

they were living. Yet for the most part these were articulate and thoughtful young people. On a positive note we were struck by the fact that those who appeared to be most successful at managing the transition from uneasy adolescence to responsible adulthood all told us that they had been given opportunities very young to have some say in what went on in their lives.

During IYC the Canadian Commission uncovered many problems related to Canada's children. So did the national commissions of most other countries. The 1959 UN Declaration on the Rights of the Child, a noble document that had organized the themes for IYC, was clearly not the right tool for redressing the problems that had been brought to our attention – problems we were learning at last to recognize as abuses of children's human rights and not just failures to meet children's needs. So, in 1980, a UN working group was established to transform the Declaration into something with teeth, a legal document, an international covenant. This process, which included not only country representatives but also non-governmental organizations, produced a draft Convention on the Rights of the Child which came before the UN General Assembly in 1989. Canada was active in all parts of this process from negotiating the text to co-sponsoring the Resolution in the General Assembly. On November 20, exactly 30 years after adopting the Declaration on the Rights of the Child, the UN unanimously adopted the new Children's Convention.

Following IYC I spent three years in the Soviet Union. Not surprisingly, my experience there deepened my understanding of the foreign policy implications of human rights abuses appreciably. But as I began studying the situation of Soviet children, my understanding of the interrelatedness of all human rights also deepened. During the Cold War there was constant tension between those who gave primacy to civil and political rights, which were understood as individual rights, and those who favoured economic, social, and cultural rights, which were understood as collective rights. The former set dominated the human rights discourse of one superpower, the latter the rhetoric of the other. In those days it was almost impossible to integrate the two sets in any discussion without being called "soft on communism" by one side or "an enemy of the people" by the other. Yet the voices of the wistful young people of Canada, the impoverished children of India and the disillu-