

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

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

UNRESTRICTED  
E/ICEF/SR.27  
7 May 1948  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

EXECUTIVE BOARD

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Lake Success, New York

Wednesday, 26 April 1948 at 10.30 a.m.

Present:

Chairman: Dr. L. RAJCHMAN	(Poland)
Mr. S. Graziano	(Argentina)
Mr. E. Heyward	(Australia)
Mrs. D. Sinclair	(Canada)
Mr. C. Hsiao	(China)
Mr. A. Escallon	(Colombia)
Mr. N. Wright	(Denmark)
Mr. J. de Folin	(France)
Mr. B. Theodoropoulos	(Greece)
Miss M. Witteveen	(Netherlands)
Mr. W. B. Sutch	(New Zealand)
Mr. E. Nord	(Norway)
Mr. C. Wollin	(Sweden)
Mr. V. Kovalenko	(Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)
Mr. V. Kobushko	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Mr. J. Alexander	(United Kingdom)
Miss K. Lenroot	(United States)
Mr. M. Levi	(Yugoslavia)
Mr. E. Kessler	(Switzerland)
ICIEF Mr. M. Pate	(Executive Director)

RECEIVED

MAY 13 1948

UNITED NATIONS

Mr. K. Borders	(Headquarters)
Mr. D. R. Sabin	(Headquarters)
Mr. J. Charnow	(Headquarters)

/Representatives

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

Mr. C. Tauber	FAO
Miss M. Scott	FAO

AGENDA

The Board adopted the following Agenda: 1. Utilization of New Resources, 2. Time and Place of next Executive Board session, 3. Plan of Operations for China.

UTILIZATION OF NEW RESOURCES (E/ICEF/58/Add.1)

Mr. THEODOROPoulos (Greece) agreed in principle to the recommended allocations of the Programme Committee. He was particularly happy to see the increase in the reserve for the Far East other than China. His Government had, in the past, been hopeful that the children of Indo-China would benefit; he trusted that this reserve would now make this possible.

Mr. LEVI (Yugoslavia) pointed out that his position had been made clear at the last meeting in his statement commenting on the statement of the representative of China.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) and Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) approved the recommendations of the Programme Committee.

Mr. HSIAO (China) stated that the footnote limitation requiring full utilization of allocations for eligibility for the additional allocation of one month (Item 5) would work an injustice to countries whose programmes started late. He also objected to this proposal because of its precedent giving the Administration the final power to decide on allocations. He suggested that, in Item 5, after the word "children", the following be inserted: "On the basis of proposals acceptable to the Programme Committee".

Mrs. SINCLAIR (Chairman of the Programme Committee) stated that discretion had been left with the Executive Director because, otherwise, there would not be time to get the programmes under way.

Mr. PATE (Executive Director) pointed out that, as agreed at the last meeting of the Executive Board, Mr. Hsiao and he were asked to get together and work out something which would make fair provision for the fact of the Chinese operation starting somewhat later than the other operations. The conclusion to which he had come after his conversation with Mr. Hsiao was that it would be fair to propose, for the European operation, that a time limit of 31 December be placed for the utilization of this supplementary one month's allocation, and that the period for China be extended to 30 June 1949.

/Mr. ALEXANDER

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) suggested that "proposals acceptable to the Chairman of the Programme Committee" be substituted for "proposals acceptable to the Administration".

Mr. HSIAO (China) stated that he had the utmost confidence in both the Chairman of the Programme Committee and the Executive Director, but that his concern was with the principle of not according the power of allocation to any single individual. He did not believe that it would be difficult to convene the Programme Committee to approve the proposals. He could not, therefore, accept the amendment proposed by Mr. Alexander.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Fund was now in the operating stage, and had to devise machinery to get things done with maximum speed and efficiency. It was not practical to convene the Programme Committee every time a summer camp programme was being set up by a country. If the Executive Director put a plan up to the Chairman of the Programme Committee, she would then be speaking with the voice of the Programme Committee, as well as for the Executive Board, in acting on proposals of the Executive Director.

The amendment of the Chinese representative was lost.

The amendment of the United Kingdom representative was passed.

The Programme of Allocations recommended by the Programme Committee (Paragraph 8) was adopted.

Paragraph 9 - Adopted without comment.

Paragraph 10 - Adopted without comment.

#### TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING OF EXECUTIVE BOARD

The CHAIRMAN referred to the proposal made at the last meeting that the Executive Board meet in Geneva, beginning 16 July.

Mr. HSIAO (China) stated that he was still against meetings in Europe.

The Board agreed to hold its next session at Geneva beginning 16 July.

Mrs. SINCLAIR (Chairman of the Programme Committee) pointed out that the Programme Committee wished to meet in Paris on 3 July. It would be difficult for a number of members of the Committee to be in Paris any earlier than that date. The report of the Programme Committee could be delivered to the Board members at Geneva or at Lake Success before the members departed for Geneva. In either event it might not be available to Board members more than one week in advance of the Board session.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the report be sent to Board Members both to Geneva and to Lake Success.

PLAN OF OPERATIONS FOR CHINA

The following verbatim record of the statement made by Mr. HSIAO (China) is inserted at his request:

Mr. HSIAO (China)

"DURING the meeting of the Board on 20 April, when it considered the first \$1,000,000 programme for China, I made a statement in answer to that of our Soviet Colleague on the interpretation of the application of the General Assembly principle of non-discrimination. Last week-end, I was made aware that my statement has left in the minds of some the impression that the Chinese Government will not participate in any form of relief except within territories under its own control. This is a wrong impression. I am most sorry that it has unfortunately come into existence. I wish now to state clearly before the Board that such has never been the attitude of our Government nor such has been the impression I wished to create. The whole matter is a misunderstanding of my statement. In order to make clear what I actually said last time, I requested the Executive Secretary of the Board to reproduce in full the stenographic text of my statement in the Summary Record of our last meeting, which is now laid before you as document E/ICEF/SR.26. What I meant to say last time was no more and no less than what was recorded from page 4 to 6. The full text is before you. You can judge whether it justified the impression that some of you have. I suggest to you to read carefully the text, and trust that a fair mind will comprehend unbiasedly the true meaning of my statement without further elaboration on my part.

"As to the attitude of my Government in regard to the relief in areas temporarily occupied by the Communists in China, I have two pieces of information to present to the Board.

"First, the sub-committee on ICEF relief of the Chinese Co-ordinating Committee passed on 6 April a resolution to recommend to the ICEF Programme Committee the expenditure of \$350,000 for the importation of raw cotton into China to be turned into Chinese currency for a programme for the children and mothers in the communist areas. The recommendation was forwarded to the ICEF Administration along with the other recommendations regarding the Chinese Programme. The Administration regarded the commodity account idea unacceptable to the Programme Committee, decided not to bring up in the Committee meeting on the 15th, the recommendation of the Chinese sub-committee, and proposed instead to leave the sum of \$350,000 for future consideration along with the allocation for the additional four months.



"Secondly, through the courtesy of the ICEF Administration, I have been furnished with a copy of a cable from the UNICEF office in Nanking, which informed the Administration to the effect that the Chinese Cabinet has approved in toto without restrictions on April 15th the plan of operation attached to the agreement that is to be signed between the Chinese Government and the ICEF. In this plan certain excerpts regarding the relief in communist areas may be of interest to you. I quote to you the original cable:

"For aid of children, adolescents, pregnant and nursing mothers in communist area, Chinese Government will provide equivalent amount in Chinese national currency.

"Paragraph 8. Aid to children, adolescents, pregnant and nursing mothers in communist areas:

1. In rendering aid to children, adolescents, pregnant and nursing mothers, it must be assured that aid should reach children, adolescents, pregnant and nursing mothers who will be eligible for aid.
2. Methods of supervision and control of aid to children, ~~adolescents~~, pregnant and nursing mothers in communist areas must be same as those practiced in other areas."

"These two pieces of information may be of help to you to understand the attitude of the Chinese Government regarding the relief in communist areas. Hence I take the liberty to inform the Board."

At this point the Meeting recessed for ten minutes.

Mr. HEYWARD (Australia) stated that he heard with pleasure the information given by Mr. Hsiao concerning the intention of the Chinese Government to take into account the relative needs of children in all geographic areas, thus giving effect to the General Assembly Resolution creating the Fund. Since everyone is agreed on the principle concerned, the question was merely one of taking a step forward in its application. The Programme Committee has accepted, on the ground of getting activity started, an immediate programme for the southern cities. He believed it was the general desire of the Board to make as early a start as possible in other geographical areas. He proposed that the Board accept in addition to paragraph 6, as proposed by the Programme Committee, the following:

"The Board noted with pleasure the proposal of the Chinese Government for specific allocation to the "northern" areas. As an  
/immediate step

immediate step in securing for the whole programme distribution among geographical areas according to the needs of children, the Board proposes to allocate \$500,000 United States dollars for use in northern areas as soon as a satisfactory programme can be developed. The relation to the United States \$1,000,000 for the southern cities is without prejudice to the final geographic distribution of the whole programme which must depend on further consideration of the relative need."

Mr. KESSLER (Switzerland) supported the Australian resolution.

Mr. HSIAO (China) raised a point of order stating that the first sentence of Mr. Heyward's resolution referred to a proposal of the Chinese Government. Actually there has been no formal proposal by his Government to the Executive Board, and therefore the Australian resolution can not be based upon a Chinese proposal. The Chinese Government has given consent to a recommendation agreed upon between the UNICEF Mission in China and the Sub-Committee of the Co-ordinating Committee, and that recommendation has been forwarded from China to the Administration. It would be up to Mr. Pate to lay the recommendation before the Board if he wished.

Mr. PATE (Executive Director) stated that the Australian resolution might better be phrased in terms of United States dollar equivalents rather than United States dollars. He explained that the plan communicated to UNICEF by the Mission in China, including the allocation for an amount equivalent to \$350,000 for relief work in communist areas, represented the decision of the Co-ordinating Committee in China established by the Ministry of Social Affairs. From the standpoint of the Administration, the proposal of Mr. Heyward, if accepted, would be considered as a mandate to move forward as promptly as possible to the establishment of UNICEF activities in all areas in China. The first step of the Administration would be to communicate with its representative in Nanking. Steps taken in all areas of China would, of course, be with the full knowledge of the Chinese Government. As originally communicated by the Mission in China, the plan specified that \$350,000 in cotton be shipped to China and there converted into cotton yarn, this yarn to be gradually sold as the money therefrom could be utilized. It was to be changed into Nationalist currency and in some form or other converted into goods purchased in China for use in the communist areas. In prior consultation by the Administration with the Programme Committee, the attitude was generally unfavourable to any type of commodity-currency plan in a receiving country.

/From the

From the standpoint of the Administration, the plan proposed seemed to be an intricate one for reporting and accounting purposes. Therefore he had recommended to the UNICEF Mission in China that before the plan was finally submitted by the Chinese Government it be reconsidered. Personally he would prefer to see a more clean-cut type of operation. If it is the desire of the Board that operations be inaugurated in cities a, b, and c in communist controlled territory, it will probably be necessary for the international staff of UNICEF to report on requirements and needs, and the willingness at those points of local governments, or other agencies which may be there, to carry out the matching obligation, and in general, the other policies of the Fund. The UNICEF Chief of Mission in Nanking, and the Chinese Government, of course, would have to be fully informed.

Mr. HSIAO (China) asked if Mr. Pate was willing to recommend the proposal which had been transmitted to him with the approval of the Chinese Government i.e. the use of \$350,000 for the relief of children in communist areas. He pointed out that he had not made any proposal, and that the Australian resolution was based on the supposition of such a proposal.

The CHAIRMAN summarized his understanding of the situation as follows: The representative from China had informed the Board of a communication which the Executive Director received from China which stated that the proposal to allocate \$350,000 to communist areas had been approved by the Chinese Government. Mr. Hsiao had raised as a point of order whether the Board was competent to discuss this matter since the proposal had not been formally communicated to the Board by the Administration. It was the Chairman's view that the final authority of the Fund rested with the Board which was now assembled. It was for the Board to take such action as it deemed appropriate. The Executive Director had transmitted to the Board information received from UNICEF Mission in China with the recommendation that it be considered by the Board taking into account the views of the Administration on the proposal to the following effect: (a) \$350,000 is to be utilized in supplies - not currency (b) the manner of distribution requires further study and direct contact with the areas in which distribution is to be effected (c) any details of the plan connected with the distribution of supplies out of monies voted by the Board would be reported immediately to the Chinese Government and, according to procedure, to the Programme Committee and the Board.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) asked whether the \$350,000 was to come out of the \$850,000 recommended by the Programme Committee in

/paragraph 6 (b)

paragraph 6 (b) E/ICEF/58, or out of the allocation to China which remains unallocated.

Mr. PATE (Executive Director) pointed out that the original amount of \$1,200,000 had been suggested, of which \$850,000 was proposed for raw cotton to be processed into cloth and children's garments, and \$350,000 for a commodity currency plan. The \$350,000 therefore was originally proposed as being in addition to the \$850,000 for raw cotton.

Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the Board was in agreement on the principle of non-discrimination. The question was one of practice and implementation. As to procedure, the starting point should be the UNICEF Mission in Nanking. The Mission should make recommendations concerning the allocation for various territories which should contain proposals guaranteeing against discrimination. If the recommendations did not contain such guarantees, it would then be the duty of the Executive Board to make amendments.

He proposed to delete the first sentence in Mr. Heyward's resolution. Mr. Hsiao had previously stated that his Government was not willing to agree to any form of relief, or help for children, going to the democratic areas. The resolution should be based on an independent decision of the Executive Board. Since \$500,000 for democratic areas in China would be insufficient to take into account the territory, population, and needs of children as a result of the fighting which has taken place there, he proposed that the figure of \$1,000,000 be substituted for \$500,000. His final amendment was to mention by name the three cities which he had previously proposed. It was his view that in the future the proportion of 1-1 between the two areas in China should be adhered to.

Mr. PATE (Executive Director) in response to a question from Mr. Hsiao, stated that the Administration was not recommending the \$350,000 cotton currency plan. On the contrary it had been trying to discourage the plan in that form.

On the motion of Mr. HSIAO (China) the meeting was adjourned.

-----