



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Long-range activities for children. United Nations International Children's Endowment Fund (A/1411 and A/C.3/L.54) (<i>continued</i>)	91

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.54) (*continued*)

[Item 64]*

AUSTRALIAN DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/C.3/L.54)
(*continued*)

Sixth paragraph

1. The CHAIRMAN called on the Committee to consider the sixth paragraph of the Australian draft resolution, beginning with sub-paragraph (a). The amendments to that text appeared in the synoptic table prepared by the Secretariat (A/C.3/L.67 and Corr.1).
2. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) stated that her delegation maintained the first part of its amendment (A/C.3/L.65) to that paragraph calling for the insertion of the words "the United Nations Children's Board", but withdrew the second part of its amendment in favour of the Ecuadorian amendment (A/C.3/L.60).
3. Mr. CORREA (Ecuador) stated that while the general tendency of the Australian draft resolution was to prolong the existence of UNICEF for two years without any change the paragraph under discussion was an exception to that general trend since it called for a reduction of the membership of the Executive Board to eighteen and for a change in the method of selecting its members. The Board had been constituted on the basis of resolution 57 (I) of the General Assembly. Its membership had been based on that of the Social Commission, and other States had been added to the Board on the basis of geographical criteria or because they were major contributing or recipient countries. He could see no reason for the kind of change proposed by the Australian delegation and considered that representation of the members of the So-

cial Commission on the Executive Board was most convenient from an operational point of view. Furthermore, it appeared to be somewhat illogical to praise the Executive Board in the preamble of the Australian draft resolution while calling for a drastic reorganization of the Board in the operative part. While it might be argued that it would be proper to give the Economic and Social Council a free hand in respect of the composition of the Board, it should not be overlooked that the Council had itself concluded that governments represented on the Social Commission should be represented on the Board.

4. For those reasons his delegation had submitted an amendment (A/C.3/L.60) to that part of the Australian draft resolution.

5. Mr. MARIN (France) stated that, in view of the financial and other responsibilities of the Board, the size of its membership was most important to his delegation. For that reason it had submitted an amendment (A/C.3/L.59) proposing that the Board should consist of twenty-six members instead of eighteen. He understood that that amendment would be voted on only if the Ecuadorian amendment were rejected.

6. Mr. PEREZ PEROZO (Venezuela) said that his delegation had decided not to submit the amendment (A/C.3/L.50) which it had proposed in respect of the draft resolution prepared by the Secretary-General (A/1411) to the Australian draft resolution because, as pointed out by the Ecuadorian representative, a proposal drastically to reorganize the Executive Board of the Fund might imply dissatisfaction with the latter's work if that were to be the only change made. If the Fund were to continue for two years, it would be preferable not to make any radical change in its Executive Board and so to permit it to continue to draw upon the experience gained by that Board. The time to effect changes would be when the General Assembly decided to establish the Fund on a permanent basis.

7. He preferred the Peruvian amendment (A/C.3/L.62) to the one submitted by the French delegation;

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

the former would prevent an equal division of votes in the board, since it proposed a board composed of twenty-five, not twenty-six, members.

8. He accepted that part of the Australian draft which called for observance of the principle of geographical distribution. It seemed to him, however, that the further criteria in terms of major contributing and recipient countries were less well founded since they might lead to confusion. It was of course obvious that both contributing and recipient countries, the latter particularly from among economically under-developed areas, should be represented on the board. There was however another category of countries which might usefully be represented on the board, namely countries which, for economic or individual reasons, might be unable to make major contributions to the Fund without, however, themselves being recipient countries. He was thinking particularly of Belgium and the Netherlands, both of which had highly developed child welfare systems and neither of which was among the twenty major contributors to the Fund, nor a recipient of aid from it. Apparently the phrase "major contributing country" had been construed in terms of *per caput* contributions, and that had been the reason for the appearance of such small countries as Monaco on the list of the twenty major contributors. It was also possible to construe the phrase to mean the largest absolute contribution, in which case the United States of America would head the list, while Monaco would not be included on it at all.

9. In the circumstances he considered that the words "and to the representation of the major contributing and recipient countries" should be excluded from the draft altogether or else that their meaning should be clearly stated in the Rapporteur's report, for the guidance of the Economic and Social Council. At any rate, he proposed that a separate vote should be taken on the words to which he had referred.

10. The amendment which his delegation had submitted to the draft resolution prepared by the Secretary-General had been against automatic representation of members of the Social Commission on the proposed board, in the belief that the independent action of the Social Commission should be maintained. The Economic and Social Council should be given a free hand in that respect; adoption of the relevant part of the Australian draft did not mean that the Economic and Social Council would not be able to appoint any of the members represented on the Social Commission to membership of the board. His point was merely that the members of the Social Commission should not be represented on the board *en bloc*.

11. A further point that the Council might wish to keep in mind was the fact that its discussion of the reports of the Executive Board of the Fund would be facilitated if many members of the latter were also represented on the Council itself.

12. Mr. ANZE MATIENZO (Bolivia) stated that he would vote for the amendment submitted by the delegation of Ecuador. He could not agree with some of the observations just made by the Venezuelan representative.

13. The proposal to include the eighteen members of the Social Commission on the Executive Board was well founded. Members of the Social Commission had

technical knowledge; they had an overall perspective of the social activities of the United Nations and were therefore in an excellent position to contribute to the work of the Executive Board.

14. He also agreed with the views expressed by the French representative. It would be most advantageous to include on the board representatives of major contributing and recipient countries, as provided for in the Ecuadorian amendment; for contributing and recipient countries were participating together in a common undertaking.

15. Lord MACDONALD (United Kingdom) had originally favoured retention of sub-paragraph (a) of the sixth paragraph of the Australian draft without alteration. He had however been impressed by some of the arguments advanced during the debate and had therefore decided to support the Peruvian amendment which had the very real advantage of not encumbering the Social Commission with executive functions.

16. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) stated that the amendment submitted by the delegation of Ecuador to the Australian draft was very similar to the amendment (A/C.3/L.53) which her own delegation had previously submitted to the draft resolution prepared by the Secretary-General. She felt that the members of the Social Commission should be represented on the Executive Board because their experience was of the highest importance to the work of the Fund.

17. The principle of geographical distribution was of the greatest interest to countries of the Western hemisphere which, although regarded as a bloc, faced varying regional problems. She hoped that Central America would be represented. She would therefore vote for the retention of the principle of geographical distribution and for increasing the membership of the board. She hoped that the Social Commission membership would be chosen by the Economic and Social Council as a nucleus for the membership of the board, but that additional countries would also be represented on the latter, as proposed by the representative of Ecuador.

18. Mr. CABADA (Peru) withdrew his amendment to sub-paragraph (a) of the sixth paragraph of the Australian draft resolution in favour of the French amendment to that paragraph.

19. He was unable to vote for the Ecuadorian amendment because its adoption would, in effect, give two conflicting mandates to the Social Commission: it would transform the Commission into both an executive and a supervisory organ. The members of the Social Commission would in that capacity be called upon to supervise the plans which, in their capacity as members of the board, they had had to formulate and execute.

20. The representative of Egypt had previously, and in another connexion, submitted a proposal calling for a wider division of labour among the various Members of the United Nations. He agreed with that proposal and also felt that the functions of the United Nations should be distributed more widely among the various delegations. That was yet another reason why he could not support the Ecuadorian amendment.

21. Mr. VAZQUEZ (Uruguay) favoured the Australian draft with the modification proposed by the French delegation.

22. He believed that the members of the executive board should be appointed by the Economic and Social Council and that the representatives of Venezuela and Peru had been right when they had warned against saddling the Social Commission with both executive and administrative functions. He also believed that the membership of the board should be large enough to assure equitable geographical distribution. It might perhaps have been better to provide for an odd rather than an even membership, but that point was not, after all, of fundamental importance. The Economic and Social Council was in the best position to judge the qualifications of members of the board. The principle of geographical distribution was most important and should be respected. Perhaps the term "recipient countries" had not been well chosen and it might have been better to speak of countries participating in a programme of international co-operation. Such countries, in turn, acted as proving grounds in the development of adequate social welfare programmes for children. The board's membership should also include countries showing particularly great interest in the problem confronting it. He felt that the relevant passage of the Australian draft covered satisfactorily the points which he had made.

23. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) supported sub-paragraph (a) of the sixth paragraph of the Australian draft resolution as well as the French amendment thereto.

24. He agreed with the representatives of Peru, Venezuela and Uruguay that it would be preferable to give the Economic and Social Council a free hand in the selection of members of the executive board of the Fund. It would be unfair to many countries if the members of the Social Commission were included *en bloc* on the board. His country felt very strongly on the point at issue because it had been a member of the board from the beginning. Moreover, it had 300,000 war orphans and one out of every ten of its inhabitants was a refugee who only now was able to return to his home; for Greece, the war had lasted ten years.

25. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States amendment (A/C.3/L.65) calling for the insertion of the words "the United Nations Children's Board" before the word "from."

The amendment was rejected by 28 votes to 12, with 7 abstentions.

26. The CHAIRMAN then put to a separate vote the last part of the Ecuadorian amendment (A/C.3/60): "and to the representation of the major contributing and recipient countries".

The amendment was adopted by 30 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.

27. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the Ecuadorian amendment as a whole.

The amendment was adopted by 29 votes to 12, with 9 abstentions.

28. The CHAIRMAN explained that the vote just taken made it unnecessary to vote on the French amendment.

29. He invited the Committee to consider the United States (A/C.3/L.65) and United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.66) amendments, which proposed additional sub-paragraphs for insertion in the sixth paragraph.

30. Mr. WALKER (Australia) wished for information on the practical implications of the expression "a separate and distinct account of the United Nations" in sub-paragraph (b) of the United States amendment and wondered whether the phrase implied any change in the existing procedures.

31. Sub-paragraph (c) appeared to imply that there would definitely be some change in financial procedures and perhaps also in the mode of operation, in that members of the staff currently under the Executive Director of the Fund would be made responsible to other units of the United Nations.

32. He had no fundamental objection to the word "Endowment," but felt that it might appear somewhat pretentious in view of the limited funds available and might give the impression that the organ was regarded as a permanent one.

33. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) thought that she had made it clear previously that sub-paragraph (b) of the United States amendment had been drafted on lines similar to the relevant sub-paragraph in the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General in order to give form to the machinery suggested by the Economic and Social Council.

34. Sub-paragraph (c) did not imply that the staff would not be responsible to the executive director; it would be an integral part of the United Nations and the salaries and administrative expenses would be met by that Organization. A similar provision regarding field missions, however, was now omitted.

35. The purpose of the United States amendments was clearly to establish a permanent organ rather than an organization which should remain in existence only two years.

36. Mrs. MYRDAL (Secretariat) welcomed the United States representative's explanation, since it would have been difficult for the Secretariat to state what changes were contemplated solely in connexion with the United States amendment to the Australian draft resolution. The Secretariat had prepared estimates and explanations for the Economic and Social Council in regard to the documents submitted by the Secretary-General; similar material bearing on the financial, administrative and legal aspects could be prepared for the Third Committee.

37. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico), speaking as Rapporteur, drew attention to the footnote relating to the words "separate and distinct" and "which shall be utilized and administered exclusively" in the draft resolution prepared by the Secretary-General (A/1411), which made it clear that the words "separate and distinct" meant that the Fund was to be used exclusively for humanitarian purposes and had a bearing on tax exemptions applicable to voluntary contributions.

38. Mr. WALKER (Australia) pointed out that it still was not clear how the changed wording altered the existing arrangement under which it was a separate Fund, but not a separate and distinct account of the United Nations. If no change had been intended in arrangements, the changed wording was pointless.

39. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) explained that if the proposed machinery was set up and the staff became an integral part of the United Nations, it must be clearly stated, for taxation purposes

among others, that the Endowment Fund was a distinct account to be used exclusively for humanitarian purposes.

40. Mr. SCHACHTER (Secretariat) explained that the words "separate and distinct account of the United Nations" had been introduced in the draft resolution prepared by the Secretary-General in order to make it clear that the funds were to be used for separate purposes when the character of the organ was changed. Under the Australian draft resolution, the character of the Fund would remain the same, so that the insertion of that phrase would be unnecessary. Legally speaking, the reference to the separate account was not broad enough because other assets of the existing Fund besides strictly monetary accounts had to be taken into consideration, such as unliquidated claims.

41. Mr. TSAO (China) suggested that the legal difficulties might be overcome by the insertion of the words "carried in" between the words "shall be" and "a separate" in sub-paragraph (b) of the United States amendment. In consequence, under sub-paragraph (c) only the administrative costs of the central office would be financed by the United Nations, which would affect only the accounting, but not the legal status, of the Fund.

42. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) accepted the Chinese amendment.

43. Mr. SCHACHTER (Secretariat) said that that amendment would enable the Secretariat to interpret the paragraph more easily, especially as it would have to be interpreted in the light of the remaining provisions.

44. Mr. ANZE MATIENZO (Bolivia) would be compelled to vote against the United States amendments, because it would be illogical to vote for a changed structure of UNICEF and at the same time to vote for the continuation of UNICEF as it existed.

45. Mr. PANYUSHKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that it would have been better to vote on the Australian draft resolution than on insertions proposed by the United States, as the legal position might then have been clearer.

46. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) opposed the United States amendments. His delegation had accepted the term "Endowment" in the draft submitted by the Secretary-General, but it was not inconsistent in opposing it in connexion with the Australian draft resolution. The change of name had assumed importance because the result of adopting the United States amendments would be to change the whole aim and function of the Fund. The Committee had already adopted the spirit of the Australian draft resolution as expressed in the preamble, which quite clearly implied the Committee's desire that the Fund should continue to operate in the way in which it had worked previously. If the United States amendments were adopted as the operative part under such a preamble, there would be complete confusion. If, therefore, the Committee did not wish to adopt the Australian draft resolution as a whole, it should return to the draft submitted by the Secretary-General rather than attempt to incorporate the incongruous United States amendments.

47. It was true that the legal obligations of the Fund would not be altered if it were given a new name, but

the existing Fund had certain policy commitments to certain countries; since they were not legally binding, it was to be feared that they might be altered if the name and structure of the Fund were changed. The United States delegation clearly desired such changes, but it was to be doubted whether that desire was shared by the majority of the Committee.

48. Sub-paragraph (d) of the United States amendment was entirely inconsistent with the purposes of the Fund as conceived in the Australian draft resolution. The two purposes of the Fund stated in that paragraph were virtually identical with those in the draft submitted by the Secretary-General, to which his delegation had not objected at the time of the discussion of that draft. They were still admirable statements, with which he whole-heartedly agreed; but he could not vote for that sub-paragraph unless a third statement of purpose was added to cover the continuing needs of countries suffering from chronic or long-standing deficiencies. Western countries could not perhaps conceive of the situation in Eastern countries, where prevailing conditions were even worse than those resulting from sudden emergencies such as floods or earthquakes. He understood that the United States delegation might not accept such an addition. If that were true, it would be wisest for those who supported the insertion to vote against sub-paragraph (d) of the United States amendment, particularly as it was impossible at that stage to submit such an amendment to that amendment. Furthermore, no such amendment could be submitted to the Australian draft resolution because in it the purposes of the Fund were not specified, as it was assumed that they would remain the same as they were.

49. It had been suggested that the purpose of the Fund as stated in sub-paragraph (d) of the United States amendment was to help the under-developed countries to help themselves. It was quite untrue to suggest that they were unwilling to do so; the main pre-occupation of countries that had recently achieved their freedom was in fact to do everything in their power to make up for the lost centuries. They could not, however, do so effectively without assistance in the initial stages, and that assistance must necessarily be more in the form of the provision of supplies than in that of technical experts. While he fully appreciated the magnificent contribution made to the Fund by the United States, which had in fact taken the lead in establishing it, he must appeal to the more highly developed countries for a deeper understanding of the pressing problems of the under-developed areas.

50. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) said that, in his opinion, sub-paragraph (d) represented a real effort on the part of the United States delegation to meet the views of the majority; he was surprised that the Pakistan representative had failed to appreciate that. As worded, that paragraph left the Economic and Social Council at liberty to exercise its influence. A gradual approach might be wiser than that advocated by the representative of Pakistan.

51. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) was unable to see that the United States delegation had made any concessions; its draft was virtually identical with that submitted by the Secretary-General. The only acceptable compromise would have been the insertion of some such third purpose as he had proposed.

52. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) explained that her delegation had repeatedly expressed its understanding that assistance in the initial period would have to consist mainly of supplies; but at the same time it had emphasized the importance of embarking upon projects which would eventually change the type of need to be met. The paragraph did not mean that nothing would be furnished except material for long-range activities. The Pakistan representative was incorrect in thinking that there were no persons in the highly-developed countries who understood conditions in the under-developed areas. The representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization had told Sub-Committee 6, however, that the needs of children could never be met by supplies alone.

53. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) again appealed for a compromise. To compel the United States delegation to vote against the Australian draft resolution would virtually defeat the Committee's purpose. His country had, as a result of war, been forced to accept assistance on several occasions. There was nothing shameful in requesting assistance, but was it not too much to attempt to extort it?

54. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) said that he had been perfectly prepared to accept the two statements of purpose in the United States amendment, provided that a third, dealing with chronic emergencies, had been inserted. That, in his opinion, was conciliatory.

55. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote successively sub-paragraph (b) of the United States amendment (A/C.3/L.65) to the sixth paragraph of the Australian draft resolution, as amended by the Chinese representative, and sub-paragraphs (c), (d) and (e) of the United States amendment.

Sub-paragraph (b), as amended, was rejected by 29 votes to 8, with 8 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (c) was rejected by 30 votes to 9, with 9 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (d) was rejected by 23 votes to 10, with 11 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (e) was rejected by 26 votes to 9, with 10 abstentions.

56. Mr. WALKER (Australia) said that he was unable to support sub-paragraph (f) of the United States amendment, which would result in a needless addition to existing committees and administrative arrangements for co-ordination. Although he shared the general view that the programmes of UNICEF should be prepared in consultation with the specialized agencies, a specific provision to the effect that the programmes must receive the previous approval of those agencies might cause undesirable delay, especially since it was not clear at what level they would have to be approved.

57. Mrs. BEGRUP (Denmark) said that her government, like many other governments, wished to see the work of the specialized agencies and the United Nations planned so as to be accomplished economically and without overlapping.

58. She hoped that a representative of the Secretary-General would supply background information regarding the co-operation that already existed between UNICEF and the specialized agencies, in order to help the Committee to come to a decision with regard to sub-paragraph (f) of the United States amendment.

59. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) remarked that such information would also shed light on the sub-paragraphs (c) and (d) proposed by the United Kingdom delegation (A/C.3/L.66).

60. Lord MACDONALD (United Kingdom) was also interested in such a statement.

61. Liaison with the specialized agencies must be maintained; the fullest possible use should be made of them to ensure that the programmes of UNICEF were technically sound, even if it meant delay; otherwise the work of UNICEF would be of little value.

62. Mr. HILL (Secretariat) said that from the very outset of the discussions concerning an international organization for child welfare, the Secretary-General had insisted that the necessity of permitting the specialized agencies and the technical departments of the United Nations Secretariat to play a part in the operations of such an organization should be recognized and provided for. In paragraph 18 of his memorandum on essential long-range activities for children (E/CN.5/201) submitted to the Social Commission, the Secretary-General had taken the position that any new organizational arrangements for achieving greater co-ordination must be in line with the efforts of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in other fields of economic and social development and that the existing regular machinery of the United Nations and the specialized agencies should be used wherever practicable. His reasons had been that he was responsible for ensuring that the structure of UNICEF was in conformity with the Charter and with the agreements the United Nations had concluded with the specialized agencies, under which they were recognized as the agencies responsible for international activities in their respective fields; that he wished General Assembly resolution 310 (IV) to be implemented, so that United Nations organs would not trespass on fields which were within the competence of a specialized agency; and that he felt that, for the best success of its work, UNICEF should continue to consult specialized agencies, as it had in the past consulted the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization on parts of its programmes which were within their competence. The wording on that subject in the resolution prepared by the Secretary-General (A/1411) on the basis of the proposals made by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 310 (XI) was in effect a paraphrase of the agreement concluded between UNICEF and WHO.

63. The Committee would recall that the governing organs of three specialized agencies—WHO, FAO and ILO—had expressed grave concern and had made reservations regarding any language in the resolution the General Assembly might adopt on the future of UNICEF which did not provide for their proper participation in the preparation of the programmes. The language unanimously adopted by the Economic and Social Council in its proposals satisfied not only the specialized agencies but the Executive Director of UNICEF—in other words, those most closely concerned with the actual operations of the Fund. The Secretary-General therefore hoped that those provisions would be retained.

64. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) doubted the usefulness of the United States and United Kingdom amendments

concerning co-ordination; the Economic and Social Council had adopted a number of resolutions on that subject at its eleventh session, and it might actually be confusing to make additions to them. Surely child welfare was the field in which duplication of efforts was least to be feared, so immense was the need to be filled.

65. Mr. AMANRICH (France) was prepared to vote for the United Kingdom amendments but not for sub-paragraph (f) of the United States amendment, which was more far-reaching than the text prepared by the Secretary-General (A/1411) and might have the effect of hampering UNICEF in its work.

66. Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada) thought that the United States amendment was substantially the same as the provision arrived at by the Economic and Social Council after careful consideration. Since, as Mr. Hill had pointed out, those most closely concerned with the operations of UNICEF agreed that the arrangement would work, there was no reason to fear that delays or difficulties would be occasioned.

67. She would therefore support sub-paragraph (f) of the United States amendment.

68. Dr. CHISHOLM (World Health Organization) said that the issue before the Committee was of the utmost importance; it was, in fact, whether or not specialized agencies would be able to fulfil their responsibilities. He recalled that the agreement which the United Nations had concluded with WHO recognized the latter as the agency responsible in the field of its responsibilities under the Constitution; similar agreements had been signed with the other specialized agencies. The suggestion that that responsibility should be disregarded and that another organ should operate in the field of health without the approval of WHO could not be carried out without denouncing the agreement with WHO.

69. The responsibility of WHO to the seventy-six States which were its members was very clear. Part of it was to see that activities of the United Nations did not disrupt the orderly development of national health services—an effect which might easily be produced if money, supplies and services were to be poured in for a short period of time without a planned effort to build up a country's national services so that the work could be carried on after outside aid had stopped. The World Health Organization was the only agency which was in a position to consider all factors, to evaluate the conditions for the sound organization and development of health services and to see that the proper proportion was maintained in the various aspects of those services. It was of the utmost importance that some such arrangement as WHO had already made with UNICEF should continue, lest two international organizations should find themselves competing for the favour of governments. It was the right and the duty of WHO to approve UNICEF programmes relating to health as it was the right and the duty of other agencies to approve programmes which came within their province.

70. Mr. McDOUGALL (Food and Agriculture Organization) fully agreed with Dr. Chisholm.

71. He wished to emphasize that FAO was greatly interested in the subject of child nutrition, which was a basic factor in child welfare. The Food and Agriculture Organization estimated that there were 400 million

children in the world who suffered from under-nutrition or malnutrition to some degree. That situation could not possibly be remedied by the provision of emergency aid. Thus, it had been estimated that 4 million tons of dried milk per year would be necessary for those children; UNICEF, valuable as its work had been, had been able to supply only 60,000 tons per year.

72. That did not mean that international action in the field of child nutrition was useless; but the activities of UNICEF with regard to supplementary feeding should be correlated with the efforts of specialized agencies to aid governments to improve their methods of food production so that the need for imported supplies could be gradually eliminated and child nutrition could be improved. That might be achieved without great expenditure provided that there was close co-operation between UNICEF and the specialized agencies and governments concerned. In the interest of great and progressive improvement in child nutrition he urged the Committee to give the matter careful consideration.

73. Mr. PEREZ PEROZO (Venezuela) requested that the first part of sub-paragraph (f) of the United States amendment, ending with the words "the United Nations and the specialized agencies" should be put to the vote separately.

74. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of sub-paragraph (f) of the United States amendment (A/C.3/L.65).

That part was adopted by 36 votes to 3, with 8 abstentions.

75. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the remainder of sub-paragraph (f) of the United States amendment.

That part was rejected by 26 votes to 13, with 10 abstentions.

76. Lord MACDONALD (United Kingdom) withdrew sub-paragraph (c) of the United Kingdom amendment.

77. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) explained that the reference to "inter-governmental" organizations in sub-paragraph (d) of that amendment had been inserted by the United Kingdom at the suggestion of the United States with the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood.

Sub-paragraph (d) of the United Kingdom amendment was adopted by 30 votes to 7, with 11 abstentions.

78. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) withdrew sub-paragraphs (g), (h), (i) and (j) of the United States amendment, since they were consequential to earlier paragraphs which had been rejected.

79. Mr. OREN (Israel) remarked that sub-paragraph (b) of the sixth paragraph of the Australian draft resolution might give governments, the specialized agencies and the general public the erroneous impression that no definite agreement had been reached with respect to future needs, whereas in fact the only divergence was on the relative role of the various ways of meeting that need. Such an impression might discourage those who wished to help.

80. He consequently proposed that the word "policy" should be inserted between the words "future" and "of the Fund".

81. Mr. VLAHOVIC (Yugoslavia) recalled that he had previously expressed the view that a two-year interval would be too brief to permit proper consideration of the important question of the eventual reorganization of the Fund. In practice, the Social Commission and the Economic and Social Council would have to consider the question of the future of the Fund within one year if the General Assembly itself were to act in two years. In other words, after only one year the Fund would again be operating under the shadow of uncertainty.

82. To remedy that undesirable situation, his delegation was proposing an amendment (A/C.3/L.64), the first part of which called for the substitution of the word "three" for the word "two" in sub-paragraph (b) of the Australian draft resolution. That sub-paragraph would then read:

"(b) The General Assembly shall again consider the future of the Fund in three years time . . ."

83. The second part of the Yugoslav amendment called for the addition of the words "with the object of continuing the Fund on a permanent basis" after the word "time", in order to indicate that the eventual aim should be permanency.

84. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) withdrew his amendment (A/C.3/L.63), proposing the deletion of sub-paragraph (b), in favour of the Yugoslav text.

85. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of the Yugoslav amendment (A/C.3/L.64).

That part was adopted by 35 votes to 8, with 5 abstentions.

86. Mr. WALKER (Australia) recalled that his delegation had made it clear, at the 285th meeting, that it could accept amendments to its draft resolution which did not alter its general line, but that if drastic amendments to it were adopted his delegation might be unable to support it. If the addition to such paragraph (b) proposed by the Yugoslav representative were adopted—and he would vote against it—he would have to reserve his position on the Australian draft resolution, since its whole tenor would have been altered.

87. Mr. VLAHOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that his amendment would in no way prevent the General Assembly from reviewing the future of the Fund at any time; it merely indicated what the majority of the Committee considered a desirable objective.

88. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second part of the Yugoslav amendment (A/C.3/L.64).

That part was adopted by 31 votes to 9, with 7 abstentions.

89. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Israel amendment to insert the word "policy" between the words "future" and "of the Fund".

That amendment was rejected by 11 votes to 8, with 25 abstentions.

90. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (b) of the sixth paragraph of the Australian draft resolution, as a whole, as amended.

That sub-paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 17 votes to 9, with 3 abstentions.

Additional paragraph proposed by the Peruvian delegation (A/C.3/L.62) (continued)

91. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had to vote on the additional paragraph submitted by the Peruvian delegation.¹ That delegation had accepted the insertion, proposed by the Cuban delegation, of the words "if possible" between the words "providing" and "the necessary funds".

92. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) and Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) requested that the Peruvian amendment should be voted on in parts, the first part to end with the words "respective budgets".

93. Mr. CABADA (Peru) proposed that the second part should be a separate paragraph and begin with the words "*Expresses the hope that . . .*" Certain drafting changes would have to be made in it.

94. Mr. OREN (Israel) wondered whether there was not some inconsistency between the words "when the period of time . . . expired" and the Yugoslav amendment just adopted.

95. Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) said that there was no inconsistency: the organ could be established after the expiry of three years.

96. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first paragraph of the Peruvian amendment (A/C.3/L.62), as modified at the 285th meeting.

That paragraph as amended, was adopted by 23 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions.

97. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second paragraph of the Peruvian amendment (A/C.3/L.62).

That paragraph was rejected by 27 votes to 4, with 16 abstentions.

Additional paragraph proposed by the United Kingdom delegation (A/C.3/L.66)

98. Lord MACDONALD (United Kingdom) explained that his amendment was designed to ensure that the past discussions on that subject would not be wasted. The United States Government had indicated that it was willing to finance supplies incidental to technical assistance in aid of national programmes of child welfare and especially for demonstration projects. The Committee should take advantage of that generous offer and others like it. There were many activities being carried on within the United Nations designed to promote the economic and social development of whole communities and it was within that framework that the question of supplies should be considered by the Economic and Social Council. The principles governing the expanded programme of technical assistance, for example, did not exclude provision of supplies as an integral part of technical assistance projects.

99. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the additional paragraph proposed by the United Kingdom delegation (A/C.3/L.66).

That paragraph was adopted by 35 votes to 2, with 13 abstentions.

¹ See 285th meeting, paragraph 70.

100. Mr. PEREZ PEROZO (Venezuela) drew attention to the fact that the Economic and Social Council had recommended, in its resolution 310 (XI), that the General Assembly should amend resolution 57 (I) of the General Assembly to incorporate proposals by the Council. A reference to that fact should be made in the preamble, since the draft resolution as amended differed considerably from that prepared and presented by the Secretary-General (A/1411).

101. Mrs. MENON (India) drew attention to the need for a new title for the agenda item under discussion.

102. Mr. ANZE MATIENZO (Bolivia) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted by 29 votes to 8.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.