

United Nations

Nations Unies

UNRESTRICTED

**ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIAL**

E/ICEF/SR.23  
30 March 1948

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND**

Executive Board

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-THIRD MEETING**

Lake Success, New York  
Thursday, 11 March 1948 at 2.30 p.m.

Present:

Chairman: Dr. RAJCHMAN (Poland)

Australia	Mr. JOCKEL
Brazil	Mr. CAMPOS
Byelorussian SSR	Mr. KAMINSKY
Canada	Mrs. SINCLAIR
China	Mr. HSIAO
Colombia	Mr. ORTIZ-RODRIGUEZ
Czechoslovakia	Mr. STOLZ
Denmark	Dr. HOLM
Ecuador	Miss TOUS
France	Dr. BUGNARD
Greece	Mr. KYROU
Iraq	Mr. KHALIDY
Netherlands	Miss WITTEVEEN
New Zealand	Mr. LENDRUM
Norway	Mr. FINN MOE
Peru	Mr. BENAVIDES
Sweden	Mr. WOLLIN
Ukrainian SSR	Mr. POROZNIAKOV
Union of South Africa	Mr. WOODWARD
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. KAMENEV
United Kingdom	Mr. ALEXANDER
United States of America	Miss LENROOT
Yugoslavia	Mr. VILFRAN
Switzerland	Mr. KESSLER
Executive Director, ICEF	Mr. PATE
ICEF Headquarters	Mr. SABEN
	Mr. CHARNOW

NOTE: Corrections of this summary record provided for in the rules of procedure should be submitted in writing within the prescribed period to Mr. Delavenay, Director, Editorial Division, 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.

**RECEIVED**

APR 5 1948

UNITED NATIONS  
ARCHIVES

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

FAO

Miss SCOTT

WHO-IC

Dr. CALDERONE

The CHAIRMAN announced that the representatives of the United States of America, the Union of South Africa and New Zealand had agreed to serve on the drafting committee for the Board's report. The text of the Chinese draft resolution, as amended by the Board, had been distributed. He pointed out that the correct result of the roll-call vote taken on the Australian amendment to the Chinese draft resolution at the preceding meeting was: nine votes for, seven against and four abstentions. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had voted for the draft.

After some discussion, the Board decided by eleven votes to nine to confirm the final recording of the vote taken at the preceding meeting.

Mr. HSIAO (China) said that the amended text was quite different from the original Chinese draft, since he did not wish to vote against a text which still contained a few good points, he would abstain.

Mr. KAMENEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that in that case the text could not be called anymore a Chinese draft resolution.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) explained that although he supported the BCG programme, he would vote against the amended draft which he considered to be incomplete.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by fourteen votes to four with four abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN, after announcing that the adopted text would replace paragraph 21, first paragraph, (document E/ICEF/51) turned to the examination of the second paragraph. Referring to the United Kingdom representative:

view on the financial implications of the proposed BCG programme, the Chairman pointed out that the Danish, Norwegian and Swedish contributions would be made only on the basis of that proposal, such a contribution, would automatically result in a further matching contribution from the United States Government. Consequently the proposal would bring about an ultimate increase of ICEF resources. In connection with the allocation of the \$3,000,000 recommended for the BCG programme, the Chairman put in an urgent claim for \$1,000,000 to be assigned out of that sum to preliminary work necessary in the Far East and, perhaps, Latin America for the adequate preparation, control and administration of the BCG vaccine. Referring to his experience in China and other Far Eastern countries in connection with League of Nations projects, he agreed with the representative of China that tuberculosis was the principal health problem in that country and pointed out that preventative vaccination was not only an important, but also the only immediately available weapon against that disease. Even in Europe where the standard of living was higher than in the Far East, conditions were not entirely adequate in some countries for the preparation of BCG vaccine; but, there is every reason why, ICEF ought to start its programme there immediately on the basis of \$2,000,000 recommended by the Programme Committee. The Executive Director would make an announcement, soon regarding the person to undertake a survey in the Far East. The representative of China might be requested to initiate discussions with his Government and local WHO representatives with regard to necessary preparations.

Speaking for his own country, the Chairman said that in view of the acute health problem and great losses of medical personnel Poland would ask for assistance under the programme provided it could be completed during 1949. The young generation had to be taken care of immediately, and he was sure that other receiving countries would also like to see the project carried out by the end of the coming year. Poland had already started a BCG programme with the help of the Danish Red Cross; a different kind of BCG vaccine had been developed in his country during the last eighteen

/years,



years, but assistance would be needed until Polish medical services were ready to take over again. Poland would always be ready to cooperate in constructive programmes of international organizations and would place her experience at the disposal of others. He was convinced that the project would be taken over by the Governments as soon as possible.

Mr. HSIAO (China), concentrating his remarks on paragraph 21, second sub-paragraph, reserved his position with regard to the points listed thereunder. During the discussion of allocations in the Programme Committee, he had raised the fundamental question of ICEF's competence to assign funds to the ECG programme. Since that matter had been settled and a decision was to be taken with regard to the amounts to be allocated, he had to point out that it would be neither fair nor sufficient to allocate \$2,000,000 for an immediate European programme and only \$1,000,000 for preparatory work in the Far East, Asia and perhaps Latin America. Speaking not only for China, but for Asia as well, he pointed out that the territory of Asia and the Far East was much larger and held many more children than Europe. The Chairman had already mentioned the seriousness of the health situation in China and Asia; his country had not applied for assistance only because it had not been informed of these projects. In reply to the Chairman's remark that preliminary work was necessary before vaccination programmes could be carried out in the Far East, Mr. Hsiao brought to the Board's attention the fact that with air-transportation vaccines could be flown from Paris and Copenhagen to outlying regions long before the time-limit of the vaccine's potency was reached. Technical preparation for the local production of vaccines in the Far East could go hand in hand with mass vaccination programmes. In view of the Danish representative's statement that \$2,000,000 was absolutely necessary in order to get the programme under way, Mr. Hsiao felt that not less than \$3,000,000 should be allocated to the project and not less than one-half of that amount should be set aside for the Far East and Asia.

/Mr. CAMPOS



Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) said that he would abstain from voting on the matter because sufficient statistical data were not available in order to assess the degree of needs in various regions. The Report by the Sub-Committee on Medical Projects had very little information in that regard. He did not challenge the allocations, however, and expressed appreciation of the fact that Latin America was considered for inclusion in the project.

Upon a suggestion by Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom), the CHAIRMAN agreed to pass over the question of allocations for the time being and to proceed to the consideration of the points listed under paragraph 21, second sub-paragraph.

#### Point 1

Mr. FINN MOE (Norway) suggested the addition of the words: "and its Scandinavian associates" after the words "Danish Red Cross" on the second line of point 1.

The Board agreed to the Norwegian drafting amendment.

#### Point 2

Mr. CALDERONE (World Health Organization), upon a question by Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada) regarding the attitude of WHO toward point 2, said that without a proper statistical analysis the programme would lose its value for future reference.

Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada) said that, as pointed out before, the ICEF was carrying out an emergency programme, expenditures for statistical studies should be borne by WHO which was interested in the permanent values of the project.

/Miss LENROOT

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) agreed, but suggested that since WHO had not yet been finally established the Board might delete the phrase: "except that this cooperation does not involve at present any financial commitments to WHO-IC", and make it understood that the Administration would be asked to explore the possibilities in that respect.

This suggestion was agreed to by the Board.

The CHAIRMAN observed that in connection with the provision of point 2, frequent consultations between the Sub-committee on Medical Projects, WHO and other expert bodies would be necessary. In view of the importance of those meetings it might be advisable to appoint two more members to the sub-committee.

Mr. HOLM (Denmark) agreed with the Chairman and added that it would be most desirable to appoint experts on the BCG programme. He suggested that the United States of America and some Latin American country might be represented.

Mr. BENAVIDES (Peru) also agreed with the suggestion and proposed Brazil for membership of the sub-committee.

The CHAIRMAN, in reply to a question by the representative of the United Kingdom, specified that only countries, not persons, had been chosen. He pointed out that since the Sub-committee on Medical Projects was responsible to the Programme Committee, the Board should address a pertinent recommendation to the latter.

This was agreed to by the Board.

### Point 3

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) proposed that the following phrase should be added at the end of the point: "including expenditure for local personnel."

/This was agreed

This was agreed to by the Board.

Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada) raised two questions in connection with that point: 1) there should be some guarantee, under the model agreement, that many children could be treated in the selected areas; and 2) that local expenditures would be borne by local authorities. Her delegation considered it important to follow such a policy, even if it should slow up the project.

Dr. HOLM (Denmark) explained that although the general purpose was to reach the entire population, the Scandinavian countries preferred to carry out the project by convincing the population of the necessity of vaccination rather than by using compulsion. A demonstration team from Denmark would introduce the project, after public reaction to it was known and the local authorities committed themselves that full use would be made of the vaccination possibilities, a tri-partite agreement could be signed. The preliminary projects would be carried out by the Scandinavian countries. If, as had happened in <sup>a section of</sup> Germany, an insufficient number of people took advantage of the opportunity, the group would take the project to another part of the country.

Point 4

Dr. HOLM (Denmark), in reply to a question by the representative of the United Kingdom, said that up until the present agreements had been concluded between Denmark and participating governments; ICEF would assume responsibility only after the tri-partite agreement had been signed. Until then, the work would not be supervised or financed by ICEF.

This point was accepted.

/Point 5



Point 5

Point 5 was accepted without comment.

Point 6

Mr. PATE, Executive Director, stated that in accordance with its general policy the Administration tried to save hard currency and used each monetary unit in the most efficient manner. Some supplies might still be obtained from UNRRA; in some countries, where food was not available, technical equipment might be obtained. In reply to a question by Mr. Jockel (Australia), Mr. Pate said that it seemed most economical to purchase meter transport supplies in Europe; the question would be studied in detail.

Point 7

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) suggested that the substance of point 7, involving allocations to the Far East, should be incorporated in the second sub-paragraph of paragraph 21.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America), upon a suggestion by the representative of China, thought that the best procedure would be for her to present the United States amendment in connection with paragraph 21, point 2. She proposed the following text to be added at the end of the point: "and that a review of the situation with WHO, when finally constituted, should be undertaken."

The CHAIRMAN said that the United States amendment, accepted in substance, would be sent to the drafting committee.

Mr. HSIAO (China), referring to paragraph 27 as a whole, proposed that the total allocation should be changed from \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 and that on page 8, at the end of line 3 the words should be added: "leaving the other two million dollars for programmes outside Europe;"

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN noted that the United Kingdom had also presented a proposal on that matter. Before taking a vote on these suggestions the Board might first review its financial resources in connection with paragraph 27, especially since paragraph 25 had been dealt with and paragraph 23 was really included in the general plan of utilization of financial resources. It was understood that the Board had approved points 1 to 6; point 7 and the second sub-paragraph would be considered later.

PROGRAMME OF OPERATIONS FOR THE REMAINDER OF 1948 (Paragraph 26 and 27)

Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada) explained that the Committee had experienced difficulties because of the meager resources of the Fund and the tremendous needs to be met. The Programme Committee had carefully considered the merits of medical programmes as opposed to feeding projects.

The proposed budget appeared on page 34 of E/ICEF/51. Since it was necessary to advise the European receiving countries whether the feeding programmes would be continued, the Programme Committee recommended that the present allocations of milk, fats and cod liver oil should be extended for four months. An appropriation of \$2,700,000 for medical projects and a reserve of \$1,000,000 for allocations to countries which had not yet received aid were also recommended. The \$750,000 figure for administrative expenses for the remainder of the year had been taken over from the recommendations of the Committee on Administrative Budget. An unprogrammed balance of \$3,800,000 remained, but the sum was not in hard currency and part of it was earmarked for special purposes. It was impossible to determine how much would be available; allocation was therefore impossible. As funds and commodities from the unprogrammed balance became available, distribution would be effected to the receiving countries by the Administration on a pro-rata basis.

/Mr. ALEXANDER

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) considered the question of budgetary appropriations most important. According to Mr. Pate, the Fund had already spent \$19,000,000. The total sum of the proposed budget (page 34) was \$19,600,000. A total of \$38,000,000 would thus be spent under the priority system for war devastated countries. Only \$1,000,000 remained for all other countries in the world. The proportion could hardly be justified.

While it was true that benefits should not be sprinkled too thinly, the Fund must arrange its activities in such a way as to avoid the accusation that discrimination had been practiced or that the system of priorities had excluded countries which merited consideration.

The Fund should set aside an additional \$1,000,000 for the BCG programme in China and the Far East and \$1,000,000 more should be set aside as a reserve for countries which had not yet received aid from the Fund. Accordingly, other appropriations would have to be reduced by \$2,000,000 in order to balance the budget. The continuation programme of milk, fats and cod liver oil could be limited to two or three months instead of four. If more resources became available, the Board could at its next meeting increase the period to four months.

Since the Fund was appealing for world-wide support, it must maintain its international character by apportioning benefits more equitably.

Mr. PATE (Executive Director of ICEF) announced that most of the \$11,000,000 resources of the Fund on deposit in banks in the United States would be spent soon to purchase milk and fats.

The proposal to augment the BCG programme by another \$1,000,000 for the Far East would create an additional reserve which must be set aside and could not be touched for some time. In addition to the \$3,500,000

/Chinese programme



Chinese programme which had already been approved, the new proposal would bring the Fund's total expenditures for China to \$5,500,000. While work on the anti-tuberculosis programme could be started in Europe immediately, it would take some time to organize the project elsewhere. Since the Executive Board met every few months, it seemed unwise to tie up too much money. Accordingly, Mr. Pate recommended that the BCG programme should remain at \$3,000,000 with the possibility of future increase of the allocation for China.

Regarding aid to countries not yet served by the Fund, Mr. Pate gave assurance that the Administration favoured having the services of the Fund as broad and non-discriminatory as possible. Complete objectivity was one of the important factors in attracting support for the activities of the Fund.

Mr. HSIAO (China) felt that the BCG appropriation for China and the Far East must be increased, but deemed it undesirable to adopt the United Kingdom proposal to shorten the feeding programme to a period of less than four months. An additional six months programme had originally been planned; no further cut should be voted.

Mr. Pate had opposed the increase because most of the \$11,000,000 balance of the Fund would be spent soon and he felt that no further sums of money should be tied up. In Mr. Hsiao's opinion, however, appropriation of the additional sum for BCG would not mean that the Administration must put \$1,000,000 aside and never touch it. Future income would cover the increased allocation. Even though the additional \$1,000,000 might not immediately be spent on BCG programmes for China and the Far East, the increased aid should be voted.

/If it was felt

If it was felt that the books must balance, the \$1,000,000 needed for BCG in China and the Far East could be secured by eliminating the \$1,000,000 syphilis reserve or by increasing that reserve to \$2,000,000, so that the tuberculosis programme would be included.

Mr. KAMENEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) believed that, since the Programme Committee had adopted its recommendations after consultation with medical and other experts, discussion should be limited, and unless there were substantially new proposals from the Board, a vote should be taken.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) referred to page 33, E/ICEF/51 and pointed out that the initial six month feeding programmes would in many cases terminate in July or August. It seemed unwise to have the full programme last less than ten months, yet equitable distribution of the Fund's resources was also important.

Miss Lenroot proposed that the following text should be inserted at the end of the last paragraph on page 10:

"and that in allocations of future resources that may become available, special consideration should be given to these countries with a view to providing an equitable balance in the entire programme."

Since it was difficult to name a specific amount which might be necessary for a tuberculosis reserve, Miss Lenroot proposed that the following paragraph should be inserted after the paragraph on venereal disease (page 11):

"It is further recommended that in allocations from future resources special consideration be given to the needs of countries outside Europe for the anti-tuberculosis programme should present allocations for this purpose be found to be insufficient."

/Mr. ALEXANDER

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) recalled that in the past there had been repeated expressions of sympathy for the countries outside Europe, yet nothing had been done. There was no means of ascertaining future income, but it was unlikely that the Fund would receive another \$40,000,000. Aid to non-European countries could not be delayed.

Mr. PATE (Executive Director of ICEF) could give no estimate of future contributions, but pointed out that UNAC proceeds would provide fairly large resources to the Fund.

The CHAIRMAN appealed to the Board to accept the proposals of the Programme Committee with the two amendments suggested by the United States. The Committee had examined the question in great detail and stressed the fact that the programme fell short of the needs and expectations of the Fund. Budgeting in a relief organization always presented a very difficult problem. Estimates might be based on expected contributions, but in providing definite allocations the Board could not exceed its resources. The wisest course would therefore be to accept the proposed budget. The question of future allocations for countries which had not yet applied was adequately covered by the two United States amendments and by the United States statement on allocations. Cutting the feeding programmes already in progress, as suggested by the United Kingdom, would create a very difficult situation. Moreover, the Fund would receive added resources from UNRRA, from UNAC and possibly from governments.

By sixteen votes to one, the Board decided to close debate and proceed to a vote on the recommendations of the Programme Committee.

Paragraph 27, page 10

Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted.

A United Kingdom amendment to change "four" to "three" in the second line of paragraph 3 was rejected by twelve votes to five.

/The original



The original text of paragraph 3 was unanimously adopted.

Paragraph 4 was adopted.

Mr. HSIAO (China) proposed that in the first line of paragraph 5 the figure \$2,700,000 should be changed to \$3,700,000. The total ECG anti-tubercular project appropriation would then be \$4,000,000. Mr. Hsiao reminded the Board that in the fifteen months since the passage of the General Assembly resolution establishing the International Children's Emergency Fund, not one cent had been spent on any country outside Europe. If an additional \$1,000,000 for the Far East was refused, ICEF could not justify itself as an international Fund.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) endorsed the Chinese proposal and urged the Board to remember that there were other countries in the world besides those in Europe.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) announced that he would abstain from voting on the Chinese amendment not because he opposed aid to the Far East but because available statistics on the substance of the question were inadequate to permit judgment.

A vote was taken by roll-call. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: China, Iraq, Netherlands, Peru, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom

Against: Australia, Canada, France, United States of America

Abstained: Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Greece, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Ukrainian SSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Switzerland

The amendment was adopted by six votes to four, with eleven abstentions.

The text of paragraph 5 as amended was adopted.

Paragraph 6 was adopted.

/Mr. ALEXANDER

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) recalled that the budget indicated an unprogrammed balance of \$3,800,000 which was to be allocated among countries already receiving allocations. In recommending a reserve, the Board should consider the possibility of including the unprogrammed balance in the reserve. There was no reason why countries not yet receiving allocations should not participate in the reserve.

Mr. Alexander proposed that the sum \$1,000,000 in line 2 of paragraph 7 should be increased to \$2,000,000.

Mr. STOLZ (Czechoslovakia) stated that in addition to countries which had not yet received any allocation, there were others which had not received adequate allocations. In order to make provision for use of the reserve in adjusting allocations, the following text should be added at the end of paragraph 7:

"and also for adjustments for countries which did not receive adequate allocations."

Mr. VILFRAN (Yugoslavia) approved the Czechoslovak amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) felt that the Czechoslovak amendment might defeat its purpose and proposed that, in order to ensure adjustment of Czechoslovakia's allocation, specific mention of that country should be included in the text.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) thought that, in the light of the facts on the unprogrammed \$3,800,000, the Board was becoming involved in a difficult situation. It must be borne in mind that the amount was only partially convertible into milk, fats or fish oil. There was no indication of the extent to which supplies from the balance would be appropriate for some of the countries considered in paragraph 7.

/Under the circumstances

Under the circumstances, Miss Lenroot considered it very difficult to increase the reserve to \$2,000,000 without providing for possible use of some of the amount for countries already receiving assistance since supplies might not be appropriate for all countries.

If the reserve were left at \$1,000,000, Miss Lenroot would agree to exclusive application to countries not receiving assistance. If the increased sum of \$2,000,000 prevailed, the scope should be broadened to include countries already receiving allocations.

It would be regrettable to specify any single country; other countries might also require adjustments.

In reply to a question from Mrs. Sinclair (Canada), Mr. PATE (Executive Director of ICEF) indicated the difficulties of maintaining a balanced budget and referred specifically to page 35 E/KEF/51 which gave details of the unprogrammed balance of \$3,800,000. The contributions listed under points 5 and 6, paragraph 2, could not be converted into milk or fats. Since neither France nor Czechoslovakia was in a position to supply those commodities, only the contributions of Australia and Uruguay remained. Most of the \$2,100,000 consisted of meat contributions, possible \$1,000,000 at most could be converted into milk and fats. Canada's additional contribution with the matching amounts from the United States would increase the Fund's resources somewhat, but Mr. Pate thought it wiser to leave the reserve at \$1,000,000 and wait until the next meeting of the Board to see how much money would be available.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) felt that a consistent policy regarding budgetary matters should be maintained.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the proposed increase in the reserve would involve an additional \$1,000,000 which could be taken from the unprogrammed \$3,800,000. The \$1,000,000 BCG increase which had been voted could not be spent immediately because it would take time to organize the programme in the Far East.

/The United Kingdom



The United Kingdom amendment to increase the reserve in paragraph 7 to \$2,000,000 was adopted by eleven votes to five.

After an exchange of views on the Czechoslovak amendment, it was agreed that some provision for adjustment of allocations was needed.

The Czechoslovak amendment was unanimously adopted.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) withdrew her amendment to paragraph 7. She reiterated her understanding that action in relation to present allocations should not constitute a precedent for future allocations.

Paragraph 7 as amended was adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.