

United Nations
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

Nations Unies
CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

UNRESTRICTED
E/ICEF/SR.28
7 May 1948
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

EXECUTIVE BOARD

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, Wednesday,
28 April 1948, at 2.30 p.m.

Present:

Chairman:	Dr. L. RAJCHMAN	(Poland)
	Mr. S. Graziadio	(Argentina)
	Mr. E.J.R. Heyward	(Australia)
	Mr. R. Campos	(Brazil)
	Mrs. D.B. Sinclair	(Canada)
	Dr. C. Hsiao	(China)
	Mr. A. Escallon	(Colombia)
	Mr. I. Taborsky	(Czechoslovakia)
	Mrs. N. Wright	(Denmark)
	Mr. J. de Folin	(France)
	Mr. B. Theodoropoulos	(Greece)
	Miss M.Z.N. Witteveen	(Netherlands)
	Mr. W.B. Sutch	(New Zealand)
	Mr. E. Nord	(Norway)
	Mr. C.J. Wollin	(Sweden)
	Mr. E. Kessler	(Switzerland)
	Mr. V. Kovalenka	(Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)
	Mr. V. Kobushko	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
	Mr. J.A.C.C. Alexander	(United Kingdom)
	Miss K. Lenroet	(United States)
	Mr. M. Levi	(Yugoslavia)
	Mr. M. Pate	(Executive Director, UNICEF)
	Mr. K. Borders	(UNICEF)
	Mr. D. Sabin	(UNICEF)
	Mr. J. Charnow	(UNICEF)

/Representatives

RECEIVED

MAY 14 1948

UNITED NATIONS
ARCHIVES

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

Mr. C. Tauber (FAO)

Miss M. Scott (FAO)

Drafting Committee

The CHAIRMAN appointed the Representatives from the Netherlands and Australia to act as a Drafting Committee.

Plan of Operations for China (continued)

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) introduced the following resolution:

"The Board noted with pleasure the proposal of the Chinese Government, through the Executive Director, for an allocation of \$350,000 out of China's first allocation of \$3,500,000 for utilization in areas not under the direct control of the Chinese Government, and recommended that the Government allocate immediately further sums, not less than the proportion as indicated in the initial allocation to these areas, in view of the additional resources that have been made available to the Government by the Board. The Administration is requested to contact the Chinese Government as soon as possible to work out the details of administering relief in these areas, and to study the relative needs of children in all geographical areas in order to develop a fair proportionate distribution of ICEF relief funds based on need."

She explained that this would provide for an additional allocation to areas not under the direct control of the Chinese Government in the same proportion as the first allocation of \$350,000 to \$3,500,000. However, this would not act as a precedent for the future, which would be on the basis of a formula for the fair distribution of funds according to need. In actual figures it would mean an additional \$215,000 out of the \$2,150,000 which is proposed for allocation. When added to the original \$350,000 for areas not under the direct control of the Chinese Government, the total would be \$565,000 which is more than the amount specified by Mr. Heyward.

Mr. HEYWARD (Australia) introduced a revised amendment reading as follows:

"The Board noted with pleasure the intimation of the Chinese Government that it was considering a specific allocation to the "northern" areas. As an immediate step for securing for the whole programme distribution among geographical areas according to the

/relative

relative needs of children, the Board proposes that goods to the value of five hundred thousand U.S. dollars (\$500,000) from the remaining \$4,350,000 be made available for use in "northern" areas as soon as a satisfactory programme can be developed. The relation of this to the one million dollar (\$1,000,000) immediate programme for "southern" cities is without prejudice to the final geographic distribution of the whole programme which must depend on fuller information about relative needs."

He explained that it was not his intention that the \$500,000 proposed allocation be final. In view of the fact that the population of the areas not under the control of the Chinese Government was about one-third of the whole of China, he did not see how the Board could accept, except only provisionally, the 10 percent ratio as having its tentative approval. The final share must depend on information to be provided by the Administration on the basis of further study and consultation in China.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) stated it was not her intention to have the 10 percent any more final than the \$500,000. She had originally been ready to accept the Australian resolution, and had introduced her own only because it had been brought to her attention that some changes might develop more unanimous support.

Mr. ESCALLON (Colombia) stated that discussion of the political situation was harmful to the Fund. His Delegation did not support the resolution, which implied that there will be a quota or lines of demarcation based on certain factors because of political activities. He believed that assistance should be entirely on the basis of need. With regard to E/ICEF/58, he felt that it did not show sufficiently the discussions of the Programme Committee regarding its proposal.

Mr. KESSLER (Switzerland) supported the revised Australian resolution.

Mr. TABORSKY (Czechoslovakia) welcomed the proposal of Mr. Heyward, but believed that \$500,000 was insufficient for areas not under the control of the Chinese Government in view of the size of the territory and the population.

Mr. HSIAO (China) questioned the estimate by Mr. Heyward that one-third of the total population in China resided in areas not under the control of the Government. The large area under the control of the communists in Manchuria only had a pre-war population of 30,000,000. The greater part of the Chinese population is in the South. As a result of military operations, boundaries are constantly changing. There is no definite boundary between areas directly under Government control and those which are not. Because of the confidence of the Chinese people in the Government, there is a tendency for the population to migrate to the South

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) stated that since the United States resolution did not have the support of Mr. Hsiao, he wondered whether Miss Lenroot would be willing to withdraw her resolution or perhaps suggest a simple amendment to the Australian resolution.

Mr. de FOLIN (France) believed that the Australian Resolution substantially met the main wishes expressed around the table.

Miss LENROOT (United States of America) stated that she was willing to withdraw her amendment and vote for the Australian proposal.

In response to a question by Mr. ALEXANDER as to whether he had any substantive objection to the Australian proposal, Mr. HSIAO (China) replied that he appreciated the spirit in which Mr. Heyward's resolution had been proposed, but the resolution had some unfortunate phrases as well as being vague. He questioned the use of the word "intimation". Moreover, the terms "north" and "south" as proposed originally by Mr. Heyward confused the issues, since fighting is not divided along north and south lines. He also did not know quite what the second sentence meant. The normal procedure in the Board was to make an allocation to a country and ask the country to draw up a plan for the utilization. After the plan has been drawn up, the approval of the UNICEF field mission is secured and the plan is submitted to the Programme Committee for discussion and approval, and finally to the Board. This courtesy is not being followed in the resolution prepared here. He saw no reason why the Chinese Government should be treated differently than other governments. From this point of view the United States proposal just withdrawn is preferable to the Australian resolution.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the phrase "in accordance with the procedures of the Fund" be inserted at the end of the second sentence to meet the point made by Mr. Hsiao.

Mr. ESCALLON (Colombia) stated that he would have to abstain since the resolution was counter to the resolution establishing the Fund.

Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) repeated the suggestion he had made earlier, that the first sentence of the proposed resolution be deleted, particularly since Mr. Hsiao had just made a lengthy statement attempting to show that no relief on a large scale was needed for the children in the democratic areas of China; the territory was smaller and the population was shrinking. It was difficult to say that the resolution was in accordance with the wishes of the Nanking Government, since the Government is rather opposed to the action.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) asked Mr. Kobushko to explain what he meant by the terms "Nanking Government" and "democratic areas".

/Mr. KOBUSHKO

Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that, with the permission of the Chairman, he would attempt to explain these terms to Mr. Alexander after the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN then put the following amendments of Mr. Kobushko before the Board:

1. Deletion of the first sentence. This amendment was lost.
2. Replace \$500,000 by \$1,000,000. This amendment was lost.
3. Specific reference to assistance to Harbin, Kirin and Loyang. This amendment was lost.

Mr. HSIAO (China) explained that he would vote against the Australian proposal and that if it were passed, he wished to reserve the position of his Government.

Mr. GRAZIADIO (Argentina) stated he would abstain from voting because the proposal recognized the principle of discrimination.

Mr. THEODOROPoulos (Greece) stated that he would abstain from voting since he did not believe that the Fund could make the Chinese Government responsible for the distribution of food and policies for the areas which were not under its control.

The Australian Resolution as amended was approved by a vote of 10 for; one against; 9 abstentions.

Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he abstained because he had moved certain amendments which were not carried, and he was therefore in partial disagreement with the wording of the amendment, although he was in support of its principles. It was his hope and expectation that relief would now be given to the children in the democratic areas, and that the Administration would lay down adequate measures for this distribution.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) explained that he had abstained because, although the intent of the resolution was unobjectionable, he was confident that the Chinese Government would do everything possible to make its distribution on an equitable basis. He was not happy about the precedent that was being set up as regards directions from the Board on a geographical basis.

He noticed that Mr. Kobushko was still using the term "Nanking Government" and also "democratic areas" with reference to some unspecified part of China. He requested that Mr. Kobushko explain these terms in writing to the Chair, so that it would be circulated to Board representatives and the Board would know what he was talking about.

Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that, while he did not know the Chair's views on this matter, he felt no obligation to accede to this request.

/The Chairman

The Chairman pointed out that the Australian resolution was introduced as an addition to the Programme Committee's recommendations in paragraph 6, E/ICEF/58. In the absence of any objection, he declared the recommendations in paragraph 6 approved together with the Australian resolution.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.
