

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 1693rd
MEETING

Thursday, 6 November 1969,
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Agenda item 48: | |
| Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (continued) | |
| Part III: Means and methods (continued) | |
| Paragraph 23 (concluded) | 231 |
| Proposed new paragraph after paragraph 23 | 235 |

Chairman: Mrs. Turkia OULD DADDAH
(Mauritania).

AGENDA ITEM 48

**Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development
(continued) (A/7235 and Add.1 and 2, A/7648, A/C.3/
L.1697, A/C.3/L.1698, A/C.3/L.1701, A/C.3/L.1706,
A/C.3/L.1707, A/C.3/L.1710, A/C.3/L.1712, A/C.3/
L.1714, A/C.3/L.1716, A/C.3/L.1720, A/C.3/L.1723,
A/C.3/L.1726, A/C.3/L.1729, A/C.3/L.1730 and Corr.1
and 2)**

PART III: MEANS AND METHODS (continued)

Paragraph 23 (concluded)

1. Mr. MOUSSA (United Arab Republic) said that the sponsors of the amendment to paragraph 23 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 had agreed to make in its text the change proposed by Czechoslovakia in document A/C.3/L.1701, consisting of the deletion of the word "effective". However, they had been unable to accept the suggestions made by the delegations of Dahomey and Jamaica, as they considered the former unnecessary and thought that the latter would involve not merely a drafting change, but also an alteration in the concepts which the draft sought to express.

2. With regard to the comments made at the preceding meeting by the delegation of Cyprus, he said that the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 fully endorsed the principles stated by Cyprus, especially as they stemmed directly from the standards laid down in the United Nations Charter. Moreover, those principles, such as that concerning respect for the sovereignty of States and that concerning non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, were incorporated in article 3 of part I of the draft Declaration, and consequently constituted the basis on which the means and methods set out in part III were to be put into effect in order to achieve the objectives of social progress and development stated in part II. Under the circumstances, although the sponsors of the amendment to

paragraph 23 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 had preferred not to change their amendment to that effect, they wished to point out that those principles and standards formed the context in which the amendment should be considered.

3. Mr. PECHACEK (Czechoslovakia) thanked the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 for having agreed to the change proposed by his delegation (A/C.3/L.1701), and said that he supported that amendment.

4. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) expressed his gratitude to the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 for having taken into account the comments he had made at the preceding meeting, and said that he was satisfied with the explanation that the principles he had mentioned served as a background to that amendment.

5. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to revise his delegation's amendment (A/C.3/L.1706) and to submit it as a sub-amendment to the text in document A/C.3/L.1723; the revised USSR amendment would read:

"The adoption of measures contributing to disarmament, including, *inter alia*, the complete prohibition of tests of nuclear weapons, the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons and the prevention of the pollution of oceans and inland waters by nuclear wastes."

6. Mrs. BLACK (United States of America) pointed out that the references to general and complete disarmament to be accompanied by effective international control, and said that the omission of that element in the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, as a result of the deletion of the word "effective", was unacceptable to her delegation.

7. Mr. JHA (India) said that the word "effective", as used in the documents on disarmament, did not refer to the process of disarmament itself, but rather to the relevant systems of inspection; hence the way in which it had been used in the original text of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 was perhaps not appropriate.

8. Although the present wording of that amendment was quite satisfactory, he considered that the Soviet Union sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1706) had the merit of mentioning specifically the harmful effects on the environment produced by nuclear tests which had not yet been thoroughly studied, and also the threat involved in the accidental discharge of cultures of bacteria in preparation for possible bacteriological (biological) warfare or of

chemical substances prepared for military purposes. Certainly, anything which constituted a threat to mankind had a place in the draft Declaration.

9. Mr. PACLINI (France), while approving of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, asked its sponsors to keep the word "effective" in their text, so that it could be put to a separate vote. However, he was opposed to the Soviet Union sub-amendment for reasons of form, of competence and of substance. The incorporation of that text in paragraph 23 would not only weaken the passage, but would introduce an inconsistency, since the first part contained a reference to general and complete disarmament and the second part spelled out certain prohibitions which did not apply to the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons.

10. Mrs. CABRERA (Mexico) and Mr. BARTTFELD (Argentina) expressed their support for the Soviet Union sub-amendment, as orally revised.

11. Mr. MUSAIBLI (Southern Yemen) considered that the Soviet Union sub-amendment completed and clarified the import of the text proposed for paragraph 23 in document A/C.3/L.1723.

12. Mrs. CADIEUX (Canada) said that she was in favour of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, though she considered that it should retain the word "effective", but she was opposed to the Soviet Union sub-amendment, which did not bring out the relation between disarmament and economic and social development, as the original text did, but dealt in detail with matters which were within the competence of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

13. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) considered that the concepts expressed in the Soviet Union sub-amendment were appropriate, but that the paragraph under consideration was not the proper place for its provisions and that, furthermore, its adoption might prejudice the negotiations on disarmament which were in progress in other United Nations bodies. While the original amendment simply stressed the need for the resources released by disarmament to be used for social development, the Soviet Union sub-amendment sought to introduce into the draft Declaration matters which were at present being debated in the First Committee and in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Lastly, he explained that the word "effective" in the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 had been deleted for similar reasons, since that word could be understood as a reference to one of the elements being discussed in those negotiations.

14. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) considered that, while it was appropriate that the draft Declaration should seek to promote disarmament and the use of the resources released by disarmament for economic and social progress, a detailed list of the means by which disarmament was to be achieved was out of place in that document. His delegation therefore had no objection to the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, but was opposed to the Soviet Union sub-amendment, which dealt with a matter which was not within the province of the Third Committee but that of the First Committee and the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

15. Mr. GHAOUCY (Afghanistan) said that he favoured both the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 and the sub-amendment submitted by the Soviet Union. He recalled that the idea of the resources released by general and complete disarmament being devoted to social development had been put forward in the United Nations on previous occasions.

16. Mrs. KUME (Japan) said that Japan, as the first victim of atomic bombing, was a resolute supporter of the prohibition of any use or testing of nuclear weapons. However, she thought that since the relationship between the disarmament question and social development was very indirect and uncertain, the detailed references to disarmament contained in the Soviet Union's sub-amendment would be out of place in an instrument like the one under discussion.

17. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) said that the Soviet Union sub-amendment, which sought to specify what constituted disarmament, would weaken the aim of the formulation of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, namely to ensure that the resources released by disarmament were used for economic and social progress. He appealed to the delegation of the Soviet Union not to insist on its proposal in view of the difficulties and complications it raised.

18. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation's sub-amendment was directly connected with the provisions of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, since it specified the practical steps that would have to be taken to achieve general and complete disarmament and thus release resources for economic and social progress. Furthermore, the proposed addition referred to important humanitarian considerations such as the prohibition of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, and prevention of the pollution of oceans. Those references were fully appropriate in an instrument for promoting the well-being of humanity.

19. In conclusion, he said he was surprised by the objections expressed regarding his proposal, since most of the countries represented on the Committee had acceded to the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, signed at Moscow on 5 August 1963,¹ and since the provisions of the sub-amendment clearly met the interests of all nations.

20. Mr. ZEILEISSEN (Austria) said he thought that for reasons of form the addition proposed in the Soviet Union's sub-amendment should precede the text of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, so that there would be a logical progression from the steps to be adopted for disarmament to the use to be made of the resources released by it.

21. Mr. HJELDE (Norway) said that although the sub-amendment stated long-term goals which no one could oppose, it contained provisions which were not within the purview of the Third Committee and which, if approved, could constitute undue interference in the work of other United Nations organs.

22. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) said that the object of the paragraph under consideration was not to specify means for

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964.

achieving disarmament, as the Soviet Union's sub-amendment would have it do, but to emphasize the need for disarmament and the resources released by it to be used for economic and social progress. The practical measures to be taken to achieve general and complete disarmament were at present under consideration in other United Nations organs and the major Powers had not yet reached an agreement on the subject. It would therefore be entirely inappropriate to refer to them in the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development.

23. Mrs. KVASHNINA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said she failed to understand why it would be inappropriate, in a passage dealing with general and complete disarmament, to specify practical measures contributing to it. The text of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, if modified as proposed in the Soviet Union's sub-amendment, would not be inconsistent and would form a logical progression by first laying down the objective of general and complete disarmament, with its beneficial consequences for economic and social development, and then specifying methods for achieving that objective. Obviously, the resources at present invested in the manufacture of weapons could not be devoted to social development unless measures were first adopted for terminating their production for warlike ends.

24. Mrs. DAES (Greece) said that she supported the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 in its original form but she could not accept it if it was modified as proposed in the Soviet Union's sub-amendment, which contained elements outside the purview of the Third Committee. Moreover, although she shared the ideals underlying the sub-amendment, she considered that the expression "*inter alia*" allowed a margin for the adoption of measures of any kind. Such imprecision was unacceptable.

25. Mr. BABAA (Libya), supported by Miss MUTER (Indonesia), moved the closure of the debate.

26. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) and Mr. TEKLE (Ethiopia) opposed the motion.

The motion to close the debate was adopted by 45 votes to 10, with 33 abstentions.

27. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Soviet Union sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1706), as orally revised (see para. 5 above), to the amendment to paragraph 23 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723.

At the request of the Mexican representative, the vote was taken by roll-call.

South Africa, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Southern Yemen, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jordan, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Peru, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone.

Against: Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America,

Uruguay, Zambia, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Ceylon, Dahomey, France, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Philippines.

Abstaining: Spain, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Venezuela, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore.

The sub-amendment was adopted by 27 votes to 17, with 54 abstentions.

28. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the amendment to paragraph 23 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, as orally revised (see para. 1 above) and as amended.

The text of paragraph 23 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723, as orally revised and as amended, was adopted by 65 votes to 1, with 30 abstentions.

29. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) said that he had voted against the Soviet Union sub-amendment because, although he favoured general and complete disarmament, he did not think it should be dealt with in a draft declaration on social progress and development. He had therefore abstained from voting on the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, as orally revised and as amended.

30. Mrs. CADIEUX (Canada) said that she had voted against the Soviet Union sub-amendment because she considered the text it proposed unsuitable for inclusion in the draft Declaration, and not because of opposition to its contents, since Canada was a signatory to the Moscow Treaty, which banned nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII)). She had therefore abstained from voting on the amendment.

31. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that she had voted against the Soviet Union sub-amendment because it dealt with means and methods of disarmament that were outside the Committee's competence. Consequently, she had abstained on the amendment.

32. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) explained that he had abstained on the sub-amendment and on the amendment; he considered that the text had been weakened by the introduction of elements irrelevant to the original objective.

33. Mr. DIOGO (Dahomey) said that he had opposed the sub-amendment because the action it called for was the responsibility of other United Nations bodies and also because the list was not exhaustive. He had accordingly abstained on the amendment.

34. Mr. BARTTFELD (Argentina) said that although he was in favour of the modifications introduced by the

representative of the Soviet Union, he had abstained in the vote because the text did not make it clear whether nuclear tests for peaceful purposes were included.

35. Miss DOBSON (Australia) said that she had voted against the sub-amendment because she considered that the Committee was not the body which was competent to deal with the matters to which it related. She had consequently abstained on the amendment.

36. Mr. ZEILEISSEN (Austria) said that he had abstained on the sub-amendment and on the amendment, the final text of which he had not found satisfactory.

37. Mr. IDDIR (Algeria) said that he had abstained on the sub-amendment because the measures it listed were not exhaustive, whereas his delegation was in favour of general and complete disarmament.

38. Mrs. DE BROMLEY (Honduras) said that she had abstained on the sub-amendment not because she was opposed to its content but because she deemed it inappropriate to include it in the draft Declaration.

39. Mrs. KUME (Japan) explained that she had voted against the sub-amendment not because she had any objections of substance but because she considered that it would be unsuitable to include it in the draft Declaration. Consequently, she had abstained on the amendment.

40. Mr. PARDOS (Spain) said that his reason for abstaining on the sub-amendment was not that he was opposed to it in substance, for his country had signed the Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, but that he thought it did not fall within the Committee's competence.

41. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that he had voted against the sub-amendment and had abstained on the amendment. The final text of the latter had been weakened by the deletion of the word "effective" and it was contradictory in that it did not prohibit the manufacture and stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

42. Mr. TEKLE (Ethiopia) said that he had abstained on both the sub-amendment and on the amendment, since he considered that the Committee should concern itself only with the financial consequences of disarmament.

43. Mrs. NØRTHEN (Denmark) said that she had abstained on the sub-amendment because she considered it inappropriate to include a detailed reference to the technical aspects of disarmament in the draft Declaration; she had, however, voted in favour of the amendment because she felt it extremely important to use the resources released by disarmament for economic and social progress for all countries, particularly the developing ones.

44. Mrs. BLACK (United States of America) said that she had not been opposed to the sub-amendment in substance, for her delegation had long been in favour of general disarmament under effective international control; however, she had voted against it in the conviction that the matter it dealt with was not within the Committee's competence.

45. Mr. HEYMAN (Sweden) said that he had abstained on the sub-amendment and had voted in favour of the amendment for the same reasons as those set forth by the representative of Denmark.

46. Mr. LEW (China) said that he had abstained on the sub-amendment because, in his view, it dealt with a matter outside the Committee's competence. He had also abstained on the amendment, which did not emphasize with sufficient clarity the aim of the formulation, namely to ensure that economic and social benefits would be derived from resources released by disarmament.

47. Mrs. RAOELINA (Madagascar) said that she had abstained on the sub-amendment because she considered that since it dealt with matters outside the Committee's competence it would not be appropriate to include it in the draft Declaration. She had, however, voted in favour of the amendment, although she felt that it would have been preferable to retain the word "effective".

48. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) said that he had voted in favour of the sub-amendment and the amendment because his country, having signed the Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, was in favour of general and complete disarmament.

49. Mr. TORRES (Philippines) explained that he had voted against the sub-amendment not because he was against it in substance but because it dealt with measures to promote disarmament rather than social progress and development.

50. Mrs. FRANCK (Central African Republic) felt that the concern reflected in the sub-amendment had been duly covered by the original text of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723. She had had to abstain on the latter because the sub-amendment, which went beyond the limits of the sphere of social development, had been included in it.

51. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said that he had voted in favour of the sub-amendment on the understanding that it did not list all the means and methods that could lead to general and complete disarmament.

52. Mrs. CABRERA (Mexico) explained that she had voted in favour of the Soviet Union sub-amendment and of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 because both texts were in keeping with the spirit of the Treaty of Tlatelolco² and reflected her Government's views on both disarmament and denuclearization.

53. Mr. LEMAITRE (Colombia), who had not been present during the voting, said that he would have abstained on the sub-amendment because it dealt with a matter outside the Committee's competence.

54. Mr. GIANOLA (Uruguay) stated that his country was in favour of effective general and complete disarmament

² Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, signed at Tlatelolco, Mexico, on 14 February 1967 (see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes*, agenda item 91, document A/C.1/946).

and the use of the resources so released for economic and social progress; however, he had voted against the sub-amendment because the question was outside the competence of the Committee, which did not have the specialized knowledge, background or facts necessary to take a decision on the matter.

55. Mrs. BEGMATOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that the question of general and complete disarmament was of interest to all the peoples of the world and that it was not necessary to be an expert to assert that disarmament was essential if people were to live in peace. That was why it was relevant to raise the matter in the Committee, particularly in relation to the means and methods of achieving economic and social progress. She had, of course, voted in favour of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 as orally revised and as amended, since the Soviet Government and people took the greatest interest in bringing about peace in the world.

Proposed new paragraph after paragraph 23

56. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon), speaking on behalf of his own country and Turkey, submitted the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1714, calling for the inclusion of a new paragraph in part III of the draft Declaration. That new paragraph was a logical corollary of part I, article 9, which dealt with the use, for peaceful purposes and in the interests of all mankind, of areas of the environment such as outer space and the sea-bed and ocean floor and which the Committee had approved by an overwhelming majority at the twenty-third session. The new paragraph was based on the incontrovertible fact, recognized as a reality of the present-day world, that social progress was inextricably linked to economic development. None of the objectives listed in part II of the draft Declaration could be achieved if the stagnant economies of developing countries remained at their present low level. The results of the first United Nations Development Decade had not been entirely satisfactory, and the mobilization of available resources was therefore an urgent necessity for countries that did not want their economies to continue to stagnate. However, there was a very wide disparity between countries in the matter of natural resources and it could not be overcome at the present time. There were, however, certain areas of the environment which thus far belonged to no State in particular: outer space and the sea-bed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. It was to those areas that the amendment submitted by his country and Turkey related.

57. There were, of course, international agreements covering certain aspects of the use of outer space, such as the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies (General Assembly resolution 2222 (XXI)), and the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space (General Assembly resolution 2345 (XXII)), which were already in force, as well as an international agreement on liability for damage caused by objects launched into outer space, which, it was

hoped, would be completed in the near future. In addition, a number of United Nations bodies were studying the establishment of suitable international rules for the orderly exploration, conservation, use and exploitation of the sea-bed and ocean floor. The sponsors of the amendment did not, therefore, ask for a detailed discussion of those matters in the Committee but merely wanted the draft Declaration to enunciate the principle—which the international community had already accepted—that the areas mentioned should be used for the benefit of all mankind. The implementation of that principle would release tremendous resources for economic and social progress and development and would supplement the national resources already available. Lastly, since the most urgent need at present was to narrow the gap between the rich and poor countries of the world, the amendment urged that special consideration be given to the interests and needs of the developing countries. He hoped that the Committee would unanimously approve the new paragraph.

58. Mr. OZER (Turkey) fully endorsed the statement of the Ceylonese representative. At the forty-fourth session of the Economic and Social Council his own delegation had recommended including in part III of the draft Declaration a paragraph providing that a reasonable part of the benefits of the peaceful exploration of the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction should be devoted to social development. At the twenty-third session of the General Assembly the Committee, on the initiative of Ceylon, had approved the inclusion of that principle in part I.

59. His delegation and that of Ceylon had therefore considered it appropriate to propose that the Committee should include that idea in part III as one more means whereby all mankind could take advantage of new opportunities to accelerate progress and social development.

60. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan), while supporting the proposed new paragraph, said that he had certain reservations about its wording and wished to consult with the sponsors about it.

61. Mrs. BLACK (United States of America) expressed the view that making claims or taking decisions with regard to outer space or the sea-bed and the ocean floor was a matter not for the Committee but for the competent organs of the United Nations. She suggested that the meeting should be adjourned in order to provide an opportunity for consultations.

62. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) said that the purpose of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1714 was precisely to prevent anyone from making such claims. As the President of the United States had said in 1966, under no circumstances could the prospect of abundant harvests and mineral wealth be allowed to give rise to a new form of colonial competition between maritime States and it must be guaranteed that the sea-bed and the ocean floor should continue to be the heritage of all mankind.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.