



**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.54) ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	85

*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*)**

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the synoptic table of amendments (A/C.3/L.67) to the Australian draft resolution which had been prepared by the Secretariat.

2. He reminded the Committee that it had already adopted the first paragraph (284th meeting).

*Second paragraph (continued)*

3. Mr. MOODIE (Australia) said that his delegation had carefully studied the amendments to its draft resolution and was prepared to accept some of them. It could not, however, accept amendments contrary to the principle of the draft resolution, which was to avoid confusion and stabilize the existing situation for two years.

4. With regard to the membership of the board, the Australian delegation was equally ready to accept either the French amendment (A/C.3/L.59), which proposed a twenty-six member board, or the Peruvian amendment (A/C.3/L.62), which proposed twenty-five members.

5. The Australian delegation was also willing to accept the beginning of the additional paragraph proposed by Peru (A/C.3/L.62), that is, the insertion of the following phrase:

*"Recommends Member States to develop and improve their national child welfare services, providing the necessary funds for that important purpose under their respective budgets".*

That amendment would be an improvement.

\* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

6. The Australian delegation was in favour of the first Lebanese amendment (A/C.3/L.63) and had no objection in principle to the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.66).

7. He would abstain for the time being from any remarks on the other amendments, including the United States amendment (A/C.3/L.65), which in his opinion raised very important questions of principle.

8. Mrs. MENON (India) explained that the Indian delegation had proposed (A/C.3/L.61) the deletion of the word "emergency" before the word "action", in the second paragraph of the Australian draft resolution, because it wished the Fund to be concerned in future with permanent needs arising from persistent serious deficiencies, and not to devote itself solely to needs arising from acute crises or serious emergencies; she considered that, as it stood, the Australian draft resolution might be interpreted in a too limited way.

9. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) emphasized the extreme simplicity of her delegation's amendment, which merely consisted in wording the second paragraph as follows:

*"Recognizing the necessity for some continued action . . ."*

10. Mr. MOODIE (Australia) regretted that his delegation would be obliged to vote against those two amendments, which seemed to it incompatible with the intentions of its draft resolution.

11. The Fund had plenty of scope for emergency action for another two years.

12. The words "emergency action" must be interpreted widely as they had been interpreted by the Board in the past. Such action must not only meet the needs arising from serious emergencies, for example, catastrophes such as floods or earthquakes, but should also

apply to the real needs of peoples and grave deficiencies existing in various parts of the world. Adoption of the amendments might lead the Executive Board to pass prematurely from emergency action to long-range measures such as technical assistance.

13. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) supported the Indian amendment, although it appreciated the position of the Australian representative. To safeguard the very principle just enunciated by the latter, namely extended action by the Fund, the expression "emergency action" must be avoided, as it might lead future directors of the Fund, in drawing up their programmes, to neglect persistent needs and to concentrate on emergency needs.

14. The Pakistan delegation felt bound to make some general remarks on the second paragraph of the United States amendment, for it was of the opinion that the amendment was inspired by the same spirit as all the amendments presented by the United States delegation.

15. When the Committee had started to consider the question of long-range activities for children, it had had before it a draft resolution by the Secretary-General (A/1411), which placed the Fund on a permanent basis and assigned it a dual task: to meet relief needs in cases of serious emergencies, and to assist long-range programmes for children in the recipient countries by placing supplies and advice at the disposal of governments. The Pakistan delegation had unreservedly approved that idea, although wishing the activities of the Fund to be extended to meet the permanent needs of children in the under-developed countries, which could not be considered emergency needs in the strict sense of the term and seemed to require assistance in kind rather than long-range help or advice. Differences of opinion had arisen in the Committee and a Sub-Committee had been set up to find a satisfactory formula. The Sub-Committee having failed to do so, the Committee had decided (283rd meeting) to take as a basis for discussion the Australian draft resolution, which was very different from the Secretary-General's text, in that it no longer placed the Fund on a permanent basis nor assigned wide objectives to it.

16. When the question whether the Committee could consider the Australian draft resolution had arisen, the Pakistan delegation had raised no objection, thinking that that procedure might enable the Committee to end the deadlock and reach agreement, on the understanding that, if that were not the case, the Secretary-General's draft would be taken up again as a basis for discussion.

17. But the United States amendment brought the Committee back to its starting point, as it raised the same difficulties as the Secretary-General's draft. Sub-paragraph (d) of the text proposed by the United States for the operative part, which provided that the Executive Board should formulate the policies, determine the programmes and allocate the resources of the Fund for the purpose of providing supplies, training, and advisory assistance "with the primary objective of stimulating the development of continuing long-range activities of governments on behalf of children", seemed to fail to recognize the permanent nature of the needs arising from continuing shortages and therefore once again raised the question of principle which had divided the Committee.

18. The delegation of Pakistan was entirely in favour of long-term activities, provided they were accompanied by measures to meet already existing permanent needs.

19. In conclusion, he urged the members of the Committee to forget their differences and not to launch into discussions of principle, unless they wished to take up again as a basis of discussion the resolution drafted by the Secretary-General, which itself had raised fundamental questions that the Australian draft resolution was attempting to avert.

20. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) emphasized that the Secretary-General's draft resolution, and the Economic and Social Council's resolution upon which it was based, represented the outcome of lengthy efforts and patient reflection. Some delegations appeared to be defending the Australian draft resolution because of the importance it attributed to programmes which they themselves were in favour of continuing. She thought it her duty to warn the Committee against such an attitude which, in her opinion, might be prejudicial to children throughout the world. If it was decided to continue the existing emergency programmes, it would very probably be difficult to find the necessary support from governments.

21. She therefore appealed to the Committee to consider its decision carefully and not to follow the line of least resistance, which would be to leave the activities of the Fund unchanged. In her opinion such an attitude might be fatal to the Fund's very existence and might therefore entail great suffering for the children whom it was their intention to help.

22. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) thought that, in deciding to examine the Australian draft resolution before the Secretary-General's resolution, the Committee had merely chosen a procedure intended to enable it more easily to reach a satisfactory solution. It was not thereby obliged to adopt the Australian resolution.

23. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon), speaking on a point of order, remarked that the Committee had decided to consider the Australian draft resolution, which did not enter into the question of reorganizing the Fund, but merely that of prolonging its activities. However, the amendments submitted were a retrograde step for they raised anew the question of the reorganization of the Fund. The Committee ought therefore to decide whether it should take a decision upon those amendments.

24. AZMI Bey (Egypt) thought that that question did not arise and that, in deciding to examine the Australian draft resolution, the members of the Committee had already taken their decision on that prior question. They had had time to acquaint themselves with the amendments; if they did not approve of them, they were at liberty to vote against them.

25. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) drew the attention of the Lebanese and Pakistan delegations to the fact that the Committee would gain little by voting first on the principle of accepting or rejecting the United States amendments. Indeed it would be making a mistake because, when the time came to discuss the amendments, the United States delegation might perhaps agree to certain changes in them which would enable the Committee to adopt the Australian draft resolution.

26. He asked the representatives of Lebanon and Pakistan to abandon their proposal and agree to continue the discussion amendment by amendment.

27. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) explained that his intention was not to hasten the proceedings but to help the Committee to refrain from taking decisions while the situation was confused. The confusion was caused by the Committee's persistence in going back upon a decision of procedure which it had taken but was not respecting because it was accepting and discussing amendments which were intended completely to reorganize the Fund. The Lebanese delegation thought that an unfortunate method.

28. The method which the Committee ought to follow was to vote upon the question of principle, namely whether it wished to reorganize the Fund or merely to prolong its existence.

29. Mr. VAZQUEZ (Uruguay) supported the Indian amendment (A/C.3/L.61), which he thought improved the Australian draft resolution. Uruguay wished the permanent needs of children to be met by permanent action on the part of an organ performing a continuous task which did not depend on events. To speak of "emergency" assistance was to limit that organ's scope of action. It was in any case paradoxical to couple the ideas of permanence and emergency.

30. He would prefer the second paragraph of the draft resolution to say not "in many parts of the world" but "in all parts of the world".

31. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian amendment (A/C.3/L.61).

*The amendment was adopted by 41 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.*

32. Mr. ANZE MATIENZO (Bolivia) endorsed the Uruguayan representative's suggestion and proposed that in the second paragraph the phrase "in many parts of the world" should be deleted.

33. Lord MACDONALD (United Kingdom) reminded the Committee that 2 p.m. of the preceding Friday had been set as the time limit for submitting amendments.

34. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said any member of the Committee was entitled to ask for a separate vote on each part of the text; hence any member could propose the deletion of a passage in the text.

35. The CHAIRMAN agreed that that was the case, under rule 128 of the rules of procedure.

36. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA having withdrawn her delegation's amendment to the second paragraph, the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the phrase "in many parts of the world".

*That phrase was rejected by 30 votes to 6, with 13 abstentions.*

37. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second paragraph of the Australian draft resolution (A/C.3/L.54), as amended.

*That paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 51 votes to none.*

#### *Third paragraph*

*The third paragraph was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

#### *Fourth paragraph*

*The fourth paragraph was adopted by 51 votes to none.*

#### *Fifth paragraph*

38. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said the only purpose of her delegation's amendment to the fifth paragraph (A/C.3/L.65) was to bring out the fact that the Fund was an integral part of the United Nations.

39. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) said his amendment (A/C.3/L.63) was intended to fill a gap in the Australian draft resolution, which did not specify that governments and private persons could continue to make contributions to the Fund if they wished. They should be reminded that the United Nations was counting on them.

40. Mr. MOODIE (Australia) recalled that he had already accepted the Lebanese amendment. With reference to the United States amendment, he said that he still preferred the word "Fund", which was an inseparable part of the general conception of the Australian draft resolution. The Fund was already universally known, and contributions to it would be most readily forthcoming.

41. Mr. OREN (Israel) observed that both points of view might be reconciled by using the term "United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund".

42. Mr. ANZE MATIENZO (Bolivia) said that for reasons of real substance he would be unable to vote for the Lebanese amendment. A vast movement of voluntary co-operation on behalf of children seemed to be taking shape in the world, and hence a formal recommendation reminding the governments of their duties was unnecessary.

43. His delegation was also unable, for the reasons stated during the general debate, to accept the substitution of the words "United Nations" for the word "Fund".

44. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) said he saw no reason to oppose the Lebanese amendment, but would not vote for the fifth paragraph if the United States amendment to it were adopted.

45. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States amendment (A/C.3/L.65).

*The amendment was rejected by 32 votes to 9, with 10 abstentions.*

46. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Lebanese amendment (A/C.3/L.63).

*The amendment was adopted by 40 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.*

47. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the fifth paragraph of the Australian draft resolution, as a whole, as amended.

*That paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

*Additional paragraph proposed by the Uruguayan delegation (A/C.3/L.57/Rev.2)*

48. Mr. VAZQUEZ (Uruguay) explained that his delegation's proposal (A/C.3/L.57/Rev.2) was not so much an amendment as an addition to the draft reso-

lation under consideration. Under that draft resolution the General Assembly would recognize the necessity for continued aid to children, approve the policy of the Fund in that respect, express its gratitude to governments and individuals for their contributions and appeal to the latter and to international organizations to continue to collaborate with the Fund.

49. The Uruguayan proposal went one step further and would ensure that, in the absence of a detailed financing plan, the Fund would have an immediate and regular source of income in the form of contributions by the various Member States. It should be noted that government aid was not contemplated as an obligation, since the General Assembly could do no more than recommend; but the insertion of the text proposed by Uruguay would nevertheless stress the moral obligation of all States Members of the United Nations to participate in the great humanitarian work of UNICEF.

50. Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Cuba) drew attention to the similarity between the additional paragraph proposed by Uruguay and the one proposed by Peru (A/C.3/L.62), and wondered whether the two delegations could not agree on a joint text.

51. Mr. MOODIE (Australia) disagreed; the Peruvian text in its entirety went further than the Uruguayan. Although his delegation sympathized with the motives prompting the Uruguayan proposal, it regretted that it could not accept it, because the General Assembly could not give directives or even make recommendations to governments on how they should frame their budgets.

52. The Australian delegation might support a general recommendation urging governments not to fail to contribute to the Fund even though such a recommendation was perhaps not essential, since the resolution as a whole gave sufficient evidence of interest in the activities of UNICEF.

53. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon), introducing his amendment (A/C.3/L.63) to the additional paragraph proposed by the Uruguayan delegation, said the Uruguayan proposal in its revised form was more acceptable than the previous text (A/C.3/L.57/Rev.1), because it recommended each Member State to make such budgetary provision for UNICEF as its means permitted.

54. He feared, however, that a qualification of that nature might be interpreted as applicable only to the financial difficulties which governments might encounter in the application of that provision. It was conceivable, however, that they would be faced with difficulties of another kind, administrative or constitutional; accordingly, his delegation felt bound to press for acceptance of its amendment, in which the initial reservation was supplemented by the words "if possible".

55. Mr. RODRIGUEZ ARIAS (Argentina) also supported the idea underlying the Uruguayan proposal. His delegation would, however, be compelled to abstain from voting because of the legal and financial implications of the proposal, unless it was amended as proposed by the representative of Lebanon.

56. Mr. ANZE MATIENZO (Bolivia) observed that the Uruguayan proposal was being so diluted by

reservations that it would finally be acceptable to all delegations. That was proof that basically the initial text had been faulty.

57. Mr. ROY (Haiti) supported the views of the Bolivian representative. He pointed out that the somewhat vague recommendation which was likely to be the final form of the amended Uruguayan proposal already existed in the fifth paragraph of the draft resolution.

58. Miss SUDIRDJO (Indonesia) stated that her delegation, while sympathetic to the Uruguayan proposal, would not be able to vote for it because her government was not currently in a position to commit itself to taking the budgetary measures referred to in the proposal.

59. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said that it was self-evident that governments would spare no effort to participate in international action for assistance to children. His government was firmly resolved to do so to the best of its ability. It therefore seemed unnecessary to state in the draft resolution what could be no more than a wish and might be misconstrued as an obligation.

60. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Lebanese amendment (A/C.3/L.63) to the additional paragraph proposed by the Uruguayan delegation.

*The amendment was adopted by 18 votes to none, with 34 abstentions.*

61. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the additional paragraph proposed by the Uruguayan delegation (E/C.3/L.57/Rev.2), as amended.

*The paragraph was rejected by 22 votes to 9, with 23 abstentions.*

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

62. Mr. CABADA (Peru) reminded the Committee that the Peruvian delegation had stated during the general debate on the Australian draft resolution that it found the Australian text acceptable but thought that it could be improved. The object of the additional paragraph which it was proposing was precisely to remedy an omission in that text.

63. The Australian draft resolution was essentially intended to be a compromise text; it was the object of the additional paragraph proposed by his delegation to complete that text by improving the essential co-ordination between the programmes of the United Nations and action by the individual governments in the field of child welfare, so that at the expiry of the proposed time limit, when the future of UNICEF would be reconsidered, the United Nations could without difficulty establish an organ to assist governments in meeting the permanent requirements of child welfare.

64. Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Cuba), emphasizing that budgetary matters were a question of national sovereignty, proposed that the recommendation embodied in the additional paragraph proposed by the Peruvian delegation should be qualified by the insertion of the words "if possible", to be inserted before the words "the necessary funds".

65. The representative of PERU having accepted that amendment, the CHAIRMAN stated that the addi-

tional paragraph proposed by him would be voted on as so amended.

66. Mr. OREN (Israel) proposed that the Committee should not take a decision on the additional paragraph proposed by the Peruvian delegation until it had settled the previous question, namely, whether a given time limit should be fixed, at the expiry of which the future of the Fund would be reconsidered.

67. Mr. MOODIE (Australia) said the second part of the additional paragraph proposed by the Peruvian delegation, from the words, "in order that, when the period of time indicated . . .", appeared to prejudge the decision which the Committee was called upon to take under sub-paragraph (b) of the operative part of the draft resolution under discussion. Furthermore, that paragraph was inconsistent with the spirit of the Australian draft resolution, under which UNICEF was to continue in its existing form for two years, whereupon the governments would reconsider the entire question in the light of experience. It therefore seemed inadvisable to ask governments to take immediate measures in anticipation of the establishment of a permanent organ to replace UNICEF in two years time.

68. The Australian delegation accepted the first part of the additional paragraph submitted by the Peruvian delegation and would not object to a separate vote on that part.

69. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece), Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) and Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada) also supported the proposal of the representative of Israel.

70. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, in that case, the debate on the additional paragraph proposed by the Peruvian delegation should be closed. The vote would be taken on it when the Committee had completed its debate on the Australian draft resolution.

*It was so decided.*

71. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

*The motion was adopted by 23 votes to 6, with 13 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.