

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

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

UNRESTRICTED  
E/ICEF/SR.13  
20 October 1947  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND**

**EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTEENTH MEETING**

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Friday,  
3 October 1947, at 3.00 p.m.

**Present:**

Chairman:	Dr. Ludwik RAJCHMAN	(Poland)
	Mr. S. GRAZIADO	(Argentina)
	Mr. G. JOCKEL	(Australia)
	Mr. R. de OLIVEIRA CAMPOS	(Brazil)
	Mr. V. SKOROBOGATYI	(Byelorussian S.S.R.)
	Mrs. D. B. SINCLAIR	(Canada)
	Dr. HC. CHANG	(China)
	Mr. R. CASTELLO	(Colombia)
	Dr. J. PAPANEK	(Czechoslovakia)
	Mrs. N.M. WRIGHT	(Denmark)
	Dr. J. CORREA	(Ecuador)
	Dr. J. MABILEAU	(France)
	Mr. S. PEZMAZOGLOU	(Greece)
	Dr. M. KLOMPE	(Netherlands)
	Mr. T.O.W. BRENNER	(New Zealand)
	Mrs. A. LIONAES	(Norway)
	Mr. J.A. ENRIQUES	(Peru)
	Mr. R. BERGSTROM	(Sweden)
	Mr. H. ZOELLY	(Switzerland)
	Mr. L. KOZULA	(Ukrainian S.S.R.)
	Mr. H. WOODWARD	(Union of South Africa)
	Mr. A.P. BORISOV	(U.S.S.R.)
	Mr. J. ALEXANDER	(United Kingdom)
	Mr. D. DORT	(United States)
	Mr. S. KRASOVEC	(Yugoslavia)
Executive Director:	Mr. M. PATE	(ICEF)
European Office:	Mr. A. DAVIDSON	(ICEF)
Secretariat:	Mr. Martin HILL	(Representing the Secretary-General)
	Mr. C. LITTERIA	(Dept. of Social Affairs)

RECEIVED

European Office:

24 1947

UNITED NATIONS  
ARCHIVES

The meeting was convened by the CHAIRMAN.

Mr. PATE (ICEF) read a new text to be inserted in Document E/ICEF/26 page 3, as paragraph 4 a:

"The Programme Committee recommends to the Executive Board that the Executive Director be authorized to send qualified representatives of the ICEF to study the situation of children and mothers in countries of the Far East other than China, and the means of rendering service in the field of its work to such countries in the Far East as may request that service for the guidance of the administration."

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) could not accept the negative note in this wording. There might be more work than anticipated in the Far East and no limit should be placed on the help. He agreed to a wording which would allow priority consideration out of the last allocation.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Board must have a clear understanding.

This was not a mortgage on the first new contribution of the resources of the Fund but a statement that the Programme Committee would allow an allocation when the reserve was set up. This sum should have a priority, but it had not been decided to give it first priority.

Miss LENROOT (United States) agreed with Mr. Alexander. The last sentence should carry the idea of priority consideration.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not agree with Mr. Alexander for the reasons which he had stated earlier. The suggestion did not include the carrying out of an enquiry and therefore the whole procedure seemed improper. He would vote against it.

Mr. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia) agreed that this matter should be investigated by the administration. The three years of UNRRA work had provided some experience for Europe and China; the territories in question however, had produced no reports.

The CHAIRMAN said that three proposals lay before the Board: that of the Programme Committee as set forth in the Document, that of the Executive Director which had just been read, and that of the representative of Yugoslavia to hold an enquiry.

A vote was taken on the proposal of the representative of Yugoslavia as being furthest removed from the original.

1 Vote in favour.

The proposal was rejected.

On a vote on the proposal of the Executive Director:

0 votes in favour.

The proposal was rejected.

/On a

On a vote on the text of the Programme Committee:

14 votes in favour. 4 votes against.

This proposal was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN then referred to paragraph 25 page 8 of Document E/ICEF/23 and page 4 of Document E/ICEF/26: Medical Supplies.

Mr. PESMAZOGLU (Greece) asked if the amounts available would be too small for practical use against T.B. and Venereal Disease.

Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark) spoke on the remarkable advances made in medical science in recent years in the prevention of T.B. by the use of vaccine. She pointed out in reply to the Greek representative that Denmark might be able to assist the Fund either by supplying vaccine produced in Denmark or by placing at the disposal of the Fund trained doctors and nurses who had specialized in this particular form of prevention.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the Danish Red Cross had engaged in pioneer work in the BCG. This campaign could not be easily entrusted to small teams and the organization would have to be very thorough.

Section 7 page 5 of Document E/ICEF/26 was adopted by the Board.

Continuing, the CHAIRMAN stated that the Fund would count on the full collaboration of WHO. A communication had been received from the Health Organization stating that the proposals made by the Programme Committee had been accepted. The closest co-operation of WHO would be essential also for the anti-Venereal Disease Campaign. WHO could not provide materials but would supply technical advice.

Sections 26, 27, 28 and 29 were adopted and the Chairman passed to Sections 30, 31 and 32 of Document 23 and paragraph 8 of Document 26. He reminded the Board that at its last session the representative of France had submitted a proposal for the establishment of an international children's centre in Paris. The Board decided to refer the matter to the Programme Committee and to the Secretary-General. The project was submitted in greater detail at Paris and Professor Debre realized that the decision to establish such a centre on a permanent basis could only be taken by ECOSOC. The French Government would therefore send an official communication to ECOSOC. The Secretary-General arranged a preliminary consultation between the various specialized agencies and the Board, so that its conclusions and any recommendations from the Secretary-General may be used as guidance by the French Government. The Programme Committee decided that it was not necessary to discuss the centre as a permanent body until the Economic and Social Council had made its opinion known. A recommendation was passed to the effect that

/it would



it would be useful for the Fund to utilize such facilities and other resources as might be offered by the French Government on a temporary basis for the purpose of carrying out tasks ordered by the Executive Board. The French Government would make arrangements for training workers in the field of child health. Mr. ALEXANDER stated that the British delegation was interested in this offer. In the fifth line of paragraph 8 of Document /26 instead of "training" doctors he would suggest "informing" or "enlightening". This offer did not imply any commitment for the Executive Board nor, he presumed, for the United Nations.

Dr. STOLZ (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that the Fund was an emergency organization and therefore temporary. A children's centre would be on a permanent basis and came under WHO. It would take too long to wait until the technical personnel had been trained. He would prefer to have the personnel sent to a country where they could be shown special techniques, Denmark for instance.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that this came under the tasks assigned to the Fund. There was an acute shortage of medical personnel in Europe and there were certain facilities for training medical and auxiliary personnel. The training in question however was not intended for the long-time training needed for the ordinary rank and file. The international children's centre would provide training for senior physicians, senior specialized medical officers, directors of schools of nursing and social welfare and also architects and others connected with the reconstruction or building of children's institutions. A brief period spent at such a centre would enable staff on this high level to return to their countries equipped with valuable specialized knowledge and experience. He urged the Board to accept this recommendation.

Dr. STOLZ (Czechoslovakia) referred in this connection to the fellowship system and feared that the Economic and Social Council and General Assembly might raise strong objections.

Miss LENROOT (United States) was of the opinion that the Board could give full support to this suggestion. The Fund was certainly concerned with assisting the personnel immediately engaged in carrying out projects within the scope of the Fund. It was essential to disseminate or teach the most recent knowledge in connection with T.B. and V.D.

Mr. JOCKEL (Australia) felt some doubt, as the Fund would appear to be agreeing to the French Government financing this scheme out of its own contribution. The Fund itself was doing little more than giving its name to the project.

/Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada)

Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada) and Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) agreed that this was a way of utilizing a contribution which could not be used otherwise. Even if the Fund spent a small sum on the project it would not be taking anything from the children.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) desired to know if this temporary centre was to be established out of the contribution of the French Government and if that contribution would continue for so long as the centre existed, perhaps one or two years.

The proposal was adopted. The reservation of the Czechoslovak representative was noted.

Dr. MABILEAU (France) welcomed the unanimity with which the French proposal had been accepted. For the time being it would be sufficient if the idea were given careful consideration. The training in view was not a long term training. On the contrary, experts would be shown special techniques for saving children and the work of the Fund would be greatly accelerated.

Mr. DAVIDSON (ICEF) referred to paragraph 9 (E/ICEF/26) increasing the indigenous production of milk. The Fund was instituting a survey of milk production and processing facilities in each country to determine the maximum utility of the available milk. A member of the staff, expert in agricultural production, was now carrying out the survey with the responsible government agencies in an effort to develop plans for the better utilization of existing milk supplies.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not understand this recommendation. Governments had no need of advice on utilization of milk resources although there were heavy cattle shortages in every country. A country would find it more economical to buy cows and deal with this matter from a more realistic angle. The Chairman considered this a practical suggestion. There was a great deficit of livestock, rendering the supply of milk for children most difficult. The Fund could give assistance. One of the objects of UNRRA had been the agricultural rehabilitation and supply of breeding cattle. The Fund could not go so far as this but it could indicate some short term projects which would enable countries to achieve the maximum possible. He hoped that the Fund would receive further resources and therefore it should present constructive plans, not only respecting the number and quality of cattle but also with a view to ensuring the proper quality of the milk. A simple method of milk conservation was processing; nevertheless, many countries lacked the necessary equipment and it would be useful to know precisely what kind of facilities were lacking.

/Dr. PAPANEK

Dr. PAPANÉK (Czechoslovakia) stated that the Fund's representative in Czechoslovakia had informed the Administration concerning the new needs in Czechoslovakia. The belief that a decision once made should not be modified was erroneous.

Mr. DAVIDSON (ICEF) replied that the Fund's representative at Prague had received information concerning the additional needs; it was made clear that those figures were preliminary figures and the Fund had been advised by the Czechoslovak Government that further data would be submitted shortly.

The CHAIRMAN summed up the discussion by pointing out that the representatives of the United Kingdom, China and the United States have expressed themselves in favour of an increased allocation to Czechoslovakia. The Programme Committee had recommended unanimously that no further allowances be made for the time being. The procedure was to consider changes only on the basis of studies by the administration. On the other hand it was necessary to act quickly. The Executive Board would have to meet during the Assembly, as soon as the Third Committee had adopted the report to the Assembly on the work of the Fund. In the meantime the administration would have received further statements concerning Czechoslovakia. The Programme Committee was a sub-committee of the Executive Board set up to examine applications in detail. He suggested convening a meeting of the Programme Committee for the following day at which the representative of Czechoslovakia could attend and explain his case. The United Kingdom proposal could not be considered since it jumped from 25,000 to 35,000 children. Greece had received a very sizable allocation and the Greek representative had further made observations concerning group feeding which also would have to be discussed by the Executive Board. A decision could not be made until the necessary consultations had taken place in Greece between the Fund representative and the Greek Government. The Board must wait until this matter had been examined and he was not prepared to recommend to the Programme Committee re-opening the question of the allocation to Greece until a written communication was received from the Greek Government.

Mr. PESMAZOGLOU (Greece) replied that his proposal was not in connection with group feeding but, on the contrary, the number of refugee children now flowing into safer areas. The proposal would be submitted that very evening.

Mr. ORDING (UNAC) made a statement on the present situation on United Nations appeal for children. The UNAC would be utilized to collect money. Substantial progress in organization had already been made.

/The Economic



The Economic and Social Council had dealt very thoroughly with the Appeal and a sub-committee had considered all methods practical for a world-wide drive. The international committee would be announced very shortly and national committees had been established. The representatives of UNAC had visited eight European countries and had met with a favourable reception. New Zealand had declared herself prepared to join in the drive early in 1948. Most countries preferred the month of February. A national committee had been set up in the United States and discussions as to the best method of using the slogan were being carried on. In addition to Headquarters, regional offices had been established.

Mr. CHRISTINGER (Switzerland) informed the Committee that the Federal Council had submitted a message on international mutual aid to the Federal Assembly on 8 July 1947. The Federal Council in its preamble to this message stated that it could not conceive any termination to the philanthropic activities of Switzerland so long as the present distress continued. The Federal Council was of the opinion that it would be unworthy of Switzerland to abandon those, who, in addition to the miseries of this post-war period, were now suffering from inadequate harvests. It therefore, recommended that the indispensable relief organs should be helped to continue their work and, in particular, the International Children's Emergency Fund. The Swiss contribution should consist in the main of credits for intensifying relief work on behalf of children, more particularly the Red Cross and the DON SUISSE and financing the training in Switzerland of workers who would receive scholarships. The Federal Council had submitted a draft order providing for a further credit of 20,000,000 francs. From this credit the Federal Council would appropriate sums to enable Switzerland to participate in the work of solidarity within the scope of the ICEF and other international collective work. Those credits would be used mainly to re-inforce Swiss national organizations working on behalf of foreign children. They would also cover the contribution of the government to the ICEF.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Swiss representative and Miss LENROOT (United States) presented the report on the administrative budget. She stated that the Committee had been satisfied that the administration worked on a basis of the utmost economy. The Committee had been pleased to learn that Mr. Byron Price regarded the administration as highly efficient. The Committee found that the staff had co-operated

/in a most

in a most loyal manner and worked a considerable amount of overtime. The Committee had analysed the Washington, Lake Success and Paris offices. As the Paris office was in its initial stage the estimates were submitted for information only. The budgetary procedures of the ICEF were in line with the United Nations.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) complained that the staff was not sufficiently international and therefore not in harmony with article 101 of the Charter. He trusted that serious efforts would be made to improve that situation.

The meeting rose at 5:45 p.m.