arisen. The term "matching" had always been a source of difficulty for him also. He agreed with the proposal to refer the question back to the Programme Committee for reconsideration in the light of the discussion -- not as reconsideration of a principle, nor of the draft of a statement on an accepted principle, but merely of a section of the Programme Committee's report, i.e. paragraphs 21 and 22 entitled "Promotion of the Internal (Local) Matching Principle".

Mr. BAROR (Israel) also agreed that the section should be referred back to the Programme Committee. He proposed, however, that the original text of the Yugoslav proposal should be reproduced in the Executive Board's report.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) proposed that a sentence should be added to the paragraph of the Board's report dealing with the action taken on the section of the Programme Committee's report under discussion, to the effect that the Executive Board had contemplated no change in basic principles.

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that there was no change in principles involved, simply an unhappy wording. The whole subject required reconsideration because the Board's report was not primarily concerned with principles but with the ways in which UNICEF had dealt with governments.

Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) supported the United Kingdom representative's proposal that a statement should be included in the Board's report to the effect that the matching principle was not in question.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN noted that there was a proposal by the representative of the Dominican Republic, as amended by the Chairman of the Programme Committee, that the section dealing with the matching principle should be referred back to the Programme Committee for reconsideration and submission of a new draft to the next session of the Executive Board; a further amendment to that proposal by the representative of Iraq, as well as suggestions by various representatives concerning the new draft; and, finally, proposals by the representatives of Israel and the United Kingdom as to what should be included in the Board's report. She saw no conflict between those proposals and amendments, and suggested that all of them should be adopted simultaneously.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 6.12 p.m.