

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1678th  
MEETING**

Thursday, 23 October 1969,  
at 3.30 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 48:	
Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (continued)	
Part III: Means and methods (continued)	
Introductory sentence (concluded)	155
Paragraph 1	155
Paragraph 2	156
Paragraph 3	158

**Chairman:** Mrs. Turkia OULD DADDAH  
(Mauritania).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mrs. Sipilä (Finland),  
Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEM 48**

**Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development  
(continued) (A/7235 and Add.1 and 2, A/7648, A/C.3/  
L.1696-1726)**

**PART III: MEANS AND METHODS (continued)**

*Introductory sentence (concluded)*

1. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the introductory sentence of part III (see A/7648, annex II), as amended at the preceding meeting. The amended sentence read as follows:

"On the basis of the principles set forth in this Declaration, the achievement of the objectives of social progress and development requires the mobilization of the necessary resources by national and international action, with particular attention to such means and methods as:".

*The introductory sentence of part III, as amended, was adopted by 68 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph 1*

2. Mrs. NAZARENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) introduced an amendment (A/C.3/L.1705) to paragraph 1 of part III. Its purpose was to replace the existing paragraph 1 by a more comprehensive and precise text incorporating, *inter alia*, the concept of "programming"—a term which, like "planning", was widely used in other United Nations bodies and which should not cause any difficulties.

3. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) introduced, on behalf of the sponsors, which now included Kenya, the amendment to paragraph 1 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, which was designed to adapt the terminology to that of the new title of the draft Declaration.

4. Mr. UMRATH (Netherlands) supported the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, which improved the text, but said that he would find it difficult to support the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1705, as he felt that planning should not be based only on scientific and systematic studies.

5. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that she preferred the original paragraph 1 because it was clear and concise and used the terminology that was employed throughout the United Nations system. She did not, therefore, consider the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 to be appropriate, as it introduced a new expression which was not current. With regard to the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1705, she felt that there was no planning that was not based on a scientific analysis of social phenomena. Furthermore, the inclusion of the concepts of "programming" and "planning" in the same paragraph might give rise to a lengthy and irrelevant debate. Although the concept of "programming" was widely used in her country, at the international level she preferred to speak of development "planning".

6. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) explained that the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 felt that as it stood the original paragraph 1 gave the impression that social development planning was entirely separate from over-all development planning; they were therefore proposing changes to stress the fact that an integral process was involved.

7. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) pointed out that the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 was not a substantive one, but was intended to reflect the changes that had been made in the title of the draft Declaration. The Ukrainian amendment (A/C.3/L.1705) introduced a new idea which the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 certainly supported but which did not appear in the original text and was out of place in the paragraph in question.

8. Mr. BOURGOIN (France) felt that the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, while remaining true to the spirit of the original paragraph, had presented a more suitable formulation, and he was prepared to vote for it.

9. Mrs. NAZARENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) withdrew her amendment (A/C.3/L.1705) in favour

of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, which she considered satisfactory.

10. Mr. SADRY (Iran) agreed with the representative of Italy that the phrase “social development planning” was most commonly used in the United Nations system, but said that the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 respected the spirit of the original paragraph and he would vote for it.

11. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 1 of part III (see A/7648, annex II) and the amendment thereto in document A/C.3/L.1723.

*The amendment was adopted by 87 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph 1 of part III, as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

*Mrs. Turkia Ould Daddah (Mauritania) took the Chair.*

#### *Paragraph 2*

12. Mr. NTAWIHA (Rwanda) introduced the amendment to paragraph 2 contained in document A/C.3/L.1713, which was intended to reflect a problem that arose in developing countries, where some foreign semi-public and private enterprises refused to employ nationals, alleging that they were incompetent, and preferred to import foreign personnel, thus depriving nationals of the opportunity to occupy senior positions. He also supported the amendment to paragraph 2 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, the purpose of which was to divide the paragraph into two parts.

13. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) introduced, on behalf of the sponsors, the amendment to paragraph 2 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, which proposed the division of that paragraph into two parts. Although the sponsors had no objection whatever to the original wording of the paragraph and had left it intact in their amendment, they felt that a distinction should be made in the text between two ideas which, although related, were different: firstly, the training of national personnel and cadres, and, secondly, the adoption of policies and measures to avoid the “brain drain”. Combining the two concepts in a single paragraph only weakened both of them. The two elements not only involved different general approaches—the first being positive and the second negative—but they were also different in scope. Thus, whereas the need to train qualified national personnel was a problem usually restricted to the developing countries, the “brain drain” also affected many countries that were considered developed, whose professionals and technicians emigrated to other, even more developed countries. The sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 therefore felt that each of the two concepts should be expressed in a separate paragraph, so that their importance would be properly brought out. The first of the paragraphs in question would be paragraph 2 of part III, relating to means and methods, and the second would be inserted further on, wherever the Committee considered it appropriate.

14. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) supported the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, since each of the ideas embodied in paragraph 2 of part III of the draft Declaration (see A/7648, annex II) was valuable enough to be set out in a separate paragraph.

15. She had difficulty in agreeing to the new wording of paragraph 2 proposed in the Rwandese amendment (A/C.3/L.1713), as it seemed to restrict the original scope of the paragraph, which covered the training of national cadres for establishments of every kind, to the training of personnel for private enterprises. Furthermore, the term “enterprises”, which primarily brought to mind commercial companies, was not the most suitable one in a document dealing with social progress, and she suggested that it should be replaced by the word “institutions”, a broader term which covered other kinds of entities, such as welfare and cultural organizations which also dealt with that aspect of development. She also felt that the proposed insertion would be detrimental to the wording of the paragraph, since it would interrupt the enumeration of the categories of personnel, and she would prefer the new clause to be added at the end of the sentence to which it was an amendment.

16. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the amendment to paragraph 2 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 presented him with no difficulties; the division of the original text into two paragraphs seemed perfectly reasonable, and he would vote for it if it was put to the vote.

17. With regard to the Rwandese amendment to paragraph 2 (A/C.3/L.1713), he could not quite understand either its meaning or its purpose. He believed that those developing countries which had not chosen the socialist way—in other words, those where there were semi-public and private enterprises—should concentrate on encouraging the expansion and improvement of the public sector; the Rwandese amendment, however, seemed to be aimed at encouraging greater development of the private sector. That would be a step backwards in national evolution, and therefore his delegation would be unable to support the proposed change.

18. Mr. IDDIR (Algeria) said he considered that the problem which was brought out in the Rwandese amendment (A/C.3/L.1713) was extremely important, and urged the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 to take it into account in their proposal. Basically, the problem was that foreign enterprises operating in developing countries preferred to recruit personnel in their countries of origin and refused to open up administrative or executive posts to nationals of the country of operation. In addition, they usually paid their employees who had been recruited elsewhere a salary in hard currency which the employees did not spend in the developing country, but either remitted or took with them to their own country.

19. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) agreed that paragraph 2 should be split, as proposed in the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, although he felt that the word “avoid”, which was used in the second part of the original text, was too weak and open to misinterpretation. In order to remedy that defect, he suggested that it should be

replaced by the word “eliminate”, since the goal that was sought was not to get round the “brain drain” in some way but to stop it altogether.

20. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that she fully agreed with the reasons which had been given for splitting paragraph 2 into two parts and therefore supported the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723. However, she did not consider it proper to use the expression “brain drain” in what would become the second part of the text, not only because she felt that the term used in English was undignified and unsuited to a Declaration, but also because it restricted the scope of the concept to specific small categories of skilled personnel. She suggested the use of some other wording more acceptable in style and broader in scope, such as “the outflow of trained (or skilled) personnel”, which would include more varied categories of personnel and would also cover both migration from developing to developed countries and the movement of persons from one industrialized nation to another, more advanced nation.

21. With regard to the replacement of the verb “avoid” by “eliminate”, as proposed by Syria, she pointed out that for many developing countries the total elimination of the “brain drain” would be not only difficult, but also harmful, since it would result in a surplus of skilled personnel in relation to the posts available. However, although she did not feel that it was wrong to use the word “avoid”, she suggested that, in order to overcome the difficulty to which it had given rise, it should be replaced by “reduce”.

22. Her delegation welcomed the Rwandese amendment to paragraph 2 (A/C.3/L.1713), which highlighted a problem of great importance to many developing countries. She nevertheless considered that the wording proposed was not, perhaps, the most appropriate, since it might be interpreted as referring to establishments of only one kind, and she believed that it would be possible, through consultations and exchanges of ideas, to reflect the same idea in more satisfactory terms.

23. Mrs. NICOL (Sierra Leone) endorsed the observations of the representative of Jamaica and said that a formal declaration, such as the one under consideration, should be worded in the most dignified terms, without using vogue words or colloquialisms. The English expression “brain drain” was to be deplored, and she suggested that the end of the second part of the paragraph, as proposed in the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, beginning with the words “to avoid”, should be replaced by “to encourage nationals to remain in their own countries”.

24. Mrs. STEVENSON (Liberia) said that she agreed with the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, whereby paragraph 2 would be split into two parts. She considered that Syria’s objection would be met if the verb “avoid” was replaced by “overcome”.

25. She attached great importance to the idea which the Rwandese amendment (A/C.3/L.1713) sought to incorporate in the paragraph; to some extent that amendment also represented a solution of the problem of the “brain drain”.

26. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) emphasized that any national policy concerning the problem of the “brain drain” must aim at its total elimination and not merely at avoiding or reducing it, since it constituted an obstacle which seriously hampered the progress of the developing countries. The wording which had been suggested by the Liberian delegation in that respect in connexion with the amendment to paragraph 2 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 was realistic and he would welcome its adoption.

27. Mr. LISITSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) felt that the wording proposed for paragraph 2 in the Rwandese amendment (A/C.3/L.1713) had certain semantic shortcomings since the training of “managerial” personnel, irrespective of the type of establishment in which such personnel would be employed, was obviously included in the training of “administrative” and “executive” personnel. Actually, the original text of the paragraph was sufficiently clear; only the English text could, perhaps, give rise to some slight doubt, and that would be dispelled if the word “managerial” was inserted after the word “executive” in paragraph 2 of the draft Declaration (see A/7648, annex II), which would cover all the categories of personnel that were intended to be included in it.

28. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) pointed out that the amendment to paragraph 2 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, did not make any change in the terminology or drafting of the original text, but merely proposed that the paragraph should be split into two parts. Accordingly, any change that might be proposed in the text of the paragraph was not a sub-amendment to the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, but actually constituted an amendment to the original text (see A/7648, annex II), and it was for the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 to make a decision on that point. With regard to the objections expressed by the representatives of Jamaica and Sierra Leone concerning the English expression “brain drain”, no such difficulties arose in the other languages, and he would point out, in passing, that the term which was in dispute had been coined by English-speaking economists. The phrases which had been suggested as replacements for “brain drain”, such as “outflow of skilled personnel”, did not exactly reflect the idea which it was intended to enunciate, because they did not refer specifically to highly skilled professionals, such as chemical scientists and physicists, whose migrating to other countries actually constituted the “brain drain”, but also covered other skilled groups, such as agricultural workers or bricklayers, who generally did not emigrate from their country of origin.

29. However that might be, the concept which was embodied in the Rwandese amendment (A/C.3/L.1713), was extremely important, since one of the principal needs of the developing countries was to train local personnel who could subsequently take over responsibility for work which now had to be done by foreign experts in those countries. Nevertheless, he did not consider it correct to make a specific reference to enterprises or establishments of a given kind, since the right of each country to establish whatever kind of bodies it considered most appropriate must be respected. Moreover, in his view, the original wording of the paragraph already embodied the idea which the Rwandese amendment sought to expound in greater

detail, since the reference to administrative and executive personnel also covered managerial personnel. He therefore urged the Rwandese delegation not to press its amendment to paragraph 2 (A/C.3/L.1713).

30. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan) supported the comments of the representative of the Upper Volta to the effect that the concept embodied in the Rwandese amendment (A/C.3/L.1713) was covered in the original text of paragraph 2; he did not consider that the proposal was necessary.

31. Mr. NTAWIHA (Rwanda) said he was satisfied with the explanations which had been given concerning his amendment to paragraph 2 contained in document A/C.3/L.1713 and withdrew it.

32. Mr. TROTMAN (Guyana) said that he shared the concern which had been expressed with regard to the use of the word "avoid" in paragraph 2 of part III of the draft Declaration and of the word "brain drain" in the English text. He did not, however, consider the word "eliminate", suggested by the Syrian delegation, to be any more appropriate, because it might lead the developed countries to discourage skilled personnel from going to the developing countries, and that would be very harmful to the latter. The wording suggested by Sierra Leone might be more acceptable, although there was the danger that some retrogressive and reactionary Governments might use it as a pretext to prevent freedom of movement for their nationals, and particularly for intellectuals. He therefore considered it preferable to speak of "regulating the outflow of professional and technical personnel".

33. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) pointed out that the wording suggested by the representative of Jamaica did not take due account of the position of many developing countries, whose only means of progressing was to send indigenous personnel to be trained abroad so that they might return to their country and use the knowledge they had acquired to help in national development. The amendment to paragraph 2 in document A/C.3/L.1723 was purely a matter of form and did not make any change in the text of paragraph 2 of part III of the draft Declaration; consequently, it could not be the subject of sub-amendments.

34. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that the wording she had suggested was in accordance with the title of General Assembly resolution 2417 (XXIII).

35. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 had tried hard to find a more suitable expression than "brain drain", which was used in paragraph 2 of part III of the draft Declaration, but to no avail; they had therefore decided to keep to the original text, because they had feared that the coining of a different expression would give rise to a general debate.

36. The CHAIRMAN said she would put to the vote first the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, which proposed that paragraph 2 of part III of the draft Declaration (see A/7648, annex II) should be split into two parts; if the amendment was approved, the Committee would have to vote in turn on each of the paragraphs thus constituted.

*The amendment was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*The paragraph consisting of the first part of paragraph 2 of part III of the draft Declaration was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*The paragraph consisting of the second part of paragraph 2 of part III of the draft Declaration was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

37. Mr. SADRY (Iran) said that he had voted for the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 but regretted that, for procedural reasons, it had not been possible to incorporate the wordings suggested by Jamaica and Sierra Leone.

38. Mr. El-FATTAL (Syria) said that he had voted for the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, and explained that when he had suggested that the word "avoid" should be replaced by "eliminate", he had been referring, not to restricting freedom of movement, but to eliminating the socio-economic problem caused by the "brain drain".

39. Mr. BOURGOIN (France) explained that he had voted for the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 on the understanding that the measures referred to in paragraph 2 of part III of the draft Declaration were not incompatible with the right, set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, of everyone freely to leave his country and to return to it whenever he wished.

### *Paragraph 3*

40. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda), introducing the amendment to paragraph 3 in document A/C.3/L.1723, of which his delegation was a sponsor, said that the purpose of the amendment was to impart urgency to the measures concerning education and training referred to in paragraph 3.

41. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) introduced his amendment to paragraph 3 of part III of the draft Declaration (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 1). In it, he had rearranged the ideas in the original text and introduced some new elements, such as the provision of free education at all levels, as in his country, and acceleration of the extension and improvement of education—a concept of particular importance to the developing countries. In the English text of the amendment, the word "provided" should be inserted between the words "should be" and "free".

42. Mrs. NICOL (Sierra Leone) supported the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 1) but suggested that, in view of the material difficulty experienced by many countries in providing free education at all levels, the words "as soon as possible" should be inserted after the word "free".

43. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) agreed with the representative of Sierra Leone and pointed out that the Committee was now considering the part relating to means and not to objectives of social development, and that the feasibility of the proposed measures must be borne in mind. There was a middle way between fully paid and completely free education which was accessible to all countries and was extremely flexible, namely, State-supported education. That type of education would enable each country to

decide what ratio of official subsidies to necessary expenditure was most compatible with national needs.

44. Mr. TEPAVICHAROV (Bulgaria) supported the Iraqi amendment to paragraph 3 (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 1) as being clear and concise and in accordance with the general spirit of the draft Declaration, which was confined to the enunciation of objectives, principles and methods, without imposing any obligations.

45. Mr. NAMON (Ghana) felt that the use of the word "should" in the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 1) was appropriate, since it implied no obligation or duty but, on the contrary, indicated flexibility.

46. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) agreed with the representatives of Bulgaria and Ghana. He did not consider it advisable to include phrases like "as soon as possible" in some articles of the draft Declaration, first, because they might give the impression that there was no urgency about the articles in which the phrase did not appear, and, secondly, because, as he had already pointed out in another connexion, the idea such words were meant to express was implicit in the very nature of the Declaration.

47. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that the ideas expressed in the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 1) were in

keeping with the objectives set out in paragraph 6 of part II, which the Committee had adopted.

48. Mrs. NICOL (Sierra Leone) and Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that, in view of the comments made by other delegations, they would not press their suggestions.

49. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) withdrew, on behalf of the sponsors, the amendment to paragraph 3 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the text of paragraph 3 proposed by Iraq in its amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 1), as orally revised (see para. 41 above).

*The amendment, as orally revised, was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

51. Miss MAKOLO (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that she had abstained from voting, not because she was opposed to the ideas expressed in the amendment but because she would have preferred the retention of the word "gradually", since not all countries were able to guarantee free education at all levels immediately.

*The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.*