

## INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

Executive Board

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING

Lake Success, New York  
Friday, 12 March 1948 at 10.30 p.m.

Present:

Chairman: Dr. RAJCHMAN (Poland)

Australia	Mr. TANGE
Brazil	Mr. CAMPOS
Canada	Mrs. SINCLAIR
China	Mr. HSIAO
Colombia	Mr. ORTIZ-RODRIGUEZ
Denmark	Dr. HOLM
Ecuador	Miss TOUS
France	Dr. BUGNARD
Greece	Mr. KYROU
Iraq	Mr. KHALIDY
Netherlands	Miss WITTEVEEN
Norway	Mr. NORD
Peru	Mr. BENAVIDES
Sweden	Mr. WOLLIN
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. POROZNIAKOV
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. KAMENEV
Union of South Africa	Mr. WOODWARD
United Kingdom	Mr. ALEXANDER
United States of America	Miss LENROOT
Yugoslavia	Mr. VILFRAN
Switzerland	Mr. KESSLER
Executive Director, ICEF	Mr. PATE
ICEF Headquarters	Mr. SABIN
	Mr. CHERNOW

NOTE: Corrections of this summary record provided for in the rules of procedure should be submitted in writing within the prescribed period to Mr. Delavanay, Director, Editorial Divisions, Room CC-119, Lake Success.

Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter written on headed notepaper and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent" and bearing the appropriate symbol number.

REPORT OF THE PROGRAMME COMMITTEE (document E/ICEF/51).

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Board would continue its examination of the Report of the Programme Committee, the first ten pages of which had been dealt with at previous meetings.

The first three sub-paragraphs of paragraph 27 were approved subject to certain drafting changes.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) withdrew the amendment to the final paragraph of paragraph 27 which she had proposed at a previous meeting.

Mr. HSIAO (China) opposed the allocation of a \$1,000,000 reserve for "the treatment of children and mothers in countries which will undertake an overall campaign for the eradication of syphilis". If the recommendation were adopted in spite of his opposition he suggested that the word "overall" be omitted.

Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada) also opposed the allocation of monies from future resources at that time. The Canadian delegation had, it was true, been in favour of the proposal for the B.C.G. programme, but the present recommendation was in a different category, and the Board had frequently been told that its resources were very limited. Medical advice was that any campaign against syphilis must be overall to be effective, but as only one country had had the foresight to put such a programme into operation, the sum suggested would not be required to meet requests at the outset. The Board should confine itself to programmes which could be operated in a substantial number of countries, and should be slow to commit itself to further expenditure in view of the limited and doubtful nature of future resources. The Canadian delegation questioned the feasibility of the Board's action of the previous day in voting away monies of which it had not in fact possessed.

/Miss LENROOT

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) drew attention to document E/590 which, on page 13, stated

"because of recent developments in medical science which make possible the prevention of tuberculosis in children and the complete eradication of venereal diseases in children and pregnant mothers, priority is to be given in providing medical supplies and services to governments which wish to develop projects in these fields."

In the light of that policy a letter had already been circulated to Governments asking whether they desired to submit projects in the field of venereal disease. For that reason she would not wish the report to omit all mention of the subject, although she agreed that it was difficult to allocate specific sums from future resources, since the Board did not know to what extent they would be required. She proposed that the final sub-paragraph of paragraph 27 should be amended to read:

"It is recommended that Governments desiring to do so be encouraged to submit projects for the eradication of syphilis in children and expectant and nursing mothers for consideration of the programme Committee and the Executive Board when making allocations out of future resources."

Dr. BUGNARD (France) considered that the allocation of one million dollars recommended by the Programme Committee should not be regarded as excessive. It would be difficult to allocate less, and in view of the figures received from the one country which had already established a programme for the eradication of syphilis he considered that the matter was so important as to constitute an emergency. He could see no advantage in adopting the amended text proposed by the United States, but preferred the original wording submitted by the Programme Committee.

/Mrs. SINCLAIR

Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada), in reply to a question by Mr. Kyrou (Greece) stated that she would be prepared to accept the United States amendment.

Mr. TANGE (Australia) opposed the United States amendment. The Programme Committee's recommendation was that a reserve fund should be established for the treatment of children and mothers in countries prepared to undertake an overall campaign for the eradication of syphilis by means of a particular technique. The choice, as explained by technical experts, lay between the public health technique of the blanket application of remedial measures to a particular country, and the method of providing limited relief.. which would be extremely limited in view of the Fund's resources -- for particular cases. He strongly questioned whether the Board should adopt the latter technique. Furthermore, the Fund should not be committed, even by implication, before the Board had received some indication of the type of project which countries would suggest. The text proposed by the representative of the United States gave no indication of the kind of programmes which would be acceptable to the Fund.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) felt that in principle she and the representative of Australia were largely in agreement. She had included the word "eradication" in her amendment, and no system of individual treatment could be regarded as a programme for the eradication of syphilis. She had not used the phrase "countries which would undertake an overall campaign" because it would be impossible to cover the whole of a country as large, for instance, as China.

Mr. HSAIO (China) objected to the emphasis placed by the representative of Australia on the word "overall". If, however, the term were used in the sense of a large scale campaign for the eradication of syphilis in a certain limited area of a country, that would be acceptable to him; but if it were taken to imply a nation-wide campaign he would oppose it very strongly.

/He suggested

He suggested that the best means of encouraging campaigns would be to allocate a sum of \$300,000 immediately. The United States representative had told the Board that a circular letter had been sent to Governments, and the Board would be placed in a delicate position if it did not provide a fund which could be used in countries other than Poland. He did not agree with the United States representative that document E/590 gave authority for the circular letter, but felt that the Chief of the European Office had exceeded his duty in that respect. Several members of the Programme Committee had expressed the same view, but the action was now a fait accompli and the Board could not retract. On the whole it would be better to adopt the text suggested by the United States.

Mr. POROZNIAKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) found that the United States amendment tended to substitute the abstract for the partially concrete, whereas the original paragraph, although not entirely satisfactory, was at least based on concrete figures and requests and suggested means for dealing with the situation.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) regarded the proposal of the Chinese representative as unrealistic. One million dollars was a minimum, even for Poland alone, and the Board could not reduce the amount.

Mr. PATE (Executive Director of ICEF) pointed out that the application which had been received in connection with the share of children and mothers in the Polish programme had been withdrawn until the Board could ascertain what projects would be submitted by other Governments.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with the United States representative that "overall" should be interpreted as meaning that a programme should be on a sufficiently large scale to ensure the attainment of the object in view. It could not, however, be taken to apply to the whole of a country as large as

/China,

China, where the programme must be confined to areas which, from the technical point of view, could be considered large enough for the purpose it was sought to achieve. Furthermore, any campaign had to be sufficiently extensive to ensure that those who had been treated stood no risk of re-infection. It was impossible to define the size of such an area in a resolution because it would depend on a technical survey and on the views of the public health authorities in the country concerned.

Mr. TANGE (Australia) felt that the United States amendment put the Board's intentions in a false light. The mention of the limited sum of one million dollars in the original text made it clear that the assistance which might be expected would be very restricted. The failure to mention such a specific amount might lead Governments to expect more help than the Fund would probably be able to afford.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) suggested to the Australian representative that if the ICEF could establish the existence of a really urgent need the necessary money might conceivably be forthcoming. The inquiries would be extremely valuable, provided Governments were not led to expect immediate or substantial assistance. In keeping with his desire to see all countries treated alike in all matters, he suggested that the amendment might be reworded to read :

"It is recommended that the Governments of countries eligible under the Resolution of the General Assembly No. 57 (1) should be asked whether they wish to submit projects for the eradication of syphilis in children and expectant and nursing mothers for the consideration of the Programme Committee and the Executive Board when making allocations out of future resources."

The CHAIRMAN wished to make it clear that, although Poland's programme entailed an extensive mobilization of medical personnel and a vast

/expenditure,

expenditure, including the purchase abroad of penicillin costing 1,600,000 dollars -- which created considerable foreign exchange difficulties -- it was not dependent upon assistance from the Fund. As he had informed the Programme Committee, and as had been intimated to WHO, the Polish Government would welcome technical interest and would be pleased to make available its experience in the matter. When the Executive Board was in a position to consider the matter from a practical standpoint Poland would be ready to co-operate.

The text proposed by the United Kingdom representative was adopted by twelve votes to eight.

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Board had completed its examination of the Programme Committee's recommendations paragraph by paragraph and would proceed to consider them as a whole.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) proposed that the recommendation on page ten of the Report concerning the anti-tubercular project, which had been adopted at a previous meeting, should be reconsidered. Although the earlier vote had included a large number of abstentions it had, nevertheless, resulted in the approval of a sum two million dollars in excess of the original recommendation. In view of the unprogrammed balance, which included flexible reserves, there was some argument in favour of exceeding the original amount by one million dollars, but it was hazardous to increase it by as much as two million. Technical authorities had informed her that considerable time would be required for the development of programmes outside Europe which would call for the immediate expenditure of two million dollars, and she suggested that the paragraph be amended to read :

"Recommends that the sum of \$3,700,000 be allocated for a Bacillus-Calmette-Guerin anti-tubercular project, in addition to \$300,000 to be taken out of the \$500,000 medical reserve approved by the Executive Board (E/590 paragraph 23), of which \$1,000,000 will be taken from future resources."

/Mr. HSAIO (China)

Mr. HSAIO (China) supported the United States proposal, but pointed out that it must be understood as a definite allocation. He felt that the Administration was confusing allocation and payment. Allocation did not mean the actual and immediate disbursement of monies. Governments planned their budgets months in advance, and included in them allocations which were met from revenue received later. He could not accept any suggestion of difficulty from the Administration based on the argument that the \$3,700,000 was not available for immediate use.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) also accepted the amendment proposed by the United States representative, despite the fact that the earlier decision had been reached by a majority vote conducted in accordance with the rules of procedure. He suggested that for the purpose of clarification some indication should be included of the manner in which the total of four million dollars was to be spent -- either at the end of the paragraph under discussion or in paragraph 21 (2) as the Chairman might decide. The Board was anxious to maintain the principle of a balance between expenditure inside and outside Europe, and he suggested that the addition to the text should be amplified to read :

" ..of which \$1,000,000 be taken from future resources  
for expenditure outside Europe."

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) informed the Board that he had abstained from voting on the original proposal on the ground that a comparative survey of needy areas must be undertaken in order that a considered pattern of allocation might be formulated. From earlier discussion he had inferred that "outside Europe" comprised China, the Far East generally, the Near East and, possibly, Latin America. If countries were interested and were qualified by their needs, the problem arose as to the best means of advising them of the programme. Two procedures were possible. A circular could be sent to the



Governments concerned stating that the Executive Board had decided that \$2,000,000 might be available for B.C.G. programmes, and inviting them to submit programmes or statements of their requirements, whichever they preferred. On the other hand, it might be better for the Executive Director to proceed with the proposed survey of comparative needs and, on the basis of that, to indicate to the Governments of countries in which the infant mortality rate from T.B. reached a certain level what were the possibilities of assistance.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it would contravene resolution 57 (1) to address only members of the United Nations in regard to this matter, but that, on the other hand, a circular letter sent by the United Nations to all countries would be open to misunderstanding. The best method of avoiding such a dilemma would be to ask WHO to inform all its members of the B.C.G. programme.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) expressed warm approval of this suggestion.

Mr. HSIAO (China) said that if the words "for expenditure outside Europe", as suggested by the United Kingdom representative, followed immediately after the words "of which \$1,000,000 will be taken from future resources", the impression would be given that only \$1,000,000 was to be used outside Europe.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) felt it would have been better to deal with the matter under paragraph 21. However, if it was to be dealt with in the paragraph under discussion, the proposal could be clarified if the proposed amendment read : "\$2,000,000 to be immediately available for a European programme and \$2,000,000 for expenditures outside Europe, of which \$1,000,000 will be taken from future resources."

/Mr. BUGNARD

Mr. BUGNARD (France) supported the Brazilian proposal for the sending of a circular letter. The European programme was based upon the necessity of immediate help to war victims, and the same criteria would have to be applied outside Europe. The resources of the Fund would have to be divided equitably between European and non-European countries. In the absence of the requisite information, however, there was danger of allocating ridiculously small sums. A programme for the Far East should be undertaken only with assurance of sufficient resources.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out, firstly, that paragraph 21 of the Report implied that the European programme would be undertaken immediately, and, secondly, that sub-paragraph (4) of that paragraph stated that the Executive Board would approve the first list of countries in which operations were to be started and every subsequent proposal as to new countries. The purpose of the proposed circular letter was to obtain precise information from countries planning to seek assistance from the Fund, that information to be used in deciding on the establishment of programmes for such countries.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) agreed with the Chairman's analysis. In making its decisions, the Executive Board would have to take into consideration the priorities established by the General Assembly, but those priorities were not to be understood as establishing an exclusive right to assistance. A comparison of infant morbidity and mortality rates from tuberculosis might reveal an extremely urgent need in countries which had not been victims of aggression. Indeed, statistics indicated a higher infant mortality rate in Uruguay, for example, than in France. Furthermore, European needs had been fully taken into account through an outright allocation of \$2,000,000.

Mr. TANGE (Australia) felt that the proposed amendment to take the additional \$1,000,000 from future resources was simply an admission that the

previous decision to increase allocations for a B.C.G. programme by \$1,000,000 had no justification in the light of the Fund's present resources. He could not vote for such an attempted rationalization of the previous decision, which, he pointed out, had been adopted with less than the membership of the Board voting. Apart from the question of the desirability of an allocation of that kind, and apart from the question of whether it would be practicable for the countries concerned to make use of the resources of the Fund for the particular technical undertaking envisaged, he was strongly opposed to the tying up of future resources. If the amendment were adopted the Australian delegation reserved the right at future meetings to raise the question whether the \$1,000,000 reserve was actually being used, or could be used, for the purposes specified, and the further question whether it should not be diverted, at least in part, to other programmes such as the feeding programme.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) stated that, before the adoption of the previous decision, he had suggested several methods of avoiding the difficulties involved in the inevitable conflict of interests as between different programmes. For instance, he had proposed that no commitment beyond a period of three months be made in regard to the food programme; but his suggestions had been rejected. That was the result of not looking at the programme as a whole.

He would support the proposal as the lesser of two evils. In three or four months' time, when the Board met again, it would be possible to revise the decision if, in the light of further information, it proved to be unsound.

Mr. HSIAO (China) expressed the opinion that the objection of the representative of Australia to the additional allocation of \$1,000,000 was based on a misconception of the term "present resources". Examination of Appendix 4, on page 34 of document E/ICEF/51, would reveal that the assets

/available to

available to the Fund totaled \$19,600,000 and not \$15,800,000. The financial statement gave the erroneous impression that the figure of \$3,800,000 did not represent a sum available for allocation. While the figure did not represent cash on hand, nevertheless proper accounting procedure required that it be included among assets. With this explanation, he was willing to accept the modification proposed by the representative of the United States.

As to the project itself, it was a mistake to adopt an "all or nothing" attitude. The vaccination of 3,000,000 children would not eradicate tuberculosis, but neither would the vaccination of 15,000,000; it was better to vaccinate 3,000,000 than none.

Mr. PATE (Executive Director) thought that the appendix on page 34, taken together with the analysis on page 35, provided a very clear statement. The Fund received contributions in many different currencies. In the future, as suggested by the representative of Australia, the phrase "Equivalent in United States dollars" would appear at the top of such tables as that on page 34.

Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada), as one who had voted against increasing the allocations by \$1,000,000, did not feel that the proposed amendment improved the situation sufficiently to warrant the support of her delegation. If the amendment were passed, the Canadian delegation would reserve the same rights previously reserved by the Australian delegation.

Mr. POROZNIAKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) stated that the Board had been placed in an embarrassing position by accepting the figure of \$3,700,000, since it did not have sufficient resources to implement that decision. The large number of abstentions on that vote indicated that at the time the question had not been very clear to members of the Board. The implications of the decision had been revealed, however, by the present

/discussion.

discussion. He therefore proposed that the matter should be reconsidered and that the Board should adopt the original figure of \$2,700,000.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) noted, in connection with the Chairman's announced decision to put the Ukrainian proposal to a vote before the United States amendment, that in a sense her amendment also involved reconsideration of the matter. It would therefore be simplest to vote first on the question of reconsideration; if that motion were adopted she would then move an amendment incorporating the figure of \$3,700,000 and her proposed addition.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) questioned whether the rules of procedure allowed reconsideration of a previous decision. In reply to the Chairman's statement that actually the Board had now been reconsidering the text for some time, he declared that the purpose of that reconsideration had been merely to obtain clarification of a text definitely agreed upon; it was quite another matter to take a new vote on the text.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) stated that agreement to add a phrase to the adopted text implied no right to reconsider a vote already taken.

Mr. HSIAO (China) agreed with the remarks of the representative of Brazil. If the Board voted on reconsideration of this particular paragraph, he would feel entitled to propose reconsideration of any and every item in the Report.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) in view of the discussion which had taken place, withdrew her previous suggestion that the United States amendment might properly be treated as a proposal to reconsider.

Mr. VILFRAN (Yugoslavia) supported the Ukrainian proposal. He pointed out that a precedent for reconsideration of a question already voted upon had been set at a meeting of the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly;

/indeed,

indeed, that such a precedent had in effect been set at the previous meeting of the Board itself, since the representative of Iraq had changed his vote at the very last second, or perhaps even after the vote had actually been taken. Furthermore, there was no intention of reconsidering the substance of the recommendation voted upon; in fact, reconsideration of a small detail, the implications of which had not previously been clear, was desired precisely in order to enable the members to remain faithful to the principle underlying their earlier vote.

Mr. TANGE (Australia), on a point of order, held that procedurally the United States amendment was on exactly the same footing as a proposal to change the figure of \$3,700,000 to the original figure of \$2,700,000. This was so because allocations could be made only out of present resources and therefore a proposal to "allocate" \$1,000,000 out of future resources was tantamount to an amendment reducing the allocation by that amount.

Dr. BUGNARD (France) endorsed the position of the Australian representative and urged reconsideration of the previous decision. His delegation would support the allocation of funds for any country in the world when a concrete project was submitted, but was unwilling to commit sums for the future without knowing the exact needs of the countries concerned.

The CHAIRMAN, ruling on the point of order raised by the representative of Australia, held that the United States amendment and the Ukrainian amendment were on the same footing.

Mr. KYROU (Greece) suggested that the Board first decide on the principle of submitting the Ukrainian amendment to the vote. If that were decided affirmatively, there would then be another vote on the substance of the proposal.

/Mr. VILFRAN

Mr. VILFRAN (Yugoslavia) agreed with the representative of Greece. It would be difficult technically to call the Ukrainian proposal an amendment; rather, it was a proposal to rescind a former vote and proceed to a new one. The simplest procedure would be to determine whether the Board wished to rescind the previous vote.

Mr. TANGE (Australia), clarifying his point of order, stated his contention to be merely that the United States amendment was on the same footing as any other amendment reducing the allocation at issue to \$2,700,000. Whether any such amendment would be in order would depend on a decision by the Board as to whether it was willing to reopen discussion of the substance of the relevant paragraph.

Mr. HSIAO (China) held that if, as stated by the representative of Yugoslavia, the Ukrainian proposal was not an amendment, but a new motion, the Chairman was acting in contravention of the rules of procedure if he were to put it to the vote forthwith. He stated that the Chairman was not acting impartially.

Mr. KESSLER (Switzerland) moved that the meeting be adjourned.

The motion was adopted by nineteen votes to one.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.