



CONTENTS

Agenda item 48:

Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development
(continued)

Part II: Objectives (continued)

Proposed new paragraphs after paragraph 7 (concluded)	141
Paragraph 8	142
Paragraph 9	143
Paragraph 10	144

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.1670, A/C.3/L.1671, A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1, A/C.3/
L.1679, A/C.3/L.1681-1683, A/C.3/L.1686, A/C.3/
L.1688, A/C.3/L.1689/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1690, A/C.3/
L.1691)

PART II: OBJECTIVES (continued)

Proposed new paragraphs after paragraph 7 (concluded)

1. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) proposed that in the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1688) the words "and domestic", which had been introduced as a result of the Zambian sub-amendment, should be deleted and that the words "detrimental to the national interest", which had been inserted as a result of the Ecuadorian sub-amendment, should be replaced by the words "endangering the national interest". In addition, in order to improve the style of the English version, the word "exploitations" should be put into the singular, the words "including, in particular" should be replaced by "particularly", the words "in order to enable" should be replaced by "enabling", and the phrase "the people of every country" should be used instead of "the peoples of all countries".

2. Mr. AL-JABIRI (Iraq) accepted the oral sub-amendments of the representative of Cyprus.

3. Mr. GIANOLA (Uruguay) said that he would vote for the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1688), as revised, but felt that the point made in the first part of the sentence had already been adequately expounded in part I of the draft Declaration.¹ The reference to international monopolies

constituted a means rather than an objective and should therefore appear in part III of the draft Declaration (see A/7648, annex II). Lastly, he considered the words "of all countries" qualifying the noun "peoples" to be redundant.

4. Mr. NG'OMA (Zambia) withdrew his sub-amendment to the Iraqi amendment.

5. Mr. NAMON (Ghana) said he believed that in the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1688), as revised, "detrimental to the national interest" would be better terminology than "endangering the national interest".

6. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan) proposed that the words "endangering the national interest"—or better, perhaps "detrimental to the national interest", as suggested by the representative of Ghana—should be placed after the words "foreign economic exploitation" in the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1688).

7. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) and Mrs. EL-TELLAWY (United Arab Republic) supported the Sudanese representative's oral proposal.

8. Mr. BGOYA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, in his view, the oral sub-amendments that had been submitted to the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1688) ran counter to the original purpose of that amendment, namely, to put an end to the economic exploitation practised by international monopolies, which sometimes went so far as to dictate the policies of States. It was nonsense to refer to economic exploitation "endangering" the national interest, since, by definition, any economic exploitation infringed national interests. He found it extremely difficult to support the amendment in its revised form and he would request a separate vote on the words "endangering the national interest".

9. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that he agreed entirely with the Tanzanian representative.

10. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan) said that the purpose of his sub-amendment was to make it clear that the foreign economic exploitation referred to in the Iraqi amendment must be such as to endanger the national interest, since it had been stated in the Committee that foreign aid could sometimes be beneficial to a country. It was obvious that the activities of international monopolies were always detrimental to the interests of the State, and he had proposed a change in the Cypriot sub-amendment accordingly.

11. Mr. BARRY (Guinea) said that in his view any form of exploitation invariably infringed national interests, so that there was no need to spell out that point.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Annexes*, agenda item 50, document A/7374, para. 133.

12. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) requested the representative of Iraq not to incorporate in his amendment, as he had previously agreed to do, the Cypriot delegation's sub-amendment inserting the words "endangering the national interest" after the words "international monopolies".

13. Miss ARGUELLO (Nicaragua) proposed that the words "and private" should be inserted after the word "international" in the Iraqi amendment.

14. Mr. AL-JABIRI (Iraq) agreed to the request made by the representative of Cyprus, but said that he found the Nicaraguan sub-amendment unacceptable. He added that, in the final English version of his amendment, the words "in order to enable", which on the proposal of the Cypriot delegation had previously been replaced by "enabling", would be retained.

15. Mrs. CABRERA (Mexico) recalled that she had submitted an oral sub-amendment to the Iraqi amendment calling for the deletion of the words "particularly that practised by international monopolies", and said that she would vote against the Nicaraguan oral sub-amendment.

16. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Nicaraguan oral sub-amendment calling for the insertion of the words "and private" after the word "international" in the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1688.

The Nicaraguan oral sub-amendment was rejected by 56 votes to 1, with 45 abstentions.

17. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Mexican oral sub-amendment to the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1688).

The Mexican oral sub-amendment was rejected by 56 votes to 4, with 36 abstentions.

18. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the new paragraph contained in the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1688), as orally revised (see paras. 2 and 14 above).

The Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1688), as orally revised, was adopted by 77 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

Paragraph 8

19. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) withdrew, on behalf of the sponsors, the amendment to paragraph 8 appearing in document A/C.3/L.1689/Rev.1, paragraph 13, since the wording of it was almost the same as that contained in document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 (first paragraph of article 11).

20. Mrs. STEVENSON (Liberia) supported the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 (first paragraph of article 11), which was sufficiently broad and covered more or less all the points which her delegation wished to be included in the draft Declaration.

21. Mr. GIANOLA (Uruguay) said, with regard to amendment A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 (first paragraph of article 11), that he considered the expression "protection of the rights" inappropriate; the sponsors of the amendment were proceeding on the assumption that the rights in question

existed, and if that was so there was no need to call for their protection, since they were already safeguarded by the legal order which presupposed their existence. He therefore proposed the following wording: "Special protection for children, the aged and the disabled and for the socially disadvantaged sectors of the population".

22. Miss ARGUELLO (Nicaragua) withdrew her amendment to paragraph 8 contained in document A/C.3/L.1690 in favour of the Uruguayan oral sub-amendment.

23. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) observed that paragraph 8 of part II repeated ideas which were expressed in other paragraphs of the draft Declaration. For instance, reference was also made to the aged and the disabled, in connexion with social security schemes, in the new text of paragraph 7 adopted by the Committee, and youth was mentioned again in the original paragraph 10 of part II, in connexion with education. Where amendment A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 (first paragraph of article 11) was concerned, he did not see how the population could be divided into socially advantaged and disadvantaged sectors; in any event, for reasons of brevity, he would prefer the sponsors to withdraw the amendment.

24. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that he appreciated the concern expressed by the representative of Uruguay, but stressed the idea of protecting the rights of children, as there were some countries in which those rights were systematically violated. The idea of assuring the welfare of children, which he considered to be of prime importance, should also be incorporated in the draft Declaration. He therefore appealed to the representative of Uruguay to withdraw his oral sub-amendment. In deference to the comments made by the Ukrainian representative, the sponsors had decided to replace the words "socially disadvantaged sectors of the population", in the first paragraph of article 11 in amendment A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1, by the words "physically or mentally disadvantaged".

25. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the effect of that change would merely be to reiterate an idea embodied in paragraph 9 of part III (Means and methods), which referred to the rehabilitation of mentally or physically disabled persons. However, if the sponsors pressed their amendment, he would have no major difficulty in supporting it.

26. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) asked what difference there was between "disabled" and "physically or mentally disadvantaged"; moreover, she considered that, if the word "socially" was discarded, other persons who were disadvantaged in a social sense, such as delinquents, would be excluded.

27. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) replied that the words "mentally or physically disadvantaged" were meant to cover a specific sector of the population; a reference to delinquency had been included in the last paragraph of article 11 in document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1.

28. Mr. GIANOLA (Uruguay) withdrew his sub-amendment.

29. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment to paragraph 8 contained in document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1

(first paragraph of article 11), as orally revised (see para. 24 above).

The amendment to paragraph 8 contained in document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 (first paragraph of article 11), as orally revised, was adopted by 90 votes to none.

Paragraph 9

30. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that, where paragraph 9 was concerned the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 (second paragraph of article 11) should not be regarded as an amendment proper, because it involved only the regrouping of that paragraph with others into one article in part II of the draft Declaration, relating to objectives, and did not introduce any substantive or drafting changes.

31. Mr. NAMON (Ghana) withdrew his amendment to paragraph 9 (A/C.3/L.1681, para. 3), as he considered that the ideas underlying it had been suitably reflected in paragraph 7, which had already been adopted.

32. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) introduced the amendment (A/C.3/L.1670) to paragraph 9 proposed by her delegation and the delegations of Poland and the Soviet Union, and said the sponsors had agreed to delete the word “unmarried” before the words “mothers whose earnings” because of the difficulties which some delegations had with the expression “unmarried mothers”. The establishment of the fullest equality between women and men in all fields of activity would help to accelerate social progress by enabling the female sector of the population to participate fully in the efforts to promote general advancement. To that end, it would be necessary to adopt special measures, including the granting of leave and allowances and the development of children’s pre-school establishments so that a woman could perform her duties as a mother bringing up her family without neglecting her social work. Since the amendment of which her delegation was a co-sponsor embodied principles which had already been enunciated in the Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women and in the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, she was sure that it would receive wide support in the Committee.

33. Mrs. KUME (Japan) said she was pleased that the word “unmarried” had been deleted from the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1670. It was wrong to draw such a distinction, because there were also married mothers who were the sole support of their families and deserved the same protection as unmarried mothers. She considered that the second part of the proposed text would be better placed in part III, relating to means and methods.

34. Mr. DIOGO (Dahomey) felt that the second part of the amendment introduced by Mongolia (A/C.3/L.1670), in which very important measures were proposed, did not constitute an objective of social development but, rather, outlined means or methods of achieving such development, so that it should be included in part III of the draft Declaration. It was obvious that the granting of allowances to large families, for example, was not a goal, but a method of implementing a population policy.

35. He suggested that in the French version a better wording should be found for the phrase “*assurer l’éducation et la santé des enfants*”, which he considered rather weak.

36. Mrs. RAATIKAINEN (Finland) said that the amendment submitted by Mongolia, Poland and the USSR (A/C.3/L.1670) and the amendment proposed by Sweden (A/C.3/L.1679, para. 2) were both designed to introduce into the original text new elements which her delegation supported. However, although the provisions in amendment A/C.3/L.1670 aimed at safeguarding the health and welfare of parents and children were of great importance, they might best serve their purpose in the part of the draft Declaration which related to means and methods; she therefore suggested that the sponsors might consider the possibility of submitting them for inclusion in part III of the draft Declaration (see A/7648, annex II).

37. Although the first part of amendment A/C.3/L.1670 had originally, and rightly, stressed the role of the unmarried mother as the sole support of her children, she preferred the broader thought embodied in the Swedish amendment (A/C.3/L.1679, para. 2), which mentioned not only the mother, married or unmarried, but also the father having custody of infants. Her delegation would therefore support the latter amendment, which not only included the three basic principles in the original text of paragraph 9 (see A/7648, annex II) but, as had been pointed out, extended the scope of the third principle.

38. Mrs. NØRTHEN (Denmark) said that her delegation fully agreed with the aim of the Swedish amendment to paragraph 9 (A/C.3/L.1679, para. 2), namely, to depart from the rigid traditional concept of the roles of the sexes in the care and upbringing of children and in the family; in the Nordic countries at least, that concept was no longer the only valid one. However, she considered that the wording of the proposed text was insufficiently clear and suggested that it should read as follows:

“The provision, without prejudice to the equality of rights between men and women, of measures to safeguard the health and welfare of parents having custody of children and particularly of working women during pregnancy and the infancy of their children; the establishment of child-care facilities”.

39. With regard to amendment A/C.3/L.1670, her delegation fully agreed that it was important, as indicated in the second part of that text, to develop a system of children’s pre-school establishments so that women could participate fully in social progress and in the political and economic life of society. Such institutions could be of importance to the upbringing of children and could help to develop the child’s feeling of solidarity with other persons. The establishment of such facilities was, therefore, not only a tool for social development but was also one of its goals; consequently, it was only logical that reference should be made to it in part II of the draft Declaration. She suggested, however, that the relevant phrase in amendment A/C.3/L.1670 should be replaced by a simpler wording—for instance, “the establishment or development of child-care facilities”—and that that idea should be elaborated on in part III of the draft Declaration.

40. Mr. HEYMAN (Sweden) accepted the Danish oral sub-amendment to his amendment (A/C.3/L.1679, para. 2).

41. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) announced a revision of amendment A/C.3/L.1670 whereby everything after the words “without loss of employment or wages” in the second part was deleted. She intended to propose at the appropriate time that the passages which had been deleted should be included in part III of the draft Declaration.

42. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that it seemed a little odd to him to define the safeguarding of fathers having custody of children as an objective of social development, as was done in the Danish sub-amendment to the Swedish amendment (A/C.3/L.1679, para. 2), since the essential aim of the paragraph under consideration was to safeguard mothers, and particularly working mothers. He believed that concern for equality and perfectionist zeal were causing members to lose sight of that fundamental purpose and alter the scope of the original text, which his delegation considered preferable to the amendments.

43. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) observed that the three versions of paragraph 9 now before the Committee—the original text (see A/7648, annex II), the amendment submitted by Mongolia, Poland and the USSR (A/C.3/L.1670) and the Swedish amendment (A/C.3/L.1679, para. 2)—were very similar. However, she was in favour of the original text, and she therefore urged the sponsors of the amendments to withdraw them.

44. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment of Mongolia, Poland and the USSR to paragraph 9 (A/C.3/L.1670), as orally revised (see paras. 32 and 41 above). At the request of the representative of Japan, a separate vote would be taken on the last sentence of amendment A/C.3/L.1670, as orally revised, reading: “The granting to women of pregnancy and maternity leave and allowances, without loss of employment or wages”.

The last sentence of amendment A/C.3/L.1670 was adopted by 26 votes to 10, with 42 abstentions.

Amendment A/C.3/L.1670 as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted by 35 votes to 17, with 33 abstentions.

45. Mr. UMRATH (Netherlands) explained that, although he certainly supported the measures referred to in the last sentence of amendment A/C.3/L.1670, he had had to vote against it because he considered that it should be included in part III, and not in part II, of the draft Declaration.

46. Mr. TORRES (Philippines) said that he had abstained from voting because the ideas expressed in amendment A/C.3/L.1670 would, in his view, be better placed in part III of the draft Declaration and because he preferred the original wording of paragraph 9.

47. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that she had voted against the sentence on which a separate vote had been taken and had abstained from voting on the amendment as a whole, not because she was opposed to the substance of it, but because she would have preferred the adoption of the original text of paragraph 9.

48. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that he had voted against the amendment, and would likewise have voted against the Swedish amendment (A/C.3/L.1679, para. 2), because he thought that the wording was inferior to that of the original text of the draft Declaration and also because it introduced some confusion between objectives and methods.

49. Mr. HEYMAN (Sweden) said that he had voted against the amendment because he would have preferred the adoption of the one which his delegation had submitted (A/C.3/L.1679, para. 2), with the Danish sub-amendment.

50. Mrs. DAES (Greece) said that she had abstained from voting because she preferred the original text of the draft Declaration.

51. Mrs. DE BROMLEY (Honduras) said she had abstained from voting, not because she was opposed to the substance of the amendment, but because she preferred the original text of the draft Declaration.

52. Mrs. CADIEUX (Canada) said that she too had abstained from voting because she considered that amendment A/C.3/L.1670 should appear in part III of the draft Declaration.

53. Mrs. RAOELINA (Madagascar) said she had voted against the amendment because she considered, firstly, that it sought to introduce actual social security schemes, and, secondly, that its substance had been adequately expounded in article 10 of the Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women.

Paragraph 10

54. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) urged the sponsors of document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 to withdraw the amendment relating to paragraph 10 of the draft Declaration, since there was a more comprehensive formulation in document A/C.3/L.1689/Rev.1, paragraph 12, of which his delegation was a sponsor.

55. Mr. PAOLINI (France) withdrew, on behalf of the sponsors, the amendment to paragraph 10 of part II of the draft Declaration (A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1, third paragraph of article 11).

56. Mr. TEPAVICHAROV (Bulgaria), speaking also on behalf of Mongolia, withdrew the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1683.

57. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 10 of part II (see A/7648, annex II) and the amendment thereto in document A/C.3/L.1689/Rev.1, paragraph 12.

The amendment to paragraph 10 contained in document A/C.3/L.1689/Rev.1, paragraph 12, was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 10, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.