

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1581st
MEETING**

Tuesday, 22 October 1968,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 50:

*Draft Declaration on Social Development (con-
tinued)*

| | |
|---|----------|
| <i>Procedural discussion (concluded).</i> | <i>1</i> |
| <i>Title</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)

PROCEDURAL DISCUSSION (concluded)

1. Mr. MUKIBI (Uganda) said that he had no objection to the draft Declaration's being discussed in the order in which it was arranged in annex I of document A/7161. He thought that delegations should be allowed an opportunity formally to introduce the amendments transmitted by their Governments in their replies to the Secretary-General, as given in document A/7235. Lastly, he considered that the motion introduced at the previous meeting by the representative of France concerning the elimination of repetitions in the text was unacceptable.

2. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that in her statement at the previous meeting, she had merely said that the Declaration should be considered as a homogeneous entity and that a single time-limit should be set for the submission of amendments. She had not suggested any order of discussion and she was ready to agree to any proposal that might be submitted on that point.

3. She would not press her suggestion that the Committee should invite a member of the Second Committee to supply information on the Second United Nations Development Decade, since it did not seem to have aroused sufficient interest.

4. As she had already pointed out, she did not know whether a representative of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development had attended the meetings of the Working Party, but in any event she saw no reason why debates of that kind should not be attended by representatives of specialized agencies whose sphere of activities was relevant to the item under discussion.

5. She was surprised that the French representative's motion had not been adopted, since most delegations had referred during the general debate to the need to shorten the text of the draft. Perhaps the reason was that the motion had been worded too rigidly, and she

hoped that it would be possible to arrive at a more flexible formulation.

6. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that she was definitely opposed to the French delegation's motion because she considered it to be impracticable; it was not clear whether it referred both to repetitions in a figurative sense and to repetitions in the different parts of the Declaration.

7. Mr. SIRI (El Salvador) said he hoped that the substantive debate would begin as soon as possible, starting with the preamble. He agreed that a deadline should be set for the submission of amendments, but not in respect of the draft as a whole; a separate deadline should be set for each part.

8. His delegation was opposed to the French representative's motion, which it considered unduly rigid and restrictive. Although it agreed with any effort to shorten the text, it could not accept the omission of concepts deemed to be desirable or necessary in each part.

9. Miss FERRINGA (Netherlands) supported the Italian delegation's suggestion that a time-limit should be set for the submission of amendments. She did not believe that the suggestion that the substantive debate should begin with part I of the draft represented an unusual procedure for the Committee, and she had no difficulty in agreeing to it.

10. She shared the concern which had led to the introduction of the French delegation's motion and she would vote in favour of it.

11. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) thought that the present order of the document should be followed in the discussion. He considered it advisable to set a separate deadline for the submission of amendments to each part of the draft.

12. His delegation found the French representative's motion illogical, since the repetitions in one and the same section could be the subject of appropriate amendments, whereas repetitions between sections could not be regarded as such, in that each part of the text was completely self-contained, making it virtually impossible to compare it with others.

13. He was opposed to the establishment of a working party as suggested by the representative of Greece at the previous meeting, and he supported the suggestion made by Iran at the same meeting regarding the frequency of the Committee's meetings, although he believed that the bulk of the work must be done by the Committee.

14. Miss HART (New Zealand) said that she was surprised at the contention aroused by the French delegation's motion, since during the general debate

most delegations had repeatedly mentioned the desirability of shortening the text of the draft and eliminating unnecessary repetitions. In any event, as there appeared to be a consensus on the question, there was perhaps no need to adopt a formal decision, and the Committee could simply proceed accordingly.

15. With regard to the order to be followed in the debate, she had no objection to taking up the preamble first, although she thought that it would be advantageous to begin with the substantive part.

16. Lastly, she supported the Iranian representative's suggestion concerning the frequency of meetings.

17. Mr. HERNDL (Austria) said he thought it advisable to begin the discussion with those sections which offered the least difficulty, and from that standpoint the preamble of the draft was the least controversial part.

18. In his view, there should not be a single time-limit for the submission of amendments, but a separate deadline for each part of the document.

19. His delegation agreed with the content and the spirit of the French representative's motion, since the draft Declaration should be a precise and exact instrument, without any superfluous repetition. Nevertheless, there would be little point in taking a formal decision on the question, when most delegations were already agreed on it. Moreover, the proposal was not a strictly procedural motion; it was also substantive and could greatly affect the result of the Committee's deliberations. He therefore appealed to the representative of France to withdraw his proposal.

20. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should begin its consideration of the draft Declaration with the preamble, followed by parts I, II and III, and that 3 p.m. on Wednesday, 23 October, should be fixed as the time-limit for the submission of amendments to the title and preamble.

It was so agreed.

21. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) withdrew the motion which his delegation had introduced and said that, although he considered the statements that had been made concerning it to be very constructive, he was sorry that some delegations had not understood the spirit in which it had been formulated. He thanked those which had stated their approval of its meaning, in particular the delegations of Iran, Belgium, Greece, the Netherlands, Argentina, Italy, New Zealand and Austria, and replied to the objections that had been raised.

22. The delegations of the Upper Volta and Belgium had queried the use of the word "section" instead of "part". In view of the fact that the draft consisted of a preamble and three parts, he had felt that "section" was the most appropriate term to use in referring to its components generally.

23. The delegations of the Upper Volta and Dahomey had objected that it was not practical to be constantly turning from section to section, but that was not the method he had suggested; he had proposed dealing with each section separately.

24. The USSR delegation had stated that the proposal would cause some confusion. On the contrary, he

believed that it would have done much to clarify the text of the draft, which contained such obvious repetitions as were to be found in paragraph 11 of part I and paragraph 4 of part II, in paragraph 3 of part II and paragraph 5 of part III, and in many other places.

25. He pointed out, in connexion with the comments of the representative of Kenya, that repetition might be appropriate in an educational context, but not in an international instrument like the draft under discussion.

26. Mr. KITI (Kenya), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, stated that, in referring to the repetitions to be found in the text under consideration, he had pointed out that the use of repetition was taught in schools as a means of driving home ideas.

27. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that, in defending the repetition of ideas in the draft Declaration, he had not been stating a policy, since his country did not maintain that repetition was an effective method of persuasion. He considered the procedure proposed by the representative of France to be inappropriate, since submission of all the amendments beforehand might lead to prejudgement of the text before it had been studied properly. Consequently, he felt that it was preferable for amendments to be submitted when the paragraph to which they related was being considered. With regard to the comments made by the representative of Italy, he said that no representatives of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development had attended the meetings of the Working Party.

28. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should proceed immediately to consider the draft Declaration on Social Development, beginning with the title.

It was so agreed.

TITLE

29. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that, as she had indicated at the 1577th meeting, the concepts of progress and development were not synonymous; there was a clear-cut difference between them. The term "development" implied evolution—in other words, a gradual advance—while the concept of progress suggested a rapid, revolutionary forward movement—an idea that could not be left out of a document such as the one under consideration. Moreover, the two terms were used together in Article 55 of the United Nations Charter. For those reasons, she proposed that the title of the draft Declaration should be amended to refer to social progress and development.^{1/}

30. In addition, in the ninth preambular paragraph the phrase "the gap in social conditions between economically developed and developing countries" did not seem correct, since some social conditions were better in developing countries than in the more developed ones; she believed that what was to be eliminated was the gap in standards of living, which had repercussions in the social field.

31. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) said that he favoured the inclusion of the term "progress" in the title of the draft, which would thus be brought into line with the

^{1/} The amendment of Iraq was subsequently circulated as document A/C.3/L.1576.

substance of the document and would underline the need for active international solidarity in behalf of social advancement.

32. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that he agreed with the amendment proposed by Iraq and supported by Poland, although not for the reasons which had been mentioned; for, in his view, the intensification of United Nations activities in the social field during the past decade had resulted in a concept of social development which embraced the idea of progress. However, he considered that both terms should appear in the title for reasons for logic and consistency, since they were used together in the text with slight differences of meaning.

33. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that the same problem had arisen in the Working Party and in the Commission for Social Development and had resulted in lengthy discussions on the differences and similarities between the concepts of progress and development. Finally, after consulting numerous experts and encyclopaedias, it had been decided by a large majority to adopt the title which appeared in the draft. Bearing that in mind, he considered it inadvisable to reopen debate on that question, which would not lead to anything of practical value. As he saw it, development was a series of efforts to create better conditions, while progress was the result of such efforts. His delegation would vote against the amendment submitted by Iraq.

34. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) said it appeared from the debate on the question that many delegations from countries with different social systems disagreed with the proposed title and, for one reason or another, would prefer to have it amended as proposed by the Iraqi delegation. The concept of social progress gave an indication of the objective of development, namely, a more just social structure. In addition, it would be very desirable to retain the terminology of Article 55 a of the United Nations Charter, since the task in hand was precisely to formulate that provision of the Charter more fully.

35. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had proposed, both in the Working Party and in the Commission for Social Development, that the text should be entitled "Declaration on Social Progress". That title was in conformity with the Charter, the Preamble of which spoke of a determination "to promote social progress", and it would also indicate the primary objective of the Declaration. He preferred the term "progress", because he considered it broader and more forceful; on the other hand, the bases on which development rested appeared to be ossified.

36. The representative of Iraq had proposed a title containing both words as a compromise formula, and his delegation was prepared to co-operate and agree to it, although it was inclined to favour the other version.

37. Mr. HAQUE (Pakistan) said that his delegation had proposed the present title of the draft Declaration because, in its view, the idea of progress was contained in the concept of development. Moreover, the General Assembly, in resolution 2215 (XXI), para-

graph 3, had called for the preparation of a draft declaration on social development.

38. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) said that she disagreed with the pejorative definition of the word development as expressed by the USSR.

39. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, although progress was not referred to in resolution 2215 (XXI), it was mentioned in the Charter, which was the basic instrument governing the activities of the entire Organization. Moreover, it should be noted that the preamble of the draft Declaration itself alluded several times to social progress, so that it would be logical to include it in the title. Besides the most up-to-date terminology should be used; in the field of technology and industry, for example, the word "progress" was preferred. However, his delegation would support the Iraqi proposal as a compromise formula.

40. Mr. GHERIB (Tunisia) observed that, during the general debate, his delegation had stated that it would be prepared to consider all ideas expressed on the point under discussion in order to accommodate those who had not participated in the deliberations of the Working Party. The representative of Iraq had clearly indicated the difference between the two concepts, which, in the view of the Tunisian delegation, were complementary.

41. Despite the fact that his delegation had voted for the present title in the Commission for Social Development, it would have no difficulty in accepting the Iraqi proposal.

42. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that she would prefer the retention of the existing title. Social development was a combination of principles, objectives and methods which were gradually being defined at the national and the international level. On the other hand, there was no equally precise definition of social progress, and its inclusion would give rise to confusion.

43. Mr. MUKIIBI (Uganda) agreed with those who considered the two concepts identical; to use both words would lead to confusion, and it was therefore necessary to delete one of them. His delegation was inclined to favour the omission of the word "progress".

44. Mrs. PICKER (United States of America) urged the adoption of the title which appeared in document A/7161, annex I, since it was more specific and precise and would not lead to divergent interpretations. Moreover, it was in conformity with General Assembly resolution 2215 (XXI).

45. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) agreed with the delegations of Uganda and the United States, but said it must be acknowledged that the text of the draft Declaration mentioned both development and progress. Thus, if there was any confusion, its origin lay in the text and not in the title. If the idea of "progress" was retained in the text, it should logically be reflected in the title also. However, in order to avoid prolonging the debate, his delegation would support the Iraqi proposal.

46. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said she was surprised that the point should give rise to so much controversy.

On the basis of the wording of Article 55 a of the Charter, she proposed the words "social progress and development" as the definitive version.

47. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the amendment proposed orally by the representative of Iraq should be put to the vote without waiting for the text to be circulated, since the amendment was a very small one.

48. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) noted that there appeared to be discrepancies between the English and French versions of the phrase in the Charter which the representative of Iraq had taken as her basis.

49. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said that the representative of Iraq had merely made reference to the Charter; what was to be voted on was not that text, but the amendment itself.

50. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that the Spanish version of the Charter also appeared to differ from the others. As other delegations had suggested the terminology should be standardized throughout the text of the Declaration, and only the word "development", which was the one most used by all the organs of the United Nations, should be retained.

51. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) requested that a separate vote should be taken on the words "progress and".

52. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would have no difficulty in voting on the amendment submitted by Iraq in English, since the Russian text of the Charter was in perfect agreement with the English text.

53. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) suggested that the corresponding French version which had been discussed in the Working Party should be used in the form in which it appeared in paragraph 102 of the report of the Commission for Social Development at its nineteenth session.^{2/}

54. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) said that that version was correct but inelegant.

55. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) felt that the terms "progress" and "development" were different in content, and it would perhaps, therefore, be advisable to discuss them at greater length in order to determine precisely their different nuances.

56. Mr. GHAFI (Algeria) said that, from the point of view of the French language, it would be perfectly correct to use the title "Projet de déclaration sur le progrès et le développement social".

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.

^{2/} Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 5.