



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Long-range activities for children. United Nations International Children's Endowment Fund (A/1411 and A/C.3/L.69) (<i>concluded</i>).....	99
Draft first international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation (A/1384, A/C.3/534, A/C.3/535 and E/1681).....	105

Chairman: Mr. G. J. VAN HEUVEN GOEDHART (Netherlands).

Long-range activities for children. United Nations International Children's Endowment Fund (A/1411 and A/C.3/L.69) (*concluded*)

[Item 64]*

AUSTRALIAN DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/C.3/L.69) (*concluded*)

Vote on the draft resolution as a whole

1. The CHAIRMAN stated that before putting to the vote as a whole the draft resolution which the Committee had adopted paragraph by paragraph (A/C.3/L.69), he would call upon delegations who wished to do so to explain their vote.
2. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) expressed her delegation's intention of voting against the draft resolution as a whole, on the grounds that it failed to recognize the year and a half of concentrated efforts of several United Nations bodies to place continuing work on behalf of children on a sound footing in the United Nations structure.
3. The Pakistan representative had stated at the previous meeting that the United States amendments contained some points that were irreconcilable with the Australian draft resolution. The United States representative thought that, even without the benefit of the amendments proposed by her delegation, the text under discussion was of a hybrid nature. It provided for an Emergency Fund to deal with needs that did not arise from emergencies and to continue, not for a very limited period as might be expected, but for another three years, with the indication that it would be continued thereafter on a permanent basis. There seemed to be flagrant contradictions between the various provisions.

4. As the voting on parts of the resolution had indicated, certain governments were not prepared to undertake the difficult task of beginning to solve the problem of the needs of children on a constructive basis; they had chosen the easier path — the continuation of an emergency programme with some so-called permanent characteristics. The draft resolution gave no assurance whatever of any practical assistance to governments which might enable them to attack the real causes of children's problems, nor even of any continued assistance to governments to tackle the emergency problems in that field. During the discussion preceding the paragraph-by-paragraph vote, the governments which had questioned key parts of the resolution were in the main those which had contributed to the Fund in the past. Would they continue to do so? That was the question. Their contributions were urgently required. The Executive Director of the Fund had stated that his administration would recommend to the Executive Board, which was meeting in November, allocations for country programmes that would practically exhaust the funds available for allocation. The future financial situation of the Fund was in serious jeopardy, and one was justified in questioning whether the Committee would be acting with realism in adopting the proposed draft resolution.

5. Moreover, the resolution made no provision for placing the Fund's central administrative expenses in the regular United Nations budget. The United States Government had attached great importance to that point, in the conviction that all governments should share some financial responsibility for work on behalf of children. In that way words would be supported by action.

6. The United States desire was that permanent arrangements should be made, within the United Nations structure, for international children's welfare

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

work. All they asked was that the approach to the problem of the world's children, as the emphasis shifted from the regional post-war problems of Europe's children, should be a realistic one and that, so far as practicable, aid should begin immediately. The United States would like to see all the resources of the United Nations, including those of the specialized agencies, mobilized on behalf of children. The draft resolution now before the Committee did not satisfy that objective.

7. In voting against that resolution, the United States Government wished it clearly understood that its vote in no way signified any lack of concern for children in other parts of the world, including the under-developed countries in the East, in particular. The people of the United States had always given generously to the peoples in those parts of the world and contributions from individuals to those countries had totalled over \$US 23 million during the past eighteen months.

8. Nor did its vote signify that the United States Government would fail in future to contribute to the aid required to meet the sudden emergencies which occurred all too often. It would continue to do everything possible to assist the civilian population of Korea and mitigate the plight of the refugees in the Middle East, for instance. Its attitude towards any other emergency would be the same.

9. The United States representative hoped that the Committee would reject the draft resolution and its amendments so that it might once again turn its attention to the real problem before it, namely, long-range activities for children, as presented in the Secretary-General's draft resolution (A/1411).

10. Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada) stated that her delegation had already explained its inability to support the Australian draft resolution in its original form; and in spite of the subsequent amendments the Canadian delegation still felt unable to subscribe to the revised version. It regretted the fact that the Committee had abandoned the recommendations contained in the Economic and Social Council's resolution, which represented serious thought and genuine compromise on the part of delegations.

11. In voting against the draft resolution the Canadian delegation did not intend any criticism of the work already done by UNICEF; its record of interest and contributions substantiated that. It was however convinced that the United Nations should take a more positive stand and adopt more energetic measures which would ensure the support of a larger number of governments for the future work of the Fund and so make it more useful in the future. The Canadian delegation had already expressed its fear that the effect of adopting the draft resolution might be to terminate the work of the Fund because of lack of credits; it did not wish to be a party to that.

12. That such an outcome was no remote contingency would be only too apparent to the Executive Board when it met in November. The Board would already be faced with urgent requests, most of which it would be unable to meet. It was true that it had existing credits which had not yet been allocated to any programme. But it must be remarked that administrative costs had only been voted to the end of 1950 and credits must be reserved for that purpose in the 1951 budget. The

Canadian delegation was fully aware of existing needs and did not consider that the draft resolution could meet them in a permanent way; it would therefore vote against it.

13. Canada's main concern was that the United Nations should continue its work for children and it hoped that the fears raised by the draft resolution would not materialize.

14. Mr. MOODIE (Australia) thought that the Third Committee could not be accused of having chosen the easier path and having wished to evade difficulties; he emphasized the fact that on the contrary the intention of his delegation's draft resolution was to solve some of those difficulties.

15. In voting for the revised draft, the Australian delegation wished to make a reservation concerning 6 (d). In the opinion of the Australian delegation the General Assembly was able, at any session, to review the future of the Fund and that paragraph did not prevent the Assembly from doing so after only two years if the Assembly so desired. The Australian Government was opposed to any implicit obligation to consider the continuation of the Fund on a permanent basis, when such a review was made, and reserved its position on any such proposal. It was in favour of continuing the Fund for the time being because it believed the need continued to exist, but if at any later stage it should feel that the situation had changed, the Australian Government wished to be completely free to determine its attitude in light of existing circumstances.

16. The Australian representative recalled that resolution 57 (I) provided that the Assembly should review the activities of the Fund upon the basis of a special report from the Economic and Social Council. The Australian delegation had not thought it necessary to reintroduce that provision in its draft but felt that it would be a useful procedure when the need for review arose.

17. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) said that his delegation did not consider the modified text of the Australian draft resolution unacceptable. Although it did not solve the problem of the reorganization of UNICEF, it at least ensured the continuance of the Fund, which had done such useful work in the past and which represented one of the most humanitarian activities of the United Nations.

18. He recalled that the Committee had begun its deliberations by considering the Secretary-General's draft resolution for the reorganization of the Fund, which stated that its two-fold purpose was to be: to provide supplies, training services and advisory assistance in support of the recipient countries' permanent programmes for children, and to meet relief needs in cases of serious emergencies.

19. The Pakistan delegation was not opposed to those purposes. It only wished that the Fund should also keep in mind those needs of a continuing character consequent upon serious and persistent deficiencies, particularly in the under-developed areas of the world, which were best met by the provision of supplies and appropriate related assistance. Together with the delegations of Burma, India, Indonesia and Iraq, it had therefore proposed an amendment (A/C.3/L.49) to the Secretary-General's draft resolution in that sense.

Had the Secretary-General's draft resolution and its amendments been put to a vote and had the Pakistan amendment not been accepted by the Committee, the Pakistan delegation would nevertheless not have voted against the Secretary-General's draft resolution.

20. However, the Committee had decided, at its 283rd meeting, to consider the Australian draft resolution first. That resolution did not provide for a reorganization of the Fund but for its continuance for a certain period along the same lines as in the past. The United States delegation had presented a series of amendments (A/C.3/L.65) which aimed, *inter alia*, at reintroducing the two purposes mentioned in the Secretary-General's draft resolution, and were therefore contrary to the very basis of the Australian draft resolution. Moreover, they had been presented so late that it had not been possible to suggest altering them. The Pakistan delegation had therefore decided to vote against them.

21. In conclusion the Pakistan representative stated that his delegation had never been opposed to the idea of organizing the Fund on a permanent basis with the object of helping the countries of the world to undertake long-range programmes for the welfare of their children with the advice and assistance to be offered by the Fund. Pakistan merely wished to ensure that if the aims of the Fund were to be spelt out for the future in greater detail, the continuing needs of children in underdeveloped countries would receive the attention they deserved.

22. Lord MACDONALD (United Kingdom) said that he fully appreciated the reasons which had led the representatives of the United States and Canada to vote against the draft resolution, though they might have slightly overstated their argument that the scope of the Fund was too widely defined. The draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General (A/1411) would have enlarged rather than contracted the scope of the Fund, and as everyone knew, the money likely to accrue to the Fund in the future would not approach \$US 45 million which it disbursed on an average every year.

23. In the circumstances, his delegation thought that the Australian draft resolution was a decided improvement upon the Secretary-General's text. It was true that the draft did not deal exclusively with the question of the Fund but the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.66), which had been adopted by the Committee at its 286th meeting, did provide a means of giving the Fund its place within the framework of United Nations activities.

24. There were, however, certain paragraphs of the draft which caused his delegation some uneasiness, particularly the paragraph concerning relations with specialized agencies. As it was interpreted by the United Kingdom, that paragraph meant that specialized agencies concerned with any particular programme should be invited to say whether that programme was sound from a technical point of view before the Board considered it. That was the interpretation which his country would place upon the paragraph if it were a member of the board.

25. The prospect of re-considering the future of the Fund and the idea that it would probably then be placed on a permanent basis might raise hopes which were

impossible of fulfilment. It was, however, a long-term project and his delegation simply wanted to state that it was not prepared to commit its government to supporting the maintenance of the Fund on a permanent basis.

26. He also emphasized the fact that the composition of the new executive board did not entirely meet with his delegation's desires. It would be preferable for the Economic and Social Council not to base the membership of the new board on that of the Social Commission. His delegation feared that the procedure that had been adopted might cause the Social Commission to perform dual functions.

27. With those reservations, his delegation would be able to vote for the draft resolution as amended.

28. Mr. TSAO (China) recalled that his delegation had always been in favour of establishing UNICEF on a permanent basis and incorporating its activities within the framework of the United Nations. They would therefore have preferred to take the Secretary-General's draft as a basis for discussion. However, as he had already said, in a question of that kind, administrative considerations should not be allowed to play too large a part, since the problem was primarily of a humanitarian nature.

29. The Chinese delegation would therefore not vote against the Australian draft resolution, but would prefer to abstain.

30. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that his delegation, which was convinced of the necessity of establishing the Fund on a permanent basis, would have preferred the Committee to consider the Secretary-General's draft resolution (A/1411), which represented a compromise formula produced by the Economic and Social Council. His delegation could not oppose the adoption of a resolution in favour of continuing the work of UNICEF, as it recognized the importance of the task already accomplished by that body.

31. Although it wished to make certain reservations, the Chilean delegation would nevertheless vote in favour of the draft resolution.

32. Mr. DAVIN (New Zealand) said that his delegation would vote for the resolution although it was not in agreement with sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 6, which spoke of considering the future of the Fund at the expiration of three years, with the object of continuing it on a permanent basis. His delegation had, throughout, been of the opinion that the Fund should continue only as long as contributions were forthcoming. He doubted whether it was necessary to provide for the continuance of an agency to deal with long-term problems in that field, since its functions would overlap with those of the Social Commission and the specialized agencies.

33. Apart from that, his delegation did not think that the General Assembly should approve a text establishing the Fund on a permanent basis, and thought that the Assembly would be better fitted to decide the matter on its merits in three years time. His delegation, which would vote for the resolution, wanted to state that it reserved the right to act as it saw fit when the question of establishing the Fund on a permanent basis came up for discussion.

34. His delegation, like that of the United Kingdom, was concerned about the interpretation of the paragraph on collaboration between the Fund and the specialized agencies. In that connexion it deeply regretted that the Committee had rejected the United States amendment, proposing that the necessary steps should be taken to ensure the close collaboration of the administration of the Fund with the specialized agencies particularly concerned with family and child welfare. His delegation hoped that the Fund, when putting such programmes into execution, would act in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the agreements concluded between the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

35. Mr. MARIN (France) said that it was only to be expected that the proposed text should be considerably altered after two weeks discussion and as a result of the numerous amendments which had been made to it. The French delegation thought that the text, like the one which had been discussed by the Economic and Social Council at its eleventh session, was not quite satisfactory, but would nevertheless vote for it because it allowed the Fund to continue with the best and most useful of its activities, particularly as regards assistance to under-developed countries.

36. In order to facilitate the drafting of an acceptable compromise text, the French delegation had intentionally kept to the most general considerations, and had proposed only the brief amendment (A/C.3/L.59). He regretted that members of the Economic and Social Council had suggested amendments which made a considerable difference to the proposed activities of the Fund, and which might destroy the balance reached as a result of the Council's discussions.

37. In an attempt at conciliation, he expressed the hope that everything possible would be done to prevent any hindrance to the favourable progress of the Fund, to which his government was prepared to continue to contribute. He hoped that as large a majority as possible would vote in favour of the proposed text.

38. Mrs. LIONAES (Norway) said that she would vote against the draft resolution because she thought that the text, by omitting to mention the long-term action recommended in the Secretary-General's draft, would fail to solve the fundamental problem of child welfare.

39. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) said that he would vote for the draft. He stated that his delegation was not opposed to the reorganization of the Fund, and its establishment on a permanent basis, but at the same time it did recognize the necessity of maintaining direct assistance in kind. He expressed the hope, however, that it would be possible to reach an agreement on the first point within two or three years.

40. Mr. ANZE MATIENZO (Bolivia) said that his delegation had sought throughout the discussion to adhere to the position which it had originally taken up (280th meeting) concerning the problem which the Committee was about to settle.

41. His delegation had expressed its satisfaction at the lines along which the activity of UNICEF had recently been developed; it would also be ready to support the transformation of that body into a permanent organ of the United Nations. He was all the more

ready to support the proposal to that end since it was assured of the support of the principal contributor to the Fund; he would also support it because he thought that if the General Assembly was free to take the decisions it thought best, it was not advisable for it to undervalue the recommendations made by technical organs such as the Economic and Social Council. His delegation had thus voted against the easy way out offered, in its opinion, by the adoption of the Australian resolution.

42. But the majority of the Committee had decided to base its discussions upon that draft. It would thus be illogical to try to reorganize the Fund, since that text had only suggested that it should be continued in its existing form; all the more so since partial reorganization, hastily decided upon, might do more harm than good to the functioning of the Fund. That was why his delegation had been regretfully obliged to vote against all the amendments proposed by the United States, although it was fully aware of the lofty motives inspiring them.

43. He stressed the point that the United Nations could perhaps do more good in the field of child welfare than in any other. He emphasized the importance of social work, which could not be subordinated to economic or technical assistance. It was not enough to provide under-developed countries with the material means of achieving progress: they must first be placed in a position to use those means. The work accomplished by UNICEF was calculated to prepare the way for general progress; that institution should then be helped to continue the good work and to inspire confidence in governments and in private individuals who would certainly be eager, as in the past, to contribute to an enterprise which had already given proof of its efficiency.

44. Those were the considerations which had led the Bolivian delegation to vote for the Australian draft resolution in its amended form.

45. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) recalled that her delegation, which had always considered that UNICEF should be established on a permanent basis, nevertheless could not accept without amendments the draft resolution prepared by the Secretary-General (A/1411), which in fact set up a body with absolutely new functions.

46. She would vote without reservations for the Australian draft resolution, although she regretted that the Fund could not be organized permanently before two or three years had elapsed.

47. She stated that the anxiety expressed by the Canadian representative could not be disregarded, but recalled that UNICEF had succeeded beyond all expectation, thanks to voluntary contributions. After three years, its success should be bound to continue, in view of its experience, the co-operation given to it by the specialized agencies and the prestige it enjoyed throughout the world. If that were not so, they would have to lay the blame on a certain lack of faith and goodwill, and not only on the Australian draft resolution.

48. Mrs. FORTANIER (Netherlands) stated that her delegation could not support the Australian draft resolution, and considered that that text should never have been substituted for the draft resolution submitted

by the Secretary-General, which was based on the principles laid down by the Economic and Social Council.

49. Mr. VLAHOVIC (Yugoslavia) stated that he would vote for the Australian draft, because it corresponded in many respects to his delegation's views and because it met the wishes of the majority, which sought to maintain and strengthen the activities of the Fund. He specified that he would vote the more willingly for that text because he thought it showed the majority's desire to take into consideration the views of the minority.

50. Mr. VAZQUEZ (Uruguay) stated that his delegation would vote for the Australian draft resolution, though not without some reservations and in a spirit of limited optimism.

51. He regretted that certain members of the Committee had seen fit to distinguish between the "permanent" and "continuing" needs of children in certain under-developed regions. That distinction had introduced a regrettable element of confusion into the debates. The needs of children were either accidental or permanent; they called for extraordinary or permanent action and funds, according to the case. Whatever the reason for those needs might be, however, the action to be taken in order to meet them remained the same: to be effective, it should be founded both on material assistance, which was immediate, and on technical assistance, which was aimed at the future.

52. It was in that spirit that the Uruguayan delegation was prepared to support the draft resolution prepared by the Secretary-General (A/1411). For the same reasons, it was prepared to vote for the Australian draft resolution, although certain aspects of the problem were somewhat disquieting.

53. The Uruguayan delegation was especially concerned about the financing of the Fund. The contribution of the United States of America represented more than half of the \$US 137,500,000 received in contributions from governments. Voluntary gifts from individuals, in spite of the almost mystical enthusiasm aroused by campaigns launched by UNICEF, amounted to only \$US 11 million and it was to be feared that popular support would dwindle. The Uruguayan delegation was extremely anxious, therefore, that a system should be organized whereby governments would undertake voluntarily to provide the Fund with definite assistance, either in money or in kind. He regretted that the Committee had not decided to adopt his delegation's proposal to that effect (A/C.3/L.57/Rev.2).

54. He then recalled that his delegation had voted against sub-paragraph (d) of the sixth paragraph, which prolonged the existence of UNICEF for three years. He thought that the General Assembly should be free to reconsider the question at any time that it might think fit, and hoped that it would do so fairly soon.

55. Mr. HAHN (Union of South Africa) considered that the Australian draft resolution ignored the warnings of the representatives of certain specialized agencies, especially FAO and WHO, against the establishment of a special agency for young people, and that such an organization would give rise to much overlapping between the Fund and those specialized agencies.

56. The South African delegation would therefore vote against that draft resolution.

57. Mrs. BEGTRUP (Denmark) stated that her delegation, fully realizing the extent of children's requirements in many parts of the world and particularly in countries with continuing needs, had been disappointed to note that the Committee had not seen fit to support the virtual crusade which the Economic and Social Council had wished to organize to cope with those needs, a crusade which had been assured of the support of the United States of America, the principal contributor to UNICEF.

58. Her delegation was astonished that the Committee had not understood that it would be advisable to organize a long-term activity while at the same time giving attention to immediate needs. Such a solution would have placed the United Nations in the forefront of global action on behalf of children.

59. As matters stood, however, it might be feared that the Fund could not continue its activities for lack of financial means. The Danish Government, which had always been deeply interested in the work of UNICEF, as shown by the BCG vaccination campaigns which it had helped to organize, hoped that that would not happen.

60. Nevertheless, in order to indicate its position in the current discussion, her delegation would have to vote against the Australian draft resolution, as amended.

61. Mr. VOS (Belgium) said his delegation's attitude had been clearly stated during the general debate.

62. He fully appreciated the arguments advanced by the United States representative, whose thesis was perfectly logical. Still, it was too early to deal with the reorganization of UNICEF, a matter that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to settle forthwith. The circumstances had called for a compromise solution more moderate than the draft prepared by the Secretary-General.

63. Although his delegation felt bound to make the same reservations as the delegation of the United Kingdom, it nevertheless believed that paragraph 5, sub-paragraph (a), represented a step towards a more rational policy which, if not decisive, was at least extremely useful at the current stage.

64. In a conciliatory spirit, and anxious to preserve continuity, the Belgian delegation would accordingly vote for the Australian draft resolution.

65. Mr. PEREZ PEROZO (Venezuela) said his delegation would also vote for the Australian draft resolution.

66. Still, his delegation felt bound to repeat that it disagreed with paragraph 6, sub-paragraph (a), which, while stressing the need for ensuring representation of the principal contributing and recipient countries, nevertheless failed to respect that very principle. Indeed, it provided that the members of the Social Commission, numbering eighteen, should be among the twenty-six countries which would be members of the executive board of the Fund. The members of the Social Commission were not appointed by virtue of their relations with UNICEF, so that the principle concerned would

apply only in respect of eight members, which was inadmissible.

67. He requested that the sub-paragraph concerned should, pursuant to rule 128 of the rules of procedure, be voted on separately.

68. Following the statement by the CHAIRMAN that the request of the representative of Venezuela was out of order inasmuch as the Committee had already voted on the text paragraph by paragraph, that being tantamount to a vote on each part, Mr. PEREZ PEROZO (Venezuela) did not press his proposal.

69. Mr. CABADA (Peru) conceded that the Australian draft resolution did not actually settle the problem at issue. It was, however, difficult for the Committee to embark upon a different course, the more so since its efforts to come to an agreement on the draft resolution prepared by the Secretary-General had failed.

70. Because the Peruvian delegation attached great importance to the work of UNICEF, it would vote for the compromise solution offered by the Australian draft resolution.

71. Mr. ABADA (Philippines) stated that his delegation would vote for the Australian draft resolution because of the seriousness of the situation which persisted in several parts of the world, particularly in Asia.

72. His delegation was not opposed in principle to the transformation of UNICEF into a permanent body. It felt that, in child welfare as in all other matters, the essential object of international action should be to help governments to help themselves. The time of charity must cease.

73. It would accordingly have been preferable if the Committee had adopted a resolution which took into account not only the immediate needs of children but also the need for organizing long-term action. Since the Secretary-General's draft which had pursued that object, had not been generally acceptable, his delegation believed that it was necessary, above all, to avoid a break in the work; for that reason it would vote in favour of allowing UNICEF to stand in its existing form, in spite of its misgivings about the financing of the future activities of the Fund.

74. With reference to paragraph 6, sub-paragraph (d), he said his delegation was among those which thought that a period of two years would have sufficed to enable governments to judge whether or not it was necessary to alter the organization of the Fund. At any rate, it interpreted sub-paragraph (d) as leaving governments free to take a decision at whatever time they deemed proper, and perhaps even, should they so desire, to embark again on the road indicated by the Economic and Social Council.

75. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) regretted that the Sub-Committee, which had been established to study the numerous amendments submitted to the draft resolution prepared by the Secretary-General, had not succeeded in reaching agreement. She would have welcomed the adoption of that draft resolution subject to certain amendments. Since the Committee had, however, decided otherwise, there was no choice, if there was to be continued welfare work for

needy children, but to vote for the Australian draft resolution which, at least, assured indispensable assistance immediately.

76. She hoped that governments, private persons and international organizations would spare no effort to aid the Fund in its fine work. She wished in that connexion to pay a tribute to the admirable generosity of the Government and people of the United States of America to whom the cause of children was never a matter of indifference.

77. She reiterated in conclusion that, in spite of certain reservations, her delegation would vote for the Australian draft resolution.

78. Mr. Danton JOBIM (Brazil) said that while his delegation fully appreciated the position of the United States and the disinterested motives which had caused it to propose the reorganization of UNICEF on a permanent basis, it had not been in a position, at that stage, to support the amendments submitted by the United States. His delegation was not, however, completely satisfied with the decisions that had been taken so far and regretted that the support which it would give to the Australian draft resolution could not be as enthusiastic as it might have wished.

79. His delegation felt, in particular, that it was not possible to mortgage the future: accordingly, it did not interpret paragraph 6, sub-paragraph (d), as forthwith committing governments to confer upon UNICEF a permanent character in three years.

80. Having stated those reservations, he expressed the hope that UNICEF's future activities would be crowned with the same success as in the past.

81. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that the fact that Saudi Arabia was not yet one of the contributing or recipient countries did not preclude the possibility that it would participate in the work of UNICEF in the future.

82. His delegation supported the Australian draft resolution, first, because it approved of the way in which the activities of UNICEF had been extended to embrace the whole world; secondly, because it thought that the immediate assistance contemplated in no way precluded the possibility of organizing long-range activities to support the individual efforts of the governments; and, thirdly, because it considered that the draft resolution left the door open to the possible review of the question in three years.

83. The endeavours which had been made to alter the aims of the Fund after it had palliated the urgent needs of children in Europe had been, to say the least, untimely. He feared that such endeavours might give the impression in Asia and in other regions that the United Nations was drawing a distinction between the children there and the children in Europe.

84. In order to remove that impression, the Committee should adopt the draft resolution submitted by the Australian delegation. His delegation would therefore vote for it.

85. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) agreed that the Australian draft resolution suffered from certain omissions; but his country attached considerable importance to the retention of UNICEF and therefore would vote for that draft resolution, although his delegation agreed

with the reservations expressed by the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Australian and Belgian delegations, particularly with regard to paragraph 6, sub-paragraph (a).

86. Mrs. MENON (India) proposed that the title of the agenda item and of the Australian draft resolution should be amended to read as follows:

“Continuing needs of children. United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund”.

87. The CHAIRMAN put that proposal to the vote.

The proposal was adopted by 42 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

88. The CHAIRMAN called for the vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Australian delegation as a whole, as amended (A/C.3/L.69).

89. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) asked for a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Netherlands, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Arghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Mexico.

Against: Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Canada, Denmark, Liberia.

Abstaining: China.

The Australian draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 43 votes to 8, with 1 absention, 8 delegations not being represented when the vote was taken.

90. Mr. PATE (Director-General of the United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund) told the Committee that, after following its discussions with great interest, he could give it his assurance that UNICEF in its new functions would be in a position to organize its activities taking into account the different views which had been expressed during the general debate.

91. He had noted that approximately forty countries had expressed their approval of the work accomplished so far by the Fund. On behalf of the administration of that Fund he pledged himself to continue making the same efforts in the future. The Fund would continue to co-operate as closely as possible with the Social Activities Division of the United Nations and with the specialized agencies. He had in fact already concluded agreements to that effect with some of the latter.

92. During the past three years he had visited the majority of the countries which had received assistance

from the Fund. He had visited not only their capitals but also their towns and villages and he had been able to ascertain that a combination of material aid and technical assistance was the most effective and most useful way of carrying on the work.

93. An essential factor was the maintenance of confidence in relations between UNICEF and the contributing countries. That was the more important because the Fund could not act without financial support. He hoped that every member of the Committee would become an ambassador of UNICEF to the people of his country and that, when it met in November, the Executive Board of the Fund would have at its disposal the \$US 6 million which it would need immediately to finance the schemes contemplated.

Draft first international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation (A/1384, A/C.3/534, A/C.3/535 and E/1681)

[Item 63]

94. Mr. LAUGIER (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Social Affairs) said that the steady efforts made by the United Nations for four years to promote and develop respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all had already met with considerable success.

95. As a case in point, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in Paris in 1948 had been invoked on several occasions by the General Assembly and by other organs of the United Nations. Even outside the United Nations that Declaration had had a great influence. The Indonesian Constitution, for example, reproduced the majority of its articles almost textually. It had also been quoted in national courts of law.

96. The Committee was entering the second stage of the study of the draft international covenant on human rights. That document, the origins of which went back to the beginning of the work of the Commission on Human Rights, was the outcome of long and hard work.

97. The Economic and Social Council had decided, by its resolution 303 I (XI), to transmit the draft covenant to the General Assembly for consideration with a view to reaching policy decisions on the general adequacy of the first eighteen articles, the desirability of including special articles on its application to federal States and to Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, the desirability of including articles on economic, social and cultural rights and the adequacy of the articles relating to implementation. That was the subject which the Council had transmitted to the Committee for discussion.

98. The covenant to be prepared in the light of those recommendations would be of historic importance, and he assured the Committee that the Secretariat placed itself entirely at its service in order to achieve that purpose.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.