

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1552nd
MEETING**

Friday, 15 December 1967,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 62:</i>	
<i>Capital punishment: report of the Secretary-General</i>	501
<i>Agenda item 12:</i>	
<i>Report of the Economic and Social Council (chaps. XI, XII, XIV (sects. I, III, IV, V and XVII), XV and XVII)</i>	
<i>United Nations Children's Fund.</i>	503

Chairman: Mrs. Mara RADIĆ (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEM 62

Capital punishment: report of the Secretary-General (A/6690/Rev.1, A/6703 and Corr.1, chap. XII, sect. XI; ST/SOA/SD/10, A/C.3/L.1514)

1. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/L.1514. The question of capital punishment had been placed on the General Assembly's agenda for the first time at the fourteenth session in 1959. The Assembly had adopted resolution 1396 (XIV), inviting the Economic and Social Council to initiate a study of the question of capital punishment, of the laws and practices relating thereto and of the effects of capital punishment, and the abolition thereof, on the rate of criminality. The report entitled *Capital Punishment*^{1/} had been made by the French lawyer Marc Ancel and submitted to the *Ad Hoc* Advisory Committee of Experts on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders in 1963. The report had been considered by the Economic and Social Council, which had submitted it to the General Assembly at its eighteenth session. The General Assembly had then adopted resolution 1918 (XVIII), in which it had requested the Council to invite the Commission on Human Rights to study the report entitled *Capital Punishment* and the comments thereon of the *Ad Hoc* Advisory Committee of Experts and had requested the Secretary-General, after examining the report of the Commission on Human Rights and with the co-operation of the Consultative Group on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders to present a report to the General Assembly not later than at its twenty-second session. The question of capital punishment had been on the agenda of the Commission on Human Rights since 1964. The Commission, however, had not yet been able to consider the report, as requested in resolution 1918 (XVIII), which was why the General Assembly had not received the Secretary-General's report on capital punishment. The Swedish and Venezuelan delegations had accordingly submitted a draft resolution at the forty-second

session of the Economic and Social Council, which, as orally amended, was annexed to document A/6690/Rev.1. The Economic and Social Council had not had time to consider the draft resolution and had transmitted it by its resolution 1243 (XLII) to the General Assembly so that the Assembly could decide what should be done.

2. Unfortunately, the General Assembly had not had time to examine the question in detail. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1514 therefore proposed that the General Assembly should consider the question at its twenty-third session, even if the Commission on Human Rights had not been able to study all aspects of it. Under resolution 1918 (XVIII) the Commission on Human Rights was to make recommendations. But its agenda was very heavy and it was doubtful whether it would be able to carry out that task at the next session. The aim of the draft resolution was specifically to provide the General Assembly with all the information it needed so that it could in any case make a thorough study of the question and arrive at useful conclusions. The sponsors had wished to leave the Committee completely free at its twenty-third session to decide on the relative importance it would give to the various items on its agenda; the word "priority" had been so abused in recent years that it had lost much of its meaning. Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution asked the Secretary-General to provide the General Assembly with pertinent information, whether or not the Commission on Human Rights had considered the substance of the question of capital punishment. If the Secretary-General could submit his report at the twenty-third session, the time-limit set in operative paragraph 3 of resolution 1918 (XVIII) would only need to be extended by one year. Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution was designed to get the views of the Commission on Human Rights on the draft resolution transmitted by Council resolution 1243 (XLII); even if the Commission on Human Rights was unable to consider the question of capital punishment in detail, the Committee would derive the greatest profit from any preliminary observations it might make.

3. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the draft resolution did not seem to him satisfactory in its present form. Operative paragraph 3 invited the Economic and Social Council to seek the views of the Commission on Human Rights. But the Commission on Human Rights was not an advisory body, it was a body composed of representatives of Member States and its task was to consider questions and make recommendations. There was a Consultative Group which seemed just the right body to put forward views on the question of capital punish-

^{1/} United Nations publication, Sales No.: 62.IV.2.

ment, since the question was one which should be considered in its various aspects by experts in criminology. The proposed procedure was a departure from the practice usually followed in the United Nations with regard to human rights questions. There was no hope that useful information could be supplied to the General Assembly by the next year. The Consultative Group on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders was meeting in August 1968, and it would thus be out of the question for the Commission on Human Rights, and then the Economic and Social Council, to consider its conclusions before the twenty-third session, in accordance with the normal procedure. He appealed to the sponsors not to depart from the traditional methods.

4. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) said that resolution 1918 (XVIII) had provided for the procedure normally followed in the United Nations. It was precisely because that had not led to any results that the sponsors had sought quicker methods. The General Assembly was ultimately responsible for co-ordinating all the activities of United Nations bodies and the delay of five years in carrying out resolution 1918 (XVIII) fully justified a small departure from the traditional procedures. The Economic and Social Council had requested the General Assembly to decide what action should be taken on the question of capital punishment. The sponsors had deliberately invited the Council to seek the "views" of the Commission on Human Rights. A body such as the Commission could certainly indicate its point of view on a question, whether in a draft resolution transmitted to the Economic and Social Council or in its report. It would be for the Commission to decide how it would proceed in such a matter.

5. Mr. SCHREIBER (Secretariat), answering a question from the representative of the USSR, said that the draft resolution would have no financial implications. The question of capital punishment was already on the agenda of the Consultative Group on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, which was to meet in 1968, and the task entrusted to the Commission on Human Rights in operative paragraph 3 would probably come within the framework of its regular work.

6. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that she wished to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.3/L.1514, because her country, in which capital punishment had been abolished a hundred years before, was particularly interested in the question.

7. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that in order to conform with usual procedure, paragraph 3 of the draft resolution should be replaced by a text inviting the Economic and Social Council to request the Commission on Human Rights to consider all aspects of the question of capital punishment and to submit its recommendations on the matter to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council and to seek the views of the Consultative Group on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders on the draft resolution transmitted with Council resolution 1243 (XLII). ^{2/}If

the new paragraph was adopted, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution would be superfluous.

8. Mr. BEFFEYTE (France) considered that there was a contradiction in the operative part of the draft resolution. The Economic and Social Council would not meet until 1968 after the Commission on Human Rights, whose views it would not have been able to seek by then. It would therefore be unable to find out the Commission's views and report to the General Assembly in time for its twenty-third session.

9. As the representative of the Soviet Union had said, the question of capital punishment was too complex for the General Assembly to take up until it had been studied thoroughly by the Commission on Human Rights. His delegation considered the proposal of the Soviet Union well founded and was ready to support it.

10. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) pointed out that the Economic and Social Council met every year after the end of the General Assembly session in order to organize the work entrusted to it by the Assembly. It would thus be able to give the Commission on Human Rights the necessary instructions for the meetings the Commission was to hold in February 1968.

11. Resolution 1918 (XVIII) had already submitted Mr. Marc Ancel's report entitled Capital Punishment and the comments of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee of Experts to the Commission on Human Rights through the Economic and Social Council. The only new element in operative paragraph 3 was that the Commission on Human Rights would also give its views on the draft resolution submitted by Sweden and Venezuela. Draft resolution A/C.3/L.1514 was not intended to prepare the way for a debate on the substance of the question, but to help the General Assembly organize its work at its twenty-third session.

12. Mr. PIPARSANIA (India) supported the draft resolution, except for operative paragraph 3. The Commission on Human Rights had already examined the question of capital punishment and the General Assembly should request the Commission and the Economic and Social Council to give it priority.

13. India was currently looking into the question of capital punishment, and since the committee making a study of the question had not yet submitted its recommendations, his delegation could not yet express an opinion. The question should be studied thoroughly, and the Consultative Group should be consulted; he therefore supported the Soviet Union amendment.

14. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said he had initially had the same reservations as the French representative, but now that he had heard the Swedish representative's explanation, he was in favour of the draft resolution. Regarding the Soviet Union amendment, he believed it would be better to decide at the twenty-third session whether the question was ready for study by the General Assembly, rather than refer it to another body.

15. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) did not believe that it was possible, as the Soviet Union representative apparently wished, to delete operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution. As to operative paragraph 1, in 1968 five years would have passed since the adoption of resolution 1918 (XVIII) and it would be high time

^{2/} This amendment was subsequently circulated as document A/C.3/L.1525.

for the General Assembly to take up the question again. It was because the instructions it had given to its subsidiary bodies had proved difficult to carry out that those bodies had not yet reported to it and that it would have to take up the question again itself. With regard to operative paragraph 2, he hoped that at its twenty-third session the General Assembly would have available all the information collected within the United Nations system and he would therefore like to keep the paragraph.

16. The paragraph suggested by the Soviet Union had the drawback of not setting a deadline for the Commission on Human Rights, the Economic and Social Council or the Consultative Group. His delegation would vote against the amendment.

17. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in a spirit of compromise, he was willing to agree to keep operative paragraphs 1 and 2, as they were not incompatible with the text he had suggested for paragraph 3. The Commission on Human Rights could study the question, which was already on its agenda, in the spring; the Economic and Social Council could examine it during the summer; and the Consultative Group could transmit its views directly to the General Assembly at the twenty-third session.

18. Mr. RIOS (Panama) suggested that, in order to allow the Soviet Union representative and the sponsors of the draft resolution to confer, the Committee should suspend consideration of the question of capital punishment until the next meeting and take up another agenda item in the meantime.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chaps. XI, XII, XIV (sects. I, III, IV, V and VII), XV and XVII) (A/6703 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.1515/Rev.1)

UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND

19. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the section of the report of the Economic and Social Council relating to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (A/6703 and Corr.1. XI. sect. IV).

20. Mr. LABOUISSSE (Executive Director, United Nations Children's Fund) read out a message to the Committee from Mr. Joseph Willard, Chairman of the Executive Board of UNICEF, who mentioned the remarkable harmony of views that had distinguished the last session of the Board and the way UNICEF had been able to strike a balance, maintaining its unique identity within the United Nations system of organizations and at the same time co-ordinating its work with them in a dynamic and positive way.

21. Outlining UNICEF's assistance policies, he said that, as indicated in the report of the Executive Board on its last session in June 1967,^{3/} UNICEF should not limit its assistance to purely humanitarian objectives if it wished to realize the long-term possibilities inherent in its programmes, for there was a close relationship between programmes to benefit children and the economic and social development of the coun-

tries in which the children lived. On the one hand, the level of development of a country determined the conditions in which children were born, lived and grew, and, on the other hand, national development depended on the younger generation—on their health, education and training. In accordance with successive resolutions of the Assembly, therefore, UNICEF had for the past several years been devoting the greater part of its resources to the long-range needs of children in the developing countries. Its programmes were designed not only to be of immediate benefit to children, but also to prepare them for useful and active lives so that they would contribute to the economic and social development of their countries. UNICEF was, of course, prepared to help in emergencies affecting children. UNICEF had received two calls for emergency aid in 1966. It had made a special allocation of \$1.4 million to India to help in the drought areas of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. That aid had consisted primarily of high-protein food supplements, drugs and vitamins, distribution equipment and well-drilling equipment to ensure the water supply in those states. For the continuing emergency in the Middle East, UNICEF had made a special allocation of nearly \$500,000, primarily for blankets, medical supplies and food. After a recent on-the-spot survey, he was ready to recommend to the Executive Board a further allocation of about \$500,000, to be used to equip health centres and schools. In the final analysis, as experience accumulated, UNICEF continually returned to the "country approach", by which it assisted programmes of benefit to children which had priority within the context of the development efforts of individual countries. Since countries' needs differed at different times, UNICEF could not establish global priorities for the allocation of its resources. Instead, UNICEF's field representatives worked out national priorities in agreement with each Government, according to the special needs of the country's children and youth, and on the basis of a policy for the development of the necessary permanent national services. Owing to its limited resources and the extent of need, UNICEF could only rarely undertake programmes on a nation-wide scale, such as yaws eradication and malaria and tuberculosis control. But it did give support to national programmes, such as basic health services and elementary education. It also played a catalytic role by assisting pilot projects, which, when successful, might attract additional resources and so expand into wider undertakings on a national scale. A consequence of that policy, was in fact, that stress was laid on the importance of co-ordination with other sources of aid. The three specialized agencies most closely linked with UNICEF's activities—WHO, UNESCO and FAO—had sent advisers to its headquarters in New York. UNICEF also maintained close connexions with the United Nations Social Development Division. Co-ordination in the field was accomplished through consultation between UNICEF field representatives and those of the specialized agencies concerned. For each project UNICEF worked out a detailed plan of operation in collaboration with the country concerned and the other specialized agencies participating in the project. Thus plans of operations in the area of health showed what UNICEF had to supply in the way of equipment and stipends for fitting out health centres and training para-medical per-

^{3/} Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-third Session, Supplement No. 8.

sonnel, the assistance to be given by WHO experts, and the matching contribution of the Government. With regard to the United Nations Development programme (UNDP), UNICEF's field staff kept the Resident Representatives informed of UNICEF's activities, so that they might provide useful guidance as to the priorities Governments established in their development policy, and so that they could have an idea of the relative importance and urgency of UNICEF programmes in development.

22. UNICEF was prepared to supply aid in any field where there was a need, in accordance with the priorities established by the country with which it was co-operating. The main allocations approved for 1967 could be broken down as follows: 52 per cent for health services, 13 per cent for nutrition, 5 per cent for welfare and 24 per cent for education. Those had been UNICEF's major fields of activity for several years. The most recent addition was education in 1961. Total allocations in 1967 had risen to just over \$50 million, compared with about \$38 million in 1966. There was a significant increase in the proportion, as well as the amount, of aid to education, while the sums allocated in other fields had remained the same or increased modestly. Concerning the type of aid given, UNICEF was the only United Nations body to devote 80 per cent of its funds to supplies and equipment. Another way in which UNICEF aid was unique was that its funds could be used to help meet local currency costs; that did not replace the participation of local Governments, but supplemented it in certain areas. UNICEF did not, of course, have the means to subsidize local budgets on a permanent basis, for its role was essentially innovative and catalytic. In the fields of interest to UNICEF, as in many others, there was a shortage of trained personnel, especially in administrative posts on the local or operational level, but UNICEF considered that better results would follow if personnel were trained in the environment in which they would work. UNICEF's aid to training, however, was not limited to financing local costs, but included supplying equipment for training centres. In all, about a third of UNICEF's funds were now devoted to training programmes.

23. Although children's needs in every field greatly surpassed UNICEF's capacity to help, the field of nutrition particularly deserved more resources than were allocated to it at present. UNICEF had been interested in that problem for some time and had helped to stimulate research showing the importance of protein in the diet of very young children. To that end, UNICEF had co-operated with the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development and was at present working with WHO and FAO to strengthen the WHO/FAO/UNICEF Protein Advisory Group, a body of experts whose secretariat was located at UNICEF headquarters and who provided technical guidance in the development of high-protein foods for young children. In the field, UNICEF staff were working with Governments to develop additional projects for the production and distribution of such foods. It was hoped that the allocation for those purposes could be modestly increased at the next Board session in June 1968.

24. Explaining the reasons for UNICEF's need of additional resources, he pointed out that 40 per cent

of the population in developing countries were under fifteen years of age, and that of these, about 450 million lived in countries with a national per capita income of under \$100 per year. Only a few per cent of children in rural areas of developing countries received any medical care, and only two fifths of children of school age completed primary school. There were more adult illiterates at present than in 1950, although the percentage of adult illiteracy had declined modestly. Great progress had already been achieved in many countries, but there still remained a great deal to do. The young had a decisive role to play in their countries' development and it was necessary to prepare them for that role. The appalling waste of human life and talent among the young was an impediment to economic and social development, and investment in the young was the best means of contributing to that development.

25. UNICEF could not, of course, meet all the priority needs of children, but it was doing everything within its power. The previous year a new income target of \$50 million had been set, to be reached by the end of the decade, and in July 1967 allocations had been authorized at the level of \$50 million, even before the annual income had reached that total. UNICEF was counting on some increases in contributions, but was also drawing down all of its modest resources consistent with prudent administration. UNICEF hoped that Governments and private organizations would increase their contributions in order to permit it to maintain its allocations at the new level and even to increase them. He appealed to the members of the Committee to do everything in their power to support UNICEF's efforts.

26. The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of the Committee and herself, paid a tribute to Mrs. Sinclair, who had recently retired as Deputy Executive Director (Programmes) of UNICEF. In the course of her twenty years' association with the Fund, she had represented Canada on the Executive Board and had been the Chairman of both the Programme Committee and the Executive Board.

27. Mr. REYES (Philippines) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/L.1515/Rev.1. On behalf of the seven sponsors of the original draft resolution, Canada, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Poland, Sweden, Turkey and his own country, he pointed out that those countries were represented on the Executive Board of UNICEF and, consequently, had a special responsibility for the functioning of that organization. They were not the only ones to have an interest in UNICEF, however, and had no intention of excluding other countries. Thus, they had added the Dominican Republic, Romania, Tunisia and Uganda to the list of sponsors, and they were prepared to welcome any other delegations which wished to join them, and even hoped that the whole Committee would, in a sense, sponsor the draft resolution by giving it unanimous support. He thanked the Executive Director of UNICEF, Mr. Labouisse, who, in describing the broad outlines of UNICEF's policy and the impressive results it had achieved, had provided support for the draft resolution.

28. UNICEF had attained its majority on 11 December 1967, the date of the twenty-first anniversary of an existence devoted entirely to a cause which tran-

scended national, political, racial or ideological interests. The policy of UNICEF was pragmatic, action-oriented, and yet profoundly human. UNICEF had made a tremendous contribution towards promoting international goodwill and, in many countries of Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America, a whole generation of children had benefited from that goodwill. UNICEF had a flexible policy which followed the evolution of children's needs: thus, its activities were no longer carried out in the developed countries, but in the developing countries, and its work no longer dealt solely with emergency aid, but with the whole complex of the needs of the child as a member of society. UNICEF also acted as a catalyst in its relations with other agencies and with the Governments to which it extended assistance. Thus, as the draft resolution indicated, UNICEF continued "to provide emergency aid to children and mothers in situations of urgent need, while placing increasing emphasis on long-term programmes". Those were the considerations which lay behind draft resolution A/C.3/L.1515/Rev.1. Its sponsors had in fact felt that by preparing young people to contribute towards the economic and social development of their country, UNICEF was accomplishing an important task and that its policies and programmes deserved the endorsement of the General Assembly. He also pointed out that, of all the United Nations bodies, UNICEF was one of the best administered. At a time when the more or less general failure of the United Nations Development Decade was causing deep disappointment, UNICEF stood out as one of its significant successes. It would therefore be appropriate for the Assembly to take note of the remarkable results achieved by UNICEF and to congratulate it on its twenty-first anniversary. He thought that the Governments, private organizations and individuals who had supported the work of UNICEF during the previous twenty-one years should also be congratulated. The staff of UNICEF, too, deserved the gratitude of the United Nations for their devotion, and the example of solidarity given by all the children of the world who had contributed to UNICEF should also not be forgotten.

29. Mr. ASTEN (Australia) fully supported draft resolution A/C.3/L.1515/Rev.1. In particular, he supported operative paragraphs 2 and 3, which congratulated UNICEF on its twenty-first anniversary, and he regretted that the work of the Committee had prevented it from adopting the resolution 11 December, the date of the anniversary. He also wished to draw the Committee's attention to paragraph 4, which mentioned the importance of contributions from private sources. In that connexion, he referred to the useful role played by national committees and other voluntary organizations and he asked all Member States to encourage those organizations to continue their work, which promoted the development of genuine international co-operation. In conclusion, he hoped that all Member States would support the draft

resolution, by making a firm resolve to increase their contributions to UNICEF.

30. Mr. CHRETIEN (Canada) thanked the Executive Director of UNICEF for the statement he had just made and the Chairman for her tribute to Mrs. Sinclair.

31. The Canadian delegation welcomed the fact that the Economic and Social Council had unanimously adopted resolution 1258 (XLIII), which was an indication of the confidence which members of the Council had in UNICEF. One of UNICEF's major assets was its universality: it received contributions from 119 countries and was currently providing assistance to projects in 117 countries and territories in developing regions. Canada welcomed the fact that, as indicated in the Council resolution, UNICEF, without disregarding emergency aid, attached increasing importance to programmes which provided long-term benefits for mothers and children. There was always a temptation to respond to the most immediate and urgent needs, which were immense and were present in different ways in the lives of 900 million children. But if the cycle which perpetuated those needs was to be broken, assistance must be given to programmes which would effectively achieve that end. UNICEF was well placed in that respect, since its programme had a catalytic effect on the national development programmes of many countries, and it played a particularly important role in helping those responsible for planning in each country to understand that any investment in children and youth was an investment in its potential for development and social progress.

32. The Economic and Social Council, in resolution 1258 (XLIII), commended UNICEF for maintaining close co-operation with other United Nations bodies. Such co-operation helped the Fund to utilize its resources economically and effectively. Those resources, however, must be increased if the current level of allocations was to be maintained.

33. UNICEF had shown how an international agency could involve ordinary individuals in programmes of international co-operation. The UNICEF National Committees in some twenty-three countries enabled thousands of men, women and children to become aware of the needs of mankind and to make a personal contribution towards meeting them. In Canada, the UNICEF National Committee raised approximately \$1 million a year and other countries achieved similar results. UNICEF's ability to interest so many people in the rights of all individuals deserved the praise of the Third Committee, which was concerned with finding practical ways of ensuring that human rights were respected. The Canadian delegation would wish to join the sponsors of any resolution which congratulated UNICEF on its work and hoped that such a resolution would be adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.