

**United Nations**  
**ECONOMIC**  
**AND**  
**SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**Nations Unies**  
**CONSEIL**  
**ECONOMIQUE**  
**ET SOCIAL**

UNRESTRICTED  
E/ICEF/SR 50  
17 March 1949  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

EXECUTIVE BOARD

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTIETH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,  
on Thursday, 10 March 1949, at 10.30 a.m.

Contents: Utilization of New Resources: (b) Allocations

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. W. B. SUTCH	New Zealand
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. S. CRAZIADIO	Argentina
	Mr. E.J.R. HEYWARD	Australia
	Mr. R. de OLIVEIRA CAMPOS	Brazil
	Mrs. D. B. SINCLAIR	Canada
	Dr. T. Y. WU	China
	Mr. de HOLTE CASTELLO	Colombia
	Mr. V. HOUDEK	Czechoslovakia
	Mr. F.T.B. FRIIS	Denmark
	Mr. A. MENESES	Ecuador
	Mr. L. BUGNAURD	France
	Mr. J. PESMAZCGLU	Greece
	Mr. N. A. UMOVRI	Iraq
	Miss M.Z.N. WITTEVEEN	Netherlands
	Mr. E. NORD	Norway
	Mr. J. A. ENCINAS	Peru
	Dr. L. RAJCHMAN	Poland
	Mr. C. I. WOLLIN	Sweden

Any corrections of this record should be submitted in writing, in either of the working languages (English or French), and within two working days, to Mr. E. Delavenay, Director, Official Records Division, Room F-852, Lake Success. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter, on headed notepaper, bearing the appropriate symbol number and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily by the services concerned if delegations will be good enough also to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.

Members: (Continued)

Mr. K. S. WAGNIERE	Switzerland
Mr. B. G. FOURIE	Union of South Africa
Mr. V. KOBUSHKO	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. R.T.D. LEDWARD	United Kingdom
Miss K. LENROOT	United States of America
Mr. M. LEVI	Yugoslavia

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

Dr. F. CALDERONE	World Health Organization
Dr. F. SOPER	Pan-American Sanitary Board
Miss M. L. SCOTT	) Food and Agriculture Organization
Dr. R. T. ALLMAN	

UNICEF

Mr. M. PATE	Executive Director
Mr. M. SCHMITTLINGER	Programme Co-ordinator
Dr. P.Z. KING	Medical Consultant, UNICEF
Mr. J. CHARNOW	Committee Secretary

UTILIZATION OF NEW RESOURCES: (b) ALLOCATIONS

The CHAIRMAN directed the attention of the Board to the question of allocations for the latter part of 1949 and the revised budget of operations for 1949, discussion of which had been suspended at the end of the previous meeting. He suggested the discussion should be based on the allocations recommended by the Programme Committee; an opportunity would arise later for consideration of the 1949 budget.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) said that though the recommendations of the Programme Committee on allocations carried great weight, the minority opinion raised in that Committee by the United Kingdom representative also deserved consideration.

The general debate had brought out two main issues; firstly, the relation of the work to be undertaken by the Fund in Europe with that

/undertaken

undertaken in other parts of the world, and secondly, the question whether feeding schemes at present in operation in Europe were to be discontinued wholly or in part.

The first issue was not a new one; it had been discussed at the UNICEF meetings in Geneva in 1948, and the decision would depend on the criteria to be applied in distributing UNICEF allocations. Among the suggested criteria, he considered that relative statistics should be treated with reserve and interpreted with the greatest care. Reports from representatives of the UNICEF Administration working on the spot might perhaps be regarded as the most useful aid to judgment.

The second issue had been debated in somewhat similar terms in Denmark a year and a half previously, when the Government had reluctantly decided that certain of its own feeding schemes in some European countries should be terminated. It was clear that the UNICEF feeding schemes would have to be terminated at some time; the only question was when and at what speed. Though the United Kingdom proposed perhaps too drastic a reduction, the Danish delegation supported the proposal on general grounds.

The Programme Committee had stated that the decision concerning the termination of the feeding programmes in Europe depended on whether the need for them still existed, whether the programmes could be broken off without disorganization and hardship, and to some extent, whether it was considered advisable to use for other purposes money collected specifically for feeding schemes.

The need for the feeding programmes certainly existed; it was on this evident need that the recommendations of the Administration and Programme Committee had been based. With regard to the problem of breaking off a programme without disorganization, a suitable time might be when the milk processing equipment sent by the UNICEF arrived. Perhaps the Administration could give approximate dates when this equipment might be available in the four countries of Eastern Europe previously mentioned.

The Executive Director had said that in three months' time his recommendations for allocations might have a different pattern. The Board was to meet at that time for its July session, but it would surely not be rational to change the allocations at present being agreed on/ <sup>at that</sup> sessio

/which

which would be mainly concerned with allocations for 1950. Feeding programmes should be related not to calendar years, but to harvest or school years, and a decision to terminate a feeding programme on 1 January 1950, for instance, would cause hardship. A more appropriate time for termination would be July 1949 or July 1950.

Perhaps the Executive Director would also elucidate the position as set out in document E/ICEF/100, page 13, from which it appeared that in Austria the UNICEF food allocations intended for 240,000 children were being "stretched" to feed 440,000.

Mr. PATE (Executive Director) replying to the Danish representative's questions, said that efforts were being made to ensure that the milk processing equipment arrived in the various countries in time to be used in spring or early summer 1950.

On the question of feeding programmes, it was clearly important to continue feeding throughout the winter. It was now March, and allocations were being made for supplies to last till the end of 1949; in the intervening months it was necessary that resources should be raised to maintain supplies throughout the winter. The UNICEF had, in fact, two goals: to continue feeding programmes till the end of the school year in spring 1950 and to secure more and more resources to enable a larger programme outside Europe to be undertaken.

Mr. SCHMITTLINGER (Programme Co-ordinator) said the Austrian Government was using a UNICEF allocation for 240,000 children to feed over 400,000, by eliminating infant feeding, i.e. high-priced whole milk, and using UNICEF supplies and local resources. The entire UNICEF allocation was being used for feeding programmes and UNICEF supplies were being pooled with the contributions of other foreign voluntary agencies. The Austrian Government hoped that with improved conditions, the number of children requiring UNICEF supplementary feeding would soon be reduced to <sup>about</sup> 300,000, while the rations per child would increase.

Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) said there seemed to be general agreement that UNICEF funds should be used in areas where there was an emergency; when the emergency ended it should transfer

its activities to other emergency areas. The sole consideration was therefore whether or not an emergency existed in an area where it was proposed that UNICEF should assist. Wide geographical considerations should be disregarded, and countries should be judged individually.

Individual foods should be considered in relation to other foods. If foods other than milk became more plentiful, Governments might be expected to divert more milk to children and mothers from the remainder of the population.

The fact that children were eager for the supplementary allowances was not a sound basis for judging whether they were necessary. Moreover, it was not for the UNICEF, essentially an emergency organization, to concern itself with raising the level of child-feeding above the 1939 level.

The Board had the fullest confidence in its Programme Committee and Administration, but should not regard itself as bound to accept their recommendations in every case. The South African delegation considered that it was now necessary to consider a gradual reduction of European assistance programmes in areas where improvement could be seen, though on a less drastic scale than was proposed by the United Kingdom representative.

Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) believed that it would be possible to find a compromise between the two views expressed in the report of the Programme Committee (E/ICEF/106). The difference appeared to be mainly a matter of the timing and extent of the reduction in the European feeding programmes. A useful basis for judgment was to be found on page 3 of E/ICEF/107, and as had been pointed out by the Danish representative, fare statistics should be treated with reserve.

Working on the criteria offered in that document, it should be borne in mind that the proportion of undernourished children in each country and the intensity of their needs were closely related to the economic situation and to assistance other than that of UNICEF. Varying degrees of improvement could be found in Europe, and an overall readjustment in the Fund's programme appeared necessary:

Sudden changes in the 1949 programme were to be deprecated, but when the new funds for 1950 were being reviewed, the Board might consider accelerating the shift of emphasis away from European relief towards other regions.

The Netherlands delegation approved of the general lines of the Programme Committee's recommendations, though it considered changes might be necessary in certain details after further examination of the United Kingdom proposals. The principle should, however, be laid down that, when new funds became available, priority should be given to areas outside Europe.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) declared that his delegation was convinced that the principle governing his proposal was entirely fair, and he had been pleased to find a certain measure of support on the Board for that opinion.

The Australian representative had implied that the five shiploads of milk, which was all that nine million dollars was purchasing for Europe, appeared a poor contribution compared with the assistance which UNRRA had been able to procure and would be but a drop in the ocean when distributed. Would it not, therefore, be better to divert the nine million dollars away from the beneficiaries of that scheme, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, and put it to some really valuable use in Asia, where UNICEF activities in China had shown how a relatively small expenditure could achieve a great deal?

Mr. Ledward repeated a previous statement to the effect that contributors to UNICEF might not have anticipated so great a proportion of assistance going to Eastern Europe, i. e. 40% under the present total of allocations.

He referred to a suggestion by the Australian representative to the effect that, as UNICEF assistance took six months to reach Europe, it would take even longer to reach areas in the Far East, and that allocations should be made to Europe without awaiting the reports of the missions in Asia. The speed with which UNICEF assistance had reached the Middle East after Count Bernadotte's appeal showed that this argument was unsound. The Australian representative had also suggested that the Board could not possibly judge the relative criteria for assistance, a suggestion which was hardly reasonable. On page 3 of E/ICEF/107 such criteria were suggested, and experience had also shown that no mechanical formula could be adopted in determining relative needs.

Working on the basis of those criteria, members should ask themselves whether there were more undernourished children in India or Czechoslovakia, or more homeless and orphaned children in Greece or in Poland? Was Poland, with a declared export surplus and food production rising above the pre-war

level, able to meet its own needs out of its currently available resources? Could the deprivation of children due to war in China, Bulgaria and Malaya be compared with that due to the war in Europe? As regards the wartime destruction of children's institutions, comparative estimates for Europe and the Far East might be obtained from the Secretariat of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, but in Asia such considerations were perhaps not valid. Relief supplies other than those from UNICEF sent to Central and Eastern Europe appeared to be far more considerable than relief supplies sent to distant Asia. By all the criteria, therefore, the claims of Asia were at least as strong as those of Central and Eastern Europe.

Though the only basis for the United Kingdom proposal was the conviction that such a policy was in accordance with the principles and practice of the Fund, it appeared that some members found it too radical. Instead, therefore, of his original proposal of a reduction of 5.5 millions in the allocations for Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Rumania, and the complete cessation of the feeding programmes in the summer of 1949, he would make a compromise proposal entailing a reduction of 3.5 millions, which might better meet the wishes of the Board. That would be broken up as follows: on table 4 of E/ICEF/100, column (1) would be changed to show half the proposed allocations for Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Rumania respectively, and in column (2) the allocation for Bulgaria would be reduced by \$100,000, for Czechoslovakia by \$49,000, that for Hungary would be deleted, that for Poland reduced by \$500,000 and for Rumania by \$200,000. He would make further suggestions regarding table 2 during later discussion.

As regards the date of terminating the milk programmes, surely that should be done when the milk processing equipment became available or when the country was able to feed itself, whichever happened first.

Mr. LEVI (Yugoslavia) said that he would support the Programme Committee's recommendations. The statistical data and the enunciation of principles supplied were most satisfactory; the Executive Director's statement had increased his favourable impression. The United Kingdom representative's arguments could not be regarded as valid in face of the statements by the Polish representative. The United Kingdom delegation had consistently pressed for reductions in certain areas; the motive might have some political implications. His own country had not begun to

export commodities because a surplus existed; it had been compelled to do so in order to obtain equipment to increase domestic production.

Mr. HEYWARD (Australia) felt that the United Kingdom representative had misunderstood certain of his remarks at the previous meeting. He had not implied that the countries concerned had failed to appreciate aid from the United Nations; that it was undesirable to await the reports from the chiefs of mission in Asia before allocating funds; and that the Board was not competent to make any judgment about relative needs. With regard to the question of priorities, he agreed with the Brazilian representative that the preventable death of a child anywhere was of equal importance. Resolution of the General Assembly 57(I), Section I, paragraph 1 (a) validated that view. The real issue was whether funds should be diverted from existing programmes to finance projects which would inevitably take longer to get into swing; he did not think that such action should be taken. Funds should be continuously employed; the contemplated shift of emphasis should be undertaken at a later stage. No evidence had been produced that the Governments in Asia wished the Fund to depart from the general principles governing its operation.

Dr. RAJCHMAN (Poland) outlined the procedure regularly followed preparatory to a decision by the Board. That procedure implied that the bases and criteria for such a decision had been fully examined; the Board made its decision purely on the basis of need. If members attempted to enforce their individual preferences about reallocation, especially for political reasons, it would mean the end of UNICEF. Only by submitting reasoned substitute programmes could members of the Board modify the recommendations of the Programme Committee.

Mr. MENESES (Ecuador) said that he agreed in principle with the United Kingdom proposal. He would, however, like to see the revision of certain criteria, particularly that of emergency. Insufficient attention was being paid to areas other than those devastated by war. Latin America was at present suffering from economic ills ranging from inflation

/to starvation

to starvation. Latin American Governments had been compelled to suspend their social welfare schemes, including those related to the needs of children, since they were forced to sell raw materials at low prices and import manufactured goods at high prices. The allocation of two million dollars to Latin America was gratifying because it helped to meet actual needs and at the same time demonstrated the principle of universality. That sum, however, was inadequate; it might be sufficient only for the demonstration projects of the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau. The Board should contemplate the allocation of additional funds to Latin America, particularly in view of the successful response to UNAC in that area.

Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) said that he would support the United Kingdom proposal. Statistics showed that nutrition levels in Latin America were lower than those in many parts of Europe; that constituted a situation of emergency.

Mr. PATE (Executive Director) said that the discussion had made it clear that UNICEF was showing a tendency to shift its centre of gravity; that could occur, however, only when further funds were forthcoming.

With regard to the situation in Hungary, he could not approve of the fact that that country had given up the programme of milk, fats and cod liver oil from 1 July. UNICEF was doing everything within its power to persuade that Government to maintain at least the milk programme since Hungarian children were still faced by shortage. The Hungarian Government, however, had decided it was essential to export powdered milk and fats because it was compelled to import certain raw materials and equipment, had certain obligations abroad and lacked foreign exchange. The shortage of laboratory and other equipment for children's programmes in that country had prompted the recommendation of 346,000 dollars for medical and other supplies.

With regard to Bulgaria, the Board's previous allocation of 200,000 child food units was now being fed to approximately 300,000 beneficiaries. The allocation of \$719,000 for milk, fats and cod liver oil had been intended as a normal ration

for 200,000 children. The proposed reduction to a ration for 100,000 children would inflict injustice; it would disappoint the chief of mission in that country who, after an extensive survey, had recommended that a ration for 300,000 children should be envisaged.

The effect of a reduction on the other three countries concerned would be similar; all three were fully utilizing the supplies allocated to them.

With regard to the reallocation of Medical supplies, the sums involved were not large; that programme should be maintained.

UNICEF had always hoped that its programmes would eventually affect far larger numbers of children. Although European production of such foods as bread had increased, the supply of milk, fats and cod liver oil had never covered more than a part of the needs. The Administration therefore hoped to maintain the proposed allocation, obtain further funds, continue the feeding programmes through the following winter and expand the scope of UNICEF progressively towards non-European areas.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) did not agree with the representative of South Africa that the attempt to raise standards above the 1939 level was beyond the scope of UNICEF; an interpretation of the words "for child health purposes generally" in resolution 57 (I) of the General Assembly, section I, paragraph 1 (a) justified that view. That phrase was the only justification for extending aid to parts of Asia and to Latin America. The same standards must be applied to all countries in allocating relief; <sup>in</sup> many of the countries outside Europe the level was above 1939 standards.

The United Kingdom representative had suggested that relief should be terminated either when milk processing equipment had been delivered or when a country had become capable of meeting its own needs out of its currently available resources; it would be more logical that relief should be terminated after the operation of the milk processing equipment had enabled a smooth transition to the stage at which the country concerned could take over the burden.

/With

With regard to Greece, her delegation was in full sympathy with the proposal to increase the allocation if there were a proportionate increase in the number of children affected. In accordance with table 2 (E/ICEF/100, page 18), that would be possible, since an unallocated reserve of 1.3 million dollars existed, even if the unallocated 11 million dollars contemplated in the revised 1949 budget of operations were not forthcoming.

The total allocation of 13.5 million dollars in table 4 was reasonable at the present stage; she would accept the Programme Committee's recommendations, but would propose certain minor variations on the basis of new data which had become available to her delegation after table 4 had been drawn up. It appeared that needs in Roumania and Bulgaria were considerable, that the allocation for Czechoslovakia was reasonable and that for Poland probably a little high. At a later stage, therefore, she would introduce a resolution to the effect that the Programme Committee should make a further study in the light of the new data and report to the following meeting whether changes were desirable. In reply to the Polish representative, she said that the proposed changes would affect only the countries under discussion and would not affect the fixed total of 13.5 million dollars.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) pointed out that the adoption of the United States subsidiary proposal might influence the main vote; he suggested that it might be presented in the form of an amendment to the Programme Committee's recommendations.

Mr. de HOLTE-CASTELLO (Colombia) introduced a resolution to reconcile the United Kingdom proposal with views expressed during the discussion. That proposal was based on document E/ICEF/106, paragraph 23. The recommended allocation for Europe should be reduced by 3,000,000 dollars; that sum should be reallocated as follows: 500,000 dollars to the unallocated reserve; 1,000,000 dollars to South East Asia; 750,000 dollars to India, Pakistan and Ceylon; 750,000 dollars to Latin America.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) observed that the Colombian proposal was complementary to his own.

/Mr. PATE

Mr. PATE (Executive Director) explained the advantage of fixing the allocation for the second six months of 1949 definitely so that governments could complete their plans for the production of foodstuffs to complement the milk distribution. There were funds in hand to enable work to be started immediately in the areas concerned by the Colombian proposal. Work in the Far East would be largely of a medical and educational character, involving long-term programmes. Reserves for such purposes should be allocated when the raising of funds had been assured. With regard to Greece, according to the report of the Australian member who had visited that region, the refugee problem approached that of the Middle East in magnitude. The Administration would recommend that further aid should be supplied if an appropriate organization could be built up in that country.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.