

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/ICEF/SR.74 31  
12 February 1951

ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND  
EXECUTIVE BOARD

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,  
on Friday, 9 February 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS:

- Opening of the meeting
- Question of the representation of China
- Election of the Chairman
- Adoption of the agenda
- Rules of procedure (E/ICEF/60)
- Final report of the first Executive Board (E/ICEF/L.8, E/ICEF/160)

<u>Acting Chairman:</u>	Mr. MARTIN HILL	Secretariat
<u>Chairman:</u>	Mrs. SINCLAIR	Canada
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. BRENNAN	Australia
	Mr. FENAUX	Belgium
	Mr. PACHECO	Bolivia
	Mr. de PAIVA LEITE	Brazil
	Mr. SHVETSOV	Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic
	Mr. COREA	Ceylon
	Mr. P. Y. TSAO	China

Any corrections to this record should be submitted in duplicate in either of the working languages (English or French), within two working days, to the Director, Language Services Division, Room A1-223, Lake Success. Corrections should bear the appropriate symbol number and be enclosed in an envelope marked "URGENT". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily if delegations will be good enough to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.

Members: (continued)

Miss BERNARDINO	Dominican Republic
Mr. DAVALOS	Ecuador
Mr. DEBRE	France
Mr. RAJAN	India
Miss ARTATI SUDIRDJO	Indonesia
Mr. KHALIDY	Iraq
Mr. LOURIE	Israel
Mr. MASCIO	Italy
Mr. WEIR	New Zealand
Mr. LINDT	Switzerland
Mr. DHENGSVANG	Thailand
Mr. SAVUT	Turkey
Mr. HAHN	Union of South Africa
Mr. CHECHETKIN	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. LEDWARD	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Miss LENROOT	United States of America
Mr. BRACCO	Uruguay
Mr. PLEIC	Yugoslavia

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. DAWSON	International Labour Organisation (ILO)
Mr. AYKROYD	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Mr. PATTON	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
Dr. INGALLS	World Health Organization (WHO)

OPENING OF THE MEETING

Mr. MARTIN HILL (Secretariat), on behalf of the Secretary-General, welcomed the members of the new Executive Board, particularly those who were attending a meeting of the Board for the first time, two of whom represented countries which were not Members of the United Nations. He observed that as a result of its activities during the preceding four years, UNICEF had become known all over the world, and he emphasized the greatness of its achievement. A new phase of activity was beginning for the organization and the opportunities for doing constructive work would be no less than they had been in the past.

He transmitted to the Board the Secretary-General's good wishes for success in its important task, and promised it the Secretariat's fullest co-operation. He then invited members of the Council to proceed to the election of a Chairman.

#### QUESTION OF THE REPRESENTATION OF CHINA

Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, raised the question of the representation of China. He recalled that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China had informed the United Nations that it did not consider the Kuomintang representative to represent the people of China and that he should therefore be excluded from the Executive Board and the other organs of UNICEF. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China had in August 1950 named Mr. Wu Yun-fu as its representative on the Executive Board of UNICEF. The representative of the Soviet Union endorsed the view of the Government of the People's Republic of China and declared that the presence of the Kuomintang representative in the Executive Board was out of order.

Moreover, on 25 January 1951 the Universal Postal Union had confirmed its decision to recognize the representative of the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only authorized representative of China.

He submitted a formal proposal to exclude the representative of the Kuomintang from the Executive Board and to invite the representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to take part in its work.

Mr. MARTIN HILL (Secretariat) stated that as the representative of the Secretary-General he was merely occupying the Chair until the Board had had time to elect a Chairman. He would act in accordance with the Board's wishes regarding the procedure to be followed in dealing with the proposal of the representative of the USSR, but he hoped that the substance of the question would be considered only after a Chairman had been elected.

Mr. TSAO (China) wondered whether he ought to reply to the representative of the USSR before or after the election of the Chairman. In any case he reserved the right to make his observations on the proposal before the Board.

/Miss LENROOT

Miss IENROOT (United States of America) did not wish to discuss the USSR proposal in detail. It was the opinion of her Government, in view of the General Assembly resolution of 14 December 1950, that the Executive Board of UNICEF should not take any decision on the question for the time being. She recalled that the resolution of 14 December 1950 had recommended that when any such question arose it should be considered by the General Assembly or the Interim Committee and that the attitude adopted by the General Assembly or its Interim Committee should be taken into account in other organs of the United Nations.

She further pointed out that organs of the General Assembly were still studying the question, and stated that she intended, in accordance with rule 26 of the rules of procedure, to move the adjournment of the debate on that topic until the General Assembly had come to a decision. Meanwhile, she thought that the present representative of China should keep his seat on the Board. Finally, she observed that in her Government's view no representative of the Chinese Communist Government should be permitted to occupy a seat in any organ of the United Nations as long as the armed forces of that Government were fighting against the United Nations forces in Korea.

Mr. SHVETSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that a representative of the Kuomintang, a group the Chinese people had rejected, which only maintained itself in Formosa thanks to the support of the American army and navy, could not be allowed to sit on the Board. The Chinese seat on the Executive Board belonged by right to the representative of the People's Republic of China. He therefore supported the USSR representative's proposal.

Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) pointed out that rule 9 of the rules of procedure laid down the procedure for settling questions of representation on the Board. According to that rule, the Chairman of the Executive Board examined credentials and reported upon them to the Board. He therefore proposed that a Chairman should be elected immediately. The latter would then examine the credentials of representatives and make a ruling with regard to the USSR representative's proposal, which the Board would either uphold or reverse.

Mr. TSAO (China) expressed surprise that the USSR representative was once again raising the question of Chinese representation. In his opinion, events in the Far East and the discussion in the First Committee had shown the true nature of the intentions of the Soviet Government and the Chinese Communist regime. His Government was the lawful Government of China; it had helped to establish the United Nations and the Soviet Union had signed a treaty of friendship and alliance with it in 1945. The Chinese Communist regime did not represent the Chinese people, had not been elected and was merely a tool of Russian Communism. Moreover it had recently been formally condemned by the First Committee and the General Assembly.

The Board had already on two previous occasions refused to consider the same proposal by the USSR, and he considered that the question was still outside the competence of the Board. In that connection he too quoted the resolution adopted on 14 December 1950 by the General Assembly, recommending that in the event of controversy concerning the representation of a Member State, the question should be considered in the light of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter, Article 4 of which provided that only peace-loving States could become Members of the United Nations. The Peking regime, however, had just been condemned as an aggressor by the General Assembly.

Moreover, UNICEF was not an independent organ. It was a subsidiary organ established by a General Assembly resolution and was therefore undoubtedly bound by the resolution of 14 December 1950.

According to the resolution adopted on 1 December 1950 by the General Assembly, the Executive Board of the Fund was to consist of the Governments of the States represented on the Social Commission and the Governments of eight other States to be designated by the Economic and Social Council; hence his delegation, being represented on the Social Commission and the Economic and Social Council, was entitled to sit on the UNICEF Executive Board. It would therefore be illegal and contrary to the Charter for the Executive Board, on its own authority, to change the representation of China. The USSR proposal was inadmissible and the Executive Board was not called upon to take any decision on it.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America), in accordance with rule 26 of the rules of procedure, formally moved the adjournment of the debate on the USSR proposal until the General Assembly had taken a decision on the question of Chinese representation.

/Mr. CHECHETKIN

Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) opposed the United States representative's motion for adjournment. The motion was out of order and was merely an attempt to bypass the powers of the Executive Board. The latter established its own rules of procedure and under rule 9 it was empowered to examine the credentials of representatives on the Board. The USSR proposal was therefore quite in accordance with rule 9 of the rules of procedure.

Mr. TSAO (China), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the United States representative had formally moved the adjournment of the debate. That motion had priority; only two representatives could speak for and two against it. The USSR representative, however, was dealing with the substance of the question, which was contrary to the rules of procedure.

Mr. MARTIN HILL (Secretariat) could not, as Acting Chairman, admit that remark; he was obliged to allow the USSR representative to explain why he would vote against the motion for adjournment.

Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) repeated that some organs of the United Nations had already taken decisions on the question of Chinese representation and maintained that the Board was empowered to decide on its own attitude. He therefore urged that his proposal should be put to the vote.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) also opposed the United States motion for the adjournment of the debate. He reminded the Board that the Australian representative, referring to rule 9 of the rules of procedure, had called for the immediate election of a Chairman, who would examine the credentials of representatives and report upon them to the Board. He supported the Australian proposal.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) supported the United States motion for adjournment. He stressed the great importance of the question before the Board and remarked that the General Assembly had established a Committee for the specific purpose of examining the question of the representation of Member States. Until that Committee had submitted its report the Executive Board could not come to any decision on the question.

/Mrs. SINCLAIR

Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada) also supported the United States motion for adjournment. She suggested, however, amending it to the effect that the USSR proposal should be postponed indefinitely and not merely until the General Assembly had taken a decision on the subject.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) accepted the Canadian amendment, although she preferred the original drafting of her motion. The United States motion as amended therefore simply proposed to adjourn the consideration of the USSR proposal.

Mr. MARTIN HILL (Secretariat), in reply to a question by the representative of Ceylon, said that he would first put to the vote the motion for adjournment. The procedure proposed by the Australian representative could be examined subsequently.

Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) agreed that the motion for adjournment had priority; he felt some doubt about reverting to his procedural proposal.

Mr. SHVETSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) opposed any adjournment of the USSR proposal.

Mr. TSAO (China), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the United States representative had moved the adjournment of the debate and its closure. He too was opposed to continuing the debate. He further remarked that the question of the examination of representatives' credentials by the Chairman had been raised. That was quite a separate question from the right of the governments of States to sit on the Executive Board. The Chairman could only examine the credentials of representatives.

Mr. SHVETSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) did not consider that he had infringed the rules of procedure, which allowed two representatives to speak in favour of and two against a motion for adjournment. The United Kingdom representative had also opposed the motion for adjournment, although for a different reason. He urged that the USSR proposal should be put to the vote.

/Mr. MARTIN HILL

Mr. MARTIN HILL (Secretariat) said the Board must now take a decision on the motion for closure of the debate.

Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) could not accept the way in which the procedural question had been put and urged that his proposal should be put to the vote.

Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) observed that the question under discussion was not a motion for closure of the debate, but a motion for adjournment, which took precedence over any other proposal. He remarked further that the adoption either of his original proposal that the election of the Chairman should take place first or of the motion for adjournment would in fact have the same result.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States motion for adjournment of the debate.

The motion for adjournment was adopted by 18 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) contended that it was evident from the Australian representative's observation that adjournment of the debate on his proposal was directly related to the question of the election of the Chairman. The USSR proposal would have to be reconsidered after the election.

Mr. MARTIN HILL (Secretariat) said that it would be for the Chairman who was elected to take a decision on that question.

Mr. LOURIE (Israel) had voted against the motion for adjournment because his Government was of the opinion that China should be represented in United Nations organs by the representative of the People's Republic of China.

Mr. RAJAN (India) pointed out that while his delegation had supported the resolution of the General Assembly on the question of China's representation in the General Assembly, following the defeat of India's own resolution, it had abstained on that part of the former which preserved the status of the present representatives of China pending a decision by the General Assembly on the report of the Special Committee. His delegation therefore felt free to decide the question on its merits and, in accordance with the repeatedly affirmed policy of his Government, he had therefore voted against the United States proposal.



ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN

Mr. MARTIN HILL (Secretariat) requested the members of the Executive Board to submit nominations for the office of Chairman.

Mr. DEHRE (France) nominated Mrs. Sinclair (Canada). In support of his proposal, he stressed that Canada had made an outstandingly generous and effective contribution to the work of UNICEF. Mrs. Sinclair had been Chairman of the previous Programme Committee, and the experience she had thus gained would be very valuable. He added that her whole life had been devoted to child welfare.

As a further mark of the esteem in which Mrs. Sinclair was held, he proposed that the election should be by acclamation, rather than by secret ballot.

Mr. de PAIVA LEITE (Brazil), Mr. TSAO (China), Mr. LINDT (Switzerland), Miss LENROOT (United States of America) and Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) warmly supported Mrs. Sinclair's nomination, and the proposal that the election should be by acclamation.

Mr. MARTIN HILL (Secretariat) asked whether there were any objections to the election of Mrs. Sinclair as Chairman by acclamation, which would be a departure from the rules of procedure.

Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the election of the Chairman should take place by secret ballot, in accordance with the rules of procedure.

Mr. MARTIN HILL (Secretariat) announced that the procedure laid down in the rules of procedure would be followed, as requested.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

As a result of the vote, Mrs. Sinclair (Canada) was elected Chairman.

Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that, since the Chairman had been duly elected, there was now nothing to prevent the Board from taking a decision, in accordance with rule 9 of the rules of procedure, on the proposal he had submitted at the beginning of the meeting that the Kuomintang representative should be excluded.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN stated that she had not had time to examine the credentials of representatives and she was therefore unable to accede to the USSR representative's request.

Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) challenged the Chairman's ruling and urged that his proposal should be put to the vote.

The Chairman's ruling was maintained by 18 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) explained that he had voted in favour of the Chairman's ruling because she ought to be given time to study representatives' credentials.

#### ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The CHAIRMAN called the attention of the members of the Board to the agenda submitted by the Administration. She observed that, if the usual practice of the First Executive Board was followed, a number of items would be referred to a programme committee for consideration.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America), referring to the order of the items, asked whether the election of other officers and committees should not take place immediately after the adoption of the agenda. She thought it would be appropriate to refer the first two sections of item 4 and the whole of item 7, i.e. recommendations of the Executive Director for new allocations and apportionments, to a programme committee for consideration.

Mr. de PAIVA LETTE (Brazil) agreed with the United States suggestion, adding that, in his opinion, item 6, the office of the Executive Director, should be considered immediately after the election of other officers and committees.

Mr. DEERE (France) said that as many of the members were new to the work of the Executive Board it would doubtless be easier for them to elect the other officers and the committees if they could first consult the other representatives. It would, therefore, be better to adhere in the main to the agenda as proposed by the Administration.

/Es agreed

He agreed with the United States representative that some of the questions on the agenda should be referred to a programme committee which would later report to the Board. The Board should therefore take up the consideration of the Final Report of the First Executive Board (E/ICEF/L.8) as soon as it had adopted the agenda; there would probably be a general discussion on the report during which the Board could outline the Fund's future policy and which would facilitate the consideration of additional allocations and apportionments which the Board would later undertake. At its afternoon meeting the Board could also elect its other officers and the members of the committees and could set up a programme committee to consider the Executive Director's report and other agenda items. The programme committee should submit a report to the Board at the beginning of the following week.

His delegation would propose the addition of another item to the agenda; it was anxious that the Executive Board should know of the work done by the International Children's Centre in Paris during the past year. That item could be inserted between items 8 and 9 of the agenda.

Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia) supported the French representative's proposals. The study of the Final Report of the First Executive Board would help to familiarize new members with the work of UNICEF and would give them a clearer idea of the functioning and organization of the Board.

Mr. MASCIO (Italy) said that as the representative of a country which was taking part in the work of the Executive Board for the first time, he wholeheartedly supported the French representative's proposal, which would give the work of the Board a logical sequence.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) also supported the French proposal; she added that the Board should elect its officers and the members of the committees during the afternoon meeting even if the consideration of the Final Report had not been completed. As soon as the agenda had been adopted the Board should examine the question of its rules of procedure.

The proposals of the representatives of Brazil, France, and the United States of America were adopted.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN announced that the United Nations Secretariat had asked her to suggest that the Board should consider item 6 of the agenda -- the office of the Executive Director -- in closed session. She therefore suggested that the Board should consider that item immediately before that afternoon's open meeting.

It was so decided.

The agenda was adopted as amended at the suggestion of the representatives of Brazil, France and the United States of America.

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE (E/ICEF/60)

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) submitted the following amendments to the rules of procedure: the words "ten days" in rule 3 to be replaced by the words "three weeks" and the words "as far as possible" in the third and fourth lines of the same rule to be deleted; the words at the end of sub-paragraph (b) of rule 4 following the words "by any member" to be deleted and the following sub-paragraph to be added to rule 59: "The Executive Board shall take all necessary steps to assure close collaboration between the administration of the Fund and the specialized agencies in accordance with the agreement made between the United Nations and those agencies".

The CHAIRMAN wondered whether, since the rules of procedure had been drawn up by a sub-committee and not by the Board itself, the members of the Board would not wish for an opportunity of considering them in detail. She suggested that they should be referred to a committee for study and report.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) remarked that in that case the rules of procedure of the First Executive Board would remain in force until the new rules had been adopted.

Mr. DEBRE (France) agreed with the Chairman's suggestion; as the revision of the rules of procedure would take some time, it would seem logical to retain the rules of procedure of the First Executive Board until the committee had made its report.

Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) suggested that the Board should ask the Chairman to appoint the committee in question, which, in his view, should be small.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

/FINAL REPORT

FINAL REPORT OF THE FIRST EXECUTIVE BOARD (E/ICEF/L.8, E/ICEF/160)

The CHAIRMAN recalled that at its last session the preceding Executive Board had decided to give the present Board an account of its stewardship, summarizing, for the benefit of its successors, the experience acquired by the Fund in determining policy and using its resources. She drew the attention of the members to document E/ICEF/L.8.

Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reminded the Board that in its resolution 57 (I) of 11 December 1946, the General Assembly had stipulated that the International Children's Emergency Fund should be used "for the benefit of children and adolescents of countries which were victims of aggression", for the benefit of children and adolescents which were receiving assistance from UNRRA and "for child health purposes generally, giving high priority to the children of countries victims of aggression". The General Assembly had also laid down that the Fund should dispense or distribute supplies or other assistance on the basis of need "without discrimination because of race, creed, nationality status of political belief". It was clear from the Final Report of the First Executive Board, however, that far from adhering to the principles laid down in General Assembly resolution 57 (I), UNICEF had practised discrimination towards the People's Democracies -- the countries which had suffered most from the Hitlerite invasion. Disregarding the terms of that resolution, the Fund had decreased the amount of supplies dispatched to certain countries and had even stopped all assistance to Albania, Romania and Hungary.

In view of that fact, he could not approve the report before the Board and would vote against its adoption.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) said that it was not for the Executive Board either to adopt or reject the report which was submitted to it for purposes of information only. The Board need only take note of it and request that it should be circulated to the various governments and bodies concerned. Her delegation would in due course submit a motion to that effect.

Mr. DEERE (France) agreed that there was no need for the Board to take a decision on the report since it was only meant to furnish it with data which would help it to decide upon its future course.

19/2 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.