

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1597th
MEETING**

Tuesday, 5 November 1968,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 50:

Draft Declaration on Social Development (*continued*)

Part I: Principles (*continued*) 1

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.1584 and Corr. 3, A/C.3/L.1587,
A/C.3/L.1594, A/C.3/L.1595, A/C.3/L.1597,
A/C.3/L.1599-1605, A/C.3/L.1608, A/C.3/L.1610)

PART I: PRINCIPLES (*continued*)

Article 5 (*continued*)

1. Mr. BABAA (Libya) proposed an amendment to the second paragraph of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.3), providing for the insertion of the words "at the national and international levels" after the word "information". The amendment, which Libya had previously submitted at the forty-fourth session of the Economic and Social Council^{1/} in connexion with part III of the draft Declaration, article 30, would stress the importance of information in the social field.

2. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said that the original text of article 5 (see A/7161, annex I), stressing as it did the need for the full utilization of human resources, the recognition of democratic freedoms and the full and active participation of all elements of society in social progress, accurately reflected the ideas which the Committee wished to express and the principles it was seeking to define. Many delegations had stressed the importance of the human factor in social progress and such progress clearly called for the participation of all elements of society in the formulation and implementation of a social development policy. The words "systematic social information", proposed by France, were thus clearly inadequate and he agreed with the views expressed in that connexion at the preceding meeting by the representatives of Iran, the United Arab Republic and India. It was, of course, desirable to enlighten public opinion, but stress should be laid primarily on the full participation of all elements of society in the social development process, and he therefore preferred the original text of article 5.

3. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed that the original text of article 5 was much better than the French amendment, which merely weakened it. The original text contained a whole series of ideas which were mutually complementary and were linked in a logical order. That order was not reproduced in the French amendment, which also omitted the very important idea of the recognition of democratic freedoms and the full participation of all elements of society in social progress. Furthermore, he did not understand the meaning of the word "community" in the second paragraph of the French amendment. He could not accept that amendment and would vote for the original text.

4. Mr. ARTAZA (Chile), explaining the amendment to the French amendment submitted by the Latin American countries (A/C.3/L.1603, para. 5), said that the words "marginal sectors" meant those elements which, for social and economic reasons, did not form an integral part of the national community and did not participate in the political, economic and cultural life of society. All the citizens of a country should participate in all aspects of social life and in the progress of society. The aim was thus the full integration of the individual in society. However, integration did not exclude differentiation: the aim was unity in diversity, and social unity should not be confused with social uniformity. Diversity was, indeed, a constructive element, which was essential to the life of a society and should be respected, for it constituted a factor of social integration. To speak of racial, religious or cultural differentiation did not imply social disintegration. If social progress was to be achieved, however, there must be a minimum degree of unity within that heterogeneity in order to enable the various elements of society to define their common goals. He requested the Deputy Director of the Social Development Division to inform the Committee if in current sociological terminology the words "marginal sectors" did in fact express the idea that the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1603 wished to introduce into the text.

5. Mr. TSAO (China) suggested that the words "progress and development in the social field" in the English text of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.3) should be replaced by the words "social progress and development", in accordance with the wording used in the other articles of the draft Declaration.

6. Mr. NWITENDE (Rwanda) supported the French amendment but proposed that, in conformity with the text of the combined articles 4 and 6, the word "implies" in the introductory sentence should be replaced by "requires". He regretted that in the revised version of its amendment France had deleted the

^{1/} See E/AC.7/L.538.

reference to trade unions which appeared in the third paragraph of the original amendment (A/C.3/L.1584, para. 4). He suggested to the French representative that that paragraph should be reinserted in the following form: "The granting of democratic freedoms to trade unions, subject to respect for law and order".

7. Miss KHUHRO (Pakistan) said that the explanation given by the Chilean representative had enabled her to understand the spirit which had prompted the Latin American amendment (A/C.3/L.1603, para. 5). However, she felt, that the expressions "marginal sectors" and "full integration" should be made more explicit or amended, and she would be unable to support the amendment in its existing form.

8. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) thought that the proposal submitted by Liberia at the preceding meeting was most constructive and that it would considerably improve the text of the French amendment. That amendment made no mention of freedom of information, which was a prerequisite for social development. If the French representative did not accept the Liberian suggestion, the original text of article 5 would be preferable to the French amendment. However, the original text was far from satisfactory: in particular, she would like to know the exact meaning of the words "all elements of society", and she observed that the words "joint endeavour" implied the participation not of several entities but of two only.

9. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) recalled that her delegation had proposed an amendment (A/C.3/L.1597, para. 1) calling for the insertion of a new article after article 5, which read:

"In the specific field of social welfare full recognition shall be given to the dignity of the recipients of its services. To this end social welfare services shall provide timely aid on an equal basis for equal needs and, so far as possible, shall be preventive rather than curative."

Since the French amendment concerned article 5, her delegation intended to revise its own amendment so that it could be incorporated in a new article 5. Her delegation had already said that it considered it desirable to include the principles relating to social welfare services in part I of the draft Declaration and that idea seemed to have been supported by the Iranian representative's comments and by the Latin American amendment, which had been explained by the Chilean representative. The means and methods should be based on the principles enunciated in part I of the Declaration; in part I, however, the principles relating to social welfare services were not defined with sufficient clarity.

10. If a majority of the members of the Committee were prepared to support the French amendment, she would propose the following amendment to that text:

"Insert the following paragraph after the third paragraph:

"The provision of social welfare services granting timely aid on an equal basis to equal needs and, as far as possible, on a preventive rather than curative basis."

11. If the Committee rejected the French amendment, she would maintain her amendment to the original text of the draft Declaration, in a modified form. The text of her amendment would then be the following:

"After article 5, insert the following new article as article 6:

"In order to enable individuals and groups which do not fully participate in social development to take part in it, social welfare services shall be provided and timely aid shall be granted on an equal basis for equal needs and, as far as possible, on a preventive rather than curative basis."

12. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) said that he had listened with interest to the comments made by various delegations and welcomed all constructive suggestions. He explained to delegations which had criticized the wording used at the beginning of the text that there was an error of translation in the English text. The French text used the wording adopted by the Committee in the title and in preceding articles. He also pointed out that the words "creative initiative" were in the plural in the French text but in the singular in the English translation. He accepted the Guyana representative's proposal that the words "which implies" in the introductory sentence should be replaced by "including". Although the second paragraph of the amendment reproduced the wording of article 30 of part III of the draft Declaration, he would accept the Indian delegation's proposal that the word "social" in that paragraph should be deleted so as to broaden the scope of the information and he would replace it by the words "national and international", in accordance with the Libyan proposal. He would, for the time being, retain the word "systematic", which had been criticized by the Indian representative and defended by others, but he had no serious objection to deleting it if a majority of delegations requested him to do so. He hoped that, once amended, the text of the second paragraph would be an acceptable compromise which would satisfy Liberia and the United Kingdom. He would replace the third paragraph, which had been the subject of much criticism, by the following new text, which took account of the suggestions made by various delegations, including those of Iran, Iraq, Yugoslavia, the United Arab Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"The active participation of all elements of society, individually or through associations, in achieving the common objectives of development with respect for the fundamental freedoms established in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights."

13. The new text took account of the criticism of the French amendment voiced in particular by the delegations of Iran and Yugoslavia on the ground that it made no reference to fundamental freedoms. The term "associations" returned to the concept set forth in the third paragraph of the original amendment (A/C.3/L.1584, para. 4) but the new text did not use the term "trade unions", which would be unacceptable to certain delegations.

14. Now that he had heard the Chilean delegation's comments, he understood clearly the concern of the

Latin American delegations. However, the wording they proposed might cause difficulties for certain delegations and he therefore could not incorporate their amendment (A/C.3/L.1603, para. 5) in his own text. As to the ideas which the Italian representative wished to see included in article 5, he thought that, although they were perfectly valid, they would be out of context among the principles and should rather be included under means and methods. He therefore could not accept the Italian amendment.

15. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) felt that the text proposed by the Latin American delegations (A/C.3/L.1603, para. 5), the sense of which had been explained by the Chilean representative, was not sufficiently clear to be included in the text of the Declaration. Furthermore, the ideas which it expressed were already included in the text proposed by France. His delegation would therefore not vote in favour of the Latin American sub-amendment. The Italian amendment (A/C.3/L.1597, para. 1), was less concerned with principles than with methods and would be more appropriately included in part III. It was regrettable that the new wording proposed by the French delegation for the third paragraph would considerably lengthen article 5. The second paragraph related to the dissemination of information, which concerned a method rather than a principle, and it should be ended after the words "international information"; also, the end of that paragraph was restrictive and its deletion would allay the concern of the delegations of the United Kingdom and Liberia.

16. If the French delegation agreed to shorten the text of its amendment, his delegation would withdraw its own amendment (A/C.3/L.1604, para. 3) to the original text of article 5 and would vote in favour of the French text.

17. Mr. EKONDY-AKALA (Congo, Brazzaville) expressed regret that the French delegation's revised text made no mention of the democratic freedoms referred to in the original draft. Nevertheless, he would support the French amendment in its new form.

18. Mrs. ROQUET (Canada) said that delegations seemed to be losing sight of the fact that the part of the draft under consideration concerned principles and not methods. The second paragraph of the French text, which concerned methods of developing the enlightened public opinion mentioned in the first paragraph, was out of context and she hoped that the French delegation would delete it. Similarly, she invited the Italian delegation to withdraw its amendment, which should be included in the part on means and methods.

19. Mr. TORRES-CARRILHO (Brazil) regretted that the amendment of which he was a sponsor (A/C.3/L.1603, para. 5) had been misunderstood. In his country the "marginal sectors" included many farmers from the north-eastern region who had been forced by drought to abandon their land and settle in the poorer quarters of towns. He hoped that countries which were not acquainted with such problems would nevertheless fully appreciate the importance of the Latin American amendment.

20. Mr. MEHIRI (Tunisia) observed that the central concept in the text was that of the full utilization of

human resources and that the success of development plans depended on popular participation in the national effort. The French amendment was clear and well organized. It would be strengthened by the Latin American sub-amendment, which emphasized a problem of importance for developing countries. The paragraph relating to information should be more comprehensive and should indicate that the purpose of information should be to prepare the individual to understand social progress and participate in it.

21. Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru) said that the term "marginal sectors" designated socio-economic groupings and should not be interpreted in a racial or religious sense. The misgivings and objections of certain delegations were therefore unfounded. He regretted that the French delegation had withdrawn the paragraph incorporating the idea contained in the Latin American amendment. Moreover, he did not believe that the encouragement of creative initiative would be possible while large sectors of the population lived on the fringes of society.

22. Mr. JHA (India) welcomed the deletion of the word "social" in the second paragraph of the French text. He had some reservations with regard to the word "community" at the end of the second paragraph because its meaning varied from one country to another; he would prefer it to be deleted. In the third paragraph, he would like to see the words "in achieving" replaced by "a joint endeavour to achieve". Also, he preferred the word "goals" to "objectives". His delegation would present its proposals in the form of an amendment if they were not accepted by the French delegation. The representative of Iran had suggested that the second paragraph should end after the words "international information" but he thought that the second part of that paragraph was extremely important and should be retained.

23. Mr. ARTAZA (Chile), referring to the difficulties raised by the words "marginal sectors", said that the Committee—whose task was to prepare guidelines for Governments—should not allow itself to be frightened by words, particularly since those in question were employed with growing frequency.

24. Mr. JANSSON (Secretariat), replying to the question asked earlier by the Chilean representative, said that the term "marginal sectors" had been used for the past seven or eight years in the reports of the United Nations economic commissions and various other bodies, as well as in the Report on the World Social Situation. To the United Nations, it signified groups of the population which, for economic reasons, did not participate in the social life of a country; it usually referred to unemployed persons living in shanty towns or slums who took no part in economic activities, or villagers in isolated rural areas living on a bare subsistence level, and had little opportunity to improve their circumstances. The expression had no ethnic or religious connotation, although marginal sectors could comprise minorities.

25. Mr. TSAO (China) said that he would vote in favour of the Latin American sub-amendment; he thought that the misgivings which had been expressed with regard to it were unfounded. Governments should be concerned to ensure that the marginal sectors participated in social development.

26. Mrs. PICKER (United States of America) said that the introductory sentence of the French amendment was acceptable but that she did not know what was meant by the very vague adjective "enlightened" in the first paragraph. In the third paragraph of the English text she thought that the expression "the fundamental freedoms embodied" or "the fundamental freedoms recognized" should be used.

27. Although she was not opposed to the Latin American sub-amendment, she hoped that some wording could be found which would avoid the term "marginal sectors", which to some delegations was apparently not meaningful.

28. Mr. UY (Philippines) said that, in his opinion, the French amendment was too long. He also thought the style and presentation of the various French proposals, some of which had already been approved, did not conform with normal practice in such a declaration, and he hoped that the necessary changes would be made.

29. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) thought that, in view of the confusion created by the large number of proposals and the lack of clarity in the wording of many of them, the Committee should revert to the original text of article 5, which was clear and precise and which his delegation considered excellent. He had submitted an amendment (A/C.3/L.1610) to the French amendment which, while remaining close to the original text, took into account the ideas expressed by many delegations. Like the Charter, it referred to full employment of the population and added the idea contained in the amendment submitted by the Latin American countries. It also made it clear that the common objectives referred to were social in nature. He hoped that the Committee would adopt the text he had proposed.

30. The CHAIRMAN suggested that discussion of article 5 should be suspended until the various amendments and sub-amendments were circulated in writing and that the Committee should go on to article 8, to which the amendments contained in documents A/C.3/L.1584, L.1597 and L.1604 referred.

It was so decided.

Article 8

31. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that he was withdrawing his delegation's amendment to article 8 (A/C.3/L.1604, para. 5) because the proposed wording was contained in the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584, para. 5).

32. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France), at the request of Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic), recalled the reasons why his delegation had submitted its amendment to article 8. Although the amendment made very few changes in the original text (see A/7161, annex I), it was intended primarily to bring the wording into line with the rest of the draft. For example, the subject of the first sentence should be "each Government" (as in the English text), and the word "ultimate" which appeared in the original text and had been questioned by some delegations, was not essential and had been deleted, since the idea was implied in the word "primary". He hoped that those purely editorial changes would meet with no objection.

33. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that article 8 presented no difficulties for her delegation apart from the reference to "integrating or encouraging and co-ordinating" in the original text, which was in no way improved by the reference in the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584, para. 5) to "encouraging, co-ordinating or integrating". Governments did not have a choice among those three ideas, as the French amendment appeared to imply. Although they could either integrate or co-ordinate efforts, they should in any case encourage them. Her delegation would therefore prefer a reference to "encouraging and integrating or co-ordinating".

34. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said that he supported the Jamaican representative's proposal. He also wished to point out that the word "role" did not appear in the French amendment and certainly could not be replaced by the word "responsibility". He therefore requested the French representative to withdraw his amendment so that the Committee could vote forthwith on article 8 of the original text.

35. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that she wished to associate herself with the United Arab Republic representative in emphasizing the importance of the "role" of States in social development; if the French delegation took that point of view into account, the amendment contained in paragraph 5 of document A/C.3/L.1584 would no longer be necessary.

36. Mr. UY (Philippines) said that he favoured the original article 8, as amended orally by the Jamaican representative. His delegation wished to reintroduce in its own name the amendment withdrawn by the representative of Iran (A/C.3/L.1604, para. 5).

37. Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru) said that he did not approve of the word "integrating" either in article 8 or in the French amendment. He did not think that one could speak of integrating efforts, but only of implementing, assisting or facilitating them.

38. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) said that his delegation had taken the Iranian amendment (A/C.3/L.1604, para. 5) into account in its own amendment. Referring to the opinion expressed by the Jamaican representative, he said that his delegation would like to hear the views of other representatives before taking a decision in the matter.

39. With regard to the comment by the representative of the United Arab Republic, his delegation had no objection to a reference to both the role and the responsibility of Governments.

40. Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru) made a formal proposal that the word "integrating" should be replaced by "implementing".

41. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) said that, in view of the large number of sub-amendments made to the French amendment, which suggested only minor changes, he might be willing not to press his amendment if that would facilitate the Committee's work, provided that the original text of the article was worded in such a way as to make the French translation acceptable.

42. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said that he would oppose the Italian amendment (A/C.3/

L.1597, para. 2) if it was put to the vote, because it referred essentially to means and methods.

43. Mr. HERNDL (Austria) said that he supported the original wording of article 8 although he preferred the amendment proposed by France. However, as in article 2 (d), it would be more appropriate to speak of States than of Governments. On the other hand, it seemed inappropriate to say at the end of article 8, that the primary role of States was "introducing necessary changes in the social structure". That idea might possibly be mentioned in the part devoted to means and methods. He did not wish to make a formal proposal but merely to draw the Committee's attention to two points which he thought important.

44. Mr. UY (Philippines) said that he would vote against the Italian amendment because the idea it expressed was already implicit in article 8, which referred to "comprehensive development plans".

45. Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru) said that he wished to modify the sub-amendment which he had submitted orally by retaining the word "integrating" and following it by the words "and implementing".

46. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) was pleased that the representative of Peru had modified his sub-amendment, because the idea of integrating all efforts was extremely important. She regretted that she could not support the Italian amendment, which was out of place in the part devoted to principles.

47. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the French delegation for facilitating the Committee's work by withdrawing its amendment.

48. His delegation was unable to support the Italian amendment for the reasons already explained by the representatives of India and of the United Arab Republic. As for the amendment reintroduced by the Philippine delegation, he did not consider it justified and would vote for the original version of article 8.

49. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) said that she supported the Italian amendment, which she considered perfectly relevant. The ideas which it expressed were valid both for the developing countries and for developed countries like her own, where, especially in the north and the west, there was still widespread unemployment.

50. Mr. KALANGALI (Uganda) asked the Italian delegation to facilitate the work of the Committee by withdrawing its amendment so that the discussion could be closed.

51. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) said that he supported the basic idea of the Italian amendment but did not consider it justified, since article 8 already mentioned comprehensive development plans and necessary changes in the social structure.

52. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) thanked the United Kingdom representative for supporting her delegation's amendment. The ideas which it expressed were prompted by the experience of her own country, where the closing of the social gap between the north and the south was a precondition for social progress and economic development. A mere reference to "comprehensive development plans" did not express the same idea; it implied that the whole country should be developed and not that priority should be given to certain areas, which her delegation thought should be emphasized in a declaration on social development. Despite the apparent opposition of a majority of the members, her delegation therefore maintained its amendment, on which it requested a vote.

53. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) requested the Secretariat to amend the beginning of the French text of article 8 to read as follows: "Le rôle primordial et la responsabilité ultime des gouvernements..." in order to ensure concordance between the English and French texts.

54. The CHAIRMAN requested delegations to raise translation problems during the discussion, without waiting until the text was put to the vote.

55. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) said that he could not vote on the English text and was therefore obliged to ask for the necessary changes to be made in the French version. His delegation had raised that problem during the discussion and was surprised that the Committee should wish to vote without solving it.

The Italian amendment (A/C.3/L.1597, para. 2) to article 8 of the draft Declaration (A/7161, annex I) was adopted by 42 votes to 18, with 29 abstentions.

The Peruvian oral sub-amendment, proposing the addition of the words "and implementing" after the word "integrating" in the Philippine amendment (A/C.3/L.1604, para. 5) was rejected by 9 votes to 26, with 50 abstentions.

The Philippine amendment (A/C.3/L.1604, para. 5) to article 8 was adopted by 67 votes to 1, with 17 abstentions.

Article 8, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.