

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1588th
MEETING**

Tuesday, 29 October 1968,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 50:</i>	
<i>Draft Declaration on Social Development</i> <i>(continued)</i>	
<i>Preamble (concluded).....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Organization of work.....</i>	<i>2</i>

Chairman: Mr. Erik NETTEL (Austria).

AGENDA ITEM 50

Draft Declaration on Social Development (*continued*)
(A/7161, A/7203, chap. X, sect. A; A/7235 and
Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.1582/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1584,
A/C.3/L.1586, A/C.3/L.1587, A/C.3/L.1590, A/
C.3/L.1593)

PREAMBLE (concluded)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the consolidated text of the preambular paragraphs adopted at the previous meetings (A/C.3/L.1593) and invited the Committee to consider the order in which those paragraphs were to be arranged.

2. Mr. ARTAZA (Chile), supported by Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica), Mr. UY (Philippines), Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) and Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic), stressed that the fifth paragraph should remain in its present place because it was a logical consequence of the general ideas laid down in the first four paragraphs.

It was so agreed.

3. The CHAIRMAN recalled that Cyprus, India and the United Kingdom had proposed orally that the sixth paragraph should be inserted between the fourteenth and fifteenth paragraphs.

4. Mr. HERNDL (Austria), Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic), Mr. PAOLINI (France) and Miss FERRINGA (Netherlands) supported that proposal, since the sixth paragraph was general in nature and could be considered a summary of the ideas set forth elsewhere in the preamble.

The proposal was adopted by 93 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

5. Mr. UY (Philippines), supported by Dame Mabel MILLER (Australia), proposed that the thirteenth, tenth and eleventh paragraphs should become the sixth, seventh and eighth paragraphs, since they all dealt with the promotion of social development through joint action by States.

The proposal was rejected, 20 votes being cast in favour and 20 against, with 47 abstentions.

6. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) proposed that the seventh and eighth paragraphs, which concerned international peace and security and peaceful coexistence and friendly relations among States and therefore logically followed the fifth paragraph, should become the sixth and seventh paragraphs.

7. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) said that, because of the changes which had been made in the original text of the preamble (A/7161, annex I), the second amendment in document A/C.3/L.1582/Rev.1 should read: "Insert the present thirteenth paragraph after the fifth paragraph to become the sixth paragraph of the preamble".

8. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco), supported by Mr. HERNDL (Austria), Miss FERRINGA (Netherlands), Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) and Mrs. RADIC (Yugoslavia), proposed that the seventh paragraph, which was closely related to the fifth paragraph, should follow it. That paragraph might then be followed in turn by the eighth and thirteenth paragraphs.

9. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of amendment A/C.3/L.1582/Rev.1, agreed to that proposal.

The proposal was adopted by 86 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

10. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) said that, since the fourteenth paragraph dealt with obstacles to social progress and was therefore closely linked to the thirteenth paragraph, which had now become the eighth, it should logically be inserted after it as the new ninth paragraph and should be followed by the original ninth and tenth paragraphs, which dealt with those obstacles in detail. He would not, however, press the point.

11. Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru), supported by Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon), Mr. ARTAZA (Chile), Mr. ABSHIR (Somalia), Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) and Mr. PAOLINI (France), proposed that the tenth and eleventh paragraphs should become the ninth and tenth paragraphs of the preamble.

The proposal was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

12. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt the preamble as a whole, as amended, the paragraphs being arranged in the following sequence in relation to document A/C.3/L.1593: first, second, third, fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth, thirteenth, tenth, eleventh, ninth, twelfth, fourteenth, sixth and fifteenth.

The preamble as a whole, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

13. Miss LOPES (Portugal), speaking in explanation of her votes, said that, although her delegation agreed with the objectives of the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development, it had been obliged to abstain on the third preambular paragraph because it contained a reference to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the provisions of which her country had never accepted. Her delegation had none the less voted in favour of the preamble as a whole, but with strong reservations with regard to the Declaration to which she had referred.

14. Dame Mabel MILLER (Australia) said that her delegation had abstained on the thirteenth preambular paragraph, which appeared as the fourteenth in document A/C.3/L.1593, because it was clearly ridiculous to assert that it was the primary duty of the International Telecommunication Union or of the Universal Postal Union, or even of the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, to eliminate the evils enumerated. Her delegation would have been prepared to accept the Netherlands-New Zealand amendment (A/C.3/L.1583, para. 3), which met that point, but it had been withdrawn before the vote.

15. With regard to the use of the word "colonialism" in the paragraph in question, Australia could not accept the suggestion that colonialism, in so far as it might be deemed by some to refer to the Australian administration of the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Papua, was an evil or that it impeded the process of social development in the Territory of Papua and New Guinea. The Australian Administration of Papua and New Guinea was in fact making every effort to promote rapid social progress in the Territory as part of its over-all development policies and those efforts had brought about a substantial improvement in the social conditions of the indigenous inhabitants.

16. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the preamble, but that vote was not to be taken as prejudicing the position of the French Government with regard to the different resolutions, Declarations and Conventions listed in the third and fourth preambular paragraphs.

17. Mr. CAÑADAS (Spain) said that his delegation attached particular importance to the thirteenth preambular paragraph and took exception to the implication in the United Kingdom representative's statement at the preceding meeting that colonialism assisted social development in colonies still governed by the United Kingdom. Gibraltar was one of those colonies, and he could not agree that the United Kingdom presence in that part of Spanish territory was any aid to social development. It was clear from official and other publications that local children were severely handicapped by the fact that all instruction in the schools was given in English, and that the whole cultural development and intellectual climate of Gibraltar were adversely affected by an enforced bilingualism. It was also apparent that the resources devoted to the education of local children were

woefully inadequate. Spaniards working but not residing in Gibraltar were the most underprivileged social group, denied all the social benefits available to British workers living in Gibraltar and discriminated against in the field of labour relations. It was a matter of great regret to his delegation that some delegations had seen fit to express reservations on that paragraph.

18. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) reserved her delegation's right of reply to the statement made by the representative of Spain.

19. Miss HART (New Zealand) said that at the 1574th meeting the representative of the ILO had raised the question of the relationship between the Declaration and the constitutions, conventions, recommendations and resolutions of the ILO and other organizations referred to in the fourth preambular paragraph. It was her delegation's understanding that none of the provisions in the Declaration could be regarded as adversely affecting the more detailed provisions contained in such instruments.

20. Mrs. STEVENSON (Liberia) welcomed the adoption of the preamble, and said that the text represented an improvement on the original draft (A/7161, annex I). She hoped that it would prove possible for the Committee to continue its work on the item and to adopt the draft Declaration at the current session. Such an achievement would be a fitting tribute to the International Year for Human Rights.

21. Mr. VASS (Hungary) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the preamble but regretted the fact that the tenth paragraph of the final version referred only to Member States and not to the whole international community, since Hungary attached great importance to the principle of universality.

22. Mr. KAZUHARA (Japan) said that his delegation had voted against the Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.1577/Rev.1) which now constituted the sixth preambular paragraph, not because it had any objection to the substance of it, but because it considered that the question was already adequately covered by the fifth preambular paragraph. He was still of the opinion that, in an effort to improve the text, the Committee should delete redundant formulations wherever possible. His delegation had also voted against the three-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.1588) to the first Netherlands-New Zealand amendment in document A/C.3/L.1583 and had abstained from voting on the sixth preambular paragraph of the original text (A/7161, annex I), as amended, because it considered that it was better to avoid terms that were politically contentious. The Sixth Committee had decided, after a much longer debate than had taken place during the present discussion, not to use the term "peaceful coexistence" in connexion with the items relating to the consideration of principles of international law, and he regretted that the Third Committee should be the only Main Committee of the General Assembly to accept the inclusion of that term in a resolution.

Organization of work

23. The CHAIRMAN noted that, although the Committee had originally allocated ten meetings to the consideration of the draft Declaration on Social Develop-

ment, it had already spent fifteen meetings on the general debate and on the discussion of the preamble. The Committee must now decide either to take up another agenda item or to continue its consideration of the draft Declaration; the latter course would be contrary to its earlier decision and might make it impossible to consider other important items.

24. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) said that, while his delegation was anxious to complete the work on the draft Declaration at the current session, he doubted whether there would be enough time to do so. He therefore suggested that the Committee should deal with part I, relating to principles, at the current session and defer its consideration of parts II and III until 1969.

25. Mr. ARTAZA (Chile) agreed with that suggestion. He proposed that 8 November should be fixed as the closing date for the debate on the draft Declaration at the current session. The Committee should be able in that time to conclude its consideration of the principles and, perhaps, to proceed further. If the Committee accelerated its work and limited the length of statements and the number of delegations speaking in support of any amendment, it might even be able to adopt the draft Declaration as a whole. In any case, it should make enough progress to ensure that the Declaration could be adopted at the following session, as it was most important that it should be ready for use as part of the global strategy for the second United Nations Development Decade.

26. Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru) and Mr. UY (Philippines) supported the Chilean proposal.

27. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) observed that the Committee's original target had been unrealistic; past experience should have shown that more than ten meetings would be needed to adopt a declaration. On the other hand, the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development was an extremely important document and should be given the detailed consideration it deserved. He thought that as many meetings as were necessary should be devoted to the consideration of the draft Declaration, with a view to its adoption at the current session. However, there were other urgent matters on the Committee's agenda, which should also be considered at the current session. For example, the alarming increase in the illicit drug traffic noted in the latest report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs,^{1/} which was a serious problem not only for his country but for a whole group of surrounding countries, should be considered by the Third Committee during the resumed forty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council. Other important items which should be considered at the current session included the International Year for Human Rights. He therefore proposed that the Committee should continue its consideration of the draft Declaration, on the clear understanding that it would suspend its deliberations in favour of other urgent items as necessary.

28. Mr. KALANGALI (Uganda) said that he was strongly opposed to postponing consideration of the

^{1/} Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 2.

draft Declaration until the following session; many of the ideas advanced during the general debate and in the discussion on the preamble were relevant to the substantive articles of the text and were still fresh in the mind, but they would have to be repeated if consideration of those articles was postponed for a year.

29. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that his delegation was also in favour of adopting the draft Declaration at the current session, but it should be borne in mind that the General Assembly had decided to accord high priority to the item on the world social situation and that much of the information contained in the report on that subject would be out of date if its consideration was deferred until the following year. He agreed with the representative of Iran that the Committee should not adopt a hard and fast decision; items should be considered in order of priority and, if necessary, the Committee could interrupt its consideration of the draft Declaration to deal with other items. He added that in the view of his delegation, members of the Committee would be doing more to expedite the proceedings if they merely submitted amendments to the original text of the draft Declaration, instead of drawing up new paragraphs.

30. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic), supported by Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) and Mr. LE DIRAISON (France), proposed that the Committee should continue its consideration of the draft Declaration and try to complete part I by 8 November, without, however, fixing a rigid deadline. It could then decide, in the light of the progress it had made, whether or not to consider the rest of the draft Declaration.

31. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the representative of Uganda that the Committee could and should adopt the draft Declaration at the current session. He also agreed with those delegations which thought that the Committee should adopt a flexible approach to its work; while continuing its consideration of the draft Declaration, it could temporarily suspend its deliberations in cases of extreme urgency. He did not think that a deadline should be fixed, or that any restriction should be placed on the number of meetings allocated to the item.

32. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that, although her delegation was fully committed to the draft Declaration, it felt most strongly that other important items on the agenda, and particularly non-recurrent items like the International Year for Human Rights, should not be considered in a cursory fashion.

33. The CHAIRMAN noted that there appeared to be a consensus in favour of continuing to consider the draft Declaration. He therefore suggested that the Committee should continue its work on the item and review its progress on or about 8 November. He further suggested that the deadline for the submission of amendments to part I of the draft Declaration should be fixed at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, 30 October.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.