

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 1598th
MEETING

Wednesday, 6 November 1968,
at 10.55 a.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.4, A/C.3/
L.1587, A/C.3/L.1594, A/C.3/L.1595, A/C.3/
L.1597, A/C.3/L.1599-1602, A/C.3/L.1603/Rev.1,
A/C.3/L.1604, A/C.3/L.1605, A/C.3/L.1608, A/
C.3/L.1610, A/C.3/L.1611)

PART I: PRINCIPLES (continued)

Article 5 (continued)

1. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said that he was making some changes in his amendment (A/C.3/L.1611) to the amendment of the Latin American countries (A/C.3/L.1603/Rev.1), with a view to arriving at a common text for the last paragraph of article 5 that would be satisfactory to the majority. The word "disadvantaged" would be replaced by "underprivileged", and the word "full" by "equal"; the words "of the population" would be inserted after the word "sectors", and the phrase "in order to achieve a fully integrated society" would be added at the end of the text. However, if the Latin American sponsors did not find those changes acceptable, his delegation was prepared to withdraw them.

2. Mr. ARTAZA (Chile) said that, after consulting some of the sponsors, he was prepared to accept the United Arab Republic sub-amendment, despite the fact that the new text was not entirely satisfactory to him, in that the use of less technical and precise language resulted in the dilution of certain ideas, especially those of "incorporation" and "participation".

3. Mr. JHA (India) noted that the French delegation had taken only some of his suggestions into account in the revised amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4). He was therefore withdrawing those suggestions and would support the Bulgarian amendment (A/C.3/L.1610), which conformed more realistically and completely to the original article 5 (see A/7161, annex I). He wished, however, to introduce an amendment to that amendment, which would consist of the insertion, after the word "freedoms", of the words

"and of making the individual aware of the changing conditions in society".

4. Mr. SIRI (El Salvador) commended the United Arab Republic delegation for its constructive endeavor and said that, although he had the same objections as had been expressed by Chile with regard to that delegation's sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1611), he was inclined to accept that text as orally revised. He was glad that the meaning of the words "integration" and "marginal sectors" had remained clear, so that no ambiguities of any kind would arise. He was also glad that a very specific reference to the marginality of certain sectors of society, which was one of the most serious social evils of the modern world, was being included in the draft Declaration. To omit such a reference would be a great injustice, and would also leave the important document under discussion incomplete. The existence of marginal sectors, which was the common concern of Latin American countries, also afflicted many others; however, it was apparent to him that States were making tremendous efforts to bring about the effective integration of national communities.

5. He urged all delegations to support the inclusion of the sub-amendment in the text of article 5 as proposed by France (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4).

6. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that, in the revised version of his amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4), he had introduced certain changes in the light of the suggestions made by numerous delegations. In the introductory sentence, he had replaced the word "implicque" by comporte. In the second paragraph he had deleted the words "systematic" and "social", and he had expanded and revised the third paragraph. In passing, he pointed out some discrepancies in the English version; in the first part of his amendment, the words "le progrès et le développement dans le domaine social" should be rendered in English as "social progress and development", and in the third paragraph the word "objectives" should read "goals".^{1/}

7. His amendment reproduced the ideas of the original article 5, while taking into account developments in the social field since the time when the draft Declaration had been prepared and also the comments and observations of Member States which had not had the opportunity to participate in its drafting. He welcomed the United Arab Republic suggestions with regard to the amendment of the Latin American countries, and was prepared to incorporate that new paragraph in his article. He might wish to speak again after the representative of Bulgaria had introduced his sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1610).

^{1/} A corrected English version of the French amendment was subsequently circulated as document A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4*.

8. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran), speaking on a point of order, said he considered it inadmissible that the Committee's work should be slowed down because of discrepancies in translation which caused delay and confusion. He did not see why, for instance, in the English version of the revised French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4) the words "tous les éléments de la société" had been translated as "all social groups", when the English text of the original article 5 read "all elements of society", which would be the correct translation.^{1/}

9. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) introduced an amendment (A/C.3/L.1610) to the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4). The text was basically the same as the original article 5, but it took into account the comments which had been made during the debate. He accepted the Indian proposal that the words "and of making the individual aware of the changing conditions in society" should be inserted after the word "freedoms".

10. His delegation agreed with the representative of Iran on the question of translations. In that connexion, he pointed out that in the English, French and Spanish versions of his amendment the words "of the population" should be deleted. He invited representatives to express their views on the amendment he had submitted.

11. Mr. ZORRILLA (Mexico) supported the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4) in principle and said that, although he feared that the incorporation of new articles and paragraphs would unduly lengthen the text of the Declaration, he supported the sub-amendment of the Latin American countries (A/C.3/L.1603/Rev.1). However, he believed that a few words should be added, in order to clarify its meaning. He suggested, for instance, the following wording: "the incorporation and total participation of the marginal sectors of the population in order to achieve their full integration into the mainstream of economic and social progress". Thus, none of the valuable concepts in the Latin American sub-amendment would be deleted. In his view, the United Arab Republic sub-amendment also contained elements which the sponsors could use.

12. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) noted that there appeared to be a consensus in the Committee on the proposal that the idea of the integration of the marginal sectors of society should be incorporated in the draft Declaration, and said that his country also supported the amendment of the Latin American countries. He suggested, however, that the words "effectively integrated" should be used, instead of "fully integrated".

13. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) supported the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4) and withdrew his delegation's amendment to article 5 (A/C.3/L.1604, para. 3). In his view, the United Arab Republic amendment (A/C.3/L.1611) to the Latin America sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1603/Rev.1) was an improvement, but he drew attention to the fact that, in it, the reference to the participation of the marginal sectors had been deleted. He therefore proposed that the word "for" after "opportunities" should be replaced by the words "to participate in" and that the words "and to benefit therefrom" should be added at the end of the paragraph.

14. The purpose of the Bulgarian amendment (A/C.3/L.1610) was apparently to restore the original text of article 5, with a few changes. He pointed out in that connexion that it also relapsed into the repetition which had been a weakness of the original text, although in a different sense, by referring both to conditions of full employment of the population and to full and active participation of all elements of society.

15. Mrs. PICKER (United States of America) supported the new version of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4), but said that the most suitable English translation of the word "informations" in the second paragraph would be "information", instead of "new".

16. Her delegation also supported the United Arab Republic sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1611), although it regretted that the representative of the United Arab Republic had replaced the word "disadvantaged" in the English text by "underprivileged", which seemed to have rather a condescending tone.

17. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that he could not accept the Bulgarian sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1610), and he was surprised that it had been submitted after the constructive debate which had taken place concerning the third paragraph of the amendment submitted by his delegation (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4). The Bulgarian proposal disregarded all the substantive comments made by many delegations which had not previously had the opportunity to take a hand in the formulation of the draft Declaration, and it ignored the fact that the active participation of all elements of society, which was mentioned in the paragraph in question, could occur only within the context of the fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Moreover, while he did not wish to raise a procedural issue, he felt that the Bulgarian proposal was an amendment to the original text of article 5, rather than to the amendment which his own delegation had submitted.

18. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) proposed the deletion of the words "and in their own community" in the second paragraph of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4), since the Declaration should not accentuate differences based on religious, ethnic, linguistic or similar considerations.

19. He was glad that the representative of Bulgaria had incorporated the Indian delegation's proposal in his sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1610), and he suggested that the words "as a whole" should be added after the word "society".

20. He associated himself with the comments made by the representative of Peru at the 1597th meeting and expressed his delegation's support for the sub-amendment introduced by the representative of the United Arab Republic (A/C.3/L.1611).

21. Mr. VASS (Hungary) said that he supported the original version of article 5, although he was ready to agree to any changes that would improve it, such as the Bulgarian sub-amendment, which incorporated certain positive ideas from the French amendment while retaining the concepts set forth in the text prepared by the Commission for Social Development.

22. His delegation was in favour of including in the Declaration a reference to the marginal sectors of

the population, and he supported the proposal made by the Latin American countries to that effect with the changes proposed by the representative of the United Arab Republic.

23. Miss KHUHRO (Pakistan) welcomed the United Arab Republic sub-amendment, which clarified and made more specific the content of the sub-amendment submitted by the Latin American countries. She agreed with the United States representative concerning the use of the word "underprivileged" in the English version of the United Arab Republic sub-amendment.

24. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) thought that the original text of article 5, with slight changes such as those suggested at the preceding meeting by the United Kingdom delegation, would be a more acceptable and less controversial formulation than that proposed in the French amendment.

25. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) agreed with the representative of Lebanon and said that he had submitted his sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1611) as a precaution, on the assumption that the Committee would decide to vote on the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4) instead of the original text of article 5.

26. With regard to the comments of the representatives of the United States and Pakistan concerning the use of the word "underprivileged", he said that his delegation was prepared to consider any suggestion or sub-amendments on that point.

27. In connexion with the Iranian proposal, he acknowledged that in his sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1611) he had omitted the reference to the participation of the marginal sectors of the population, but the reason was that that point was included in the third paragraph of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4), to which his sub-amendment related. However, if the representative of Iran pressed his proposal, he would have no difficulty in accepting it.

28. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said it was true that the subject of participation was included in the third paragraph of the French amendment, and he would not press his proposal, provided that should the French amendment be rejected, the United Arab Republic sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1611) was not subsequently submitted as an amendment to the original text of article 5.

29. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) said that in the English version of the third paragraph of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4) she would prefer the expression "all elements", as used in the original text of article 5, to the words "all social groups".^{1/} She also thought it incongruous to suggest, in the same paragraph, that the active participation of all elements of society could occur "individually".

30. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) proposed that in the third paragraph of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4) the words "in defining and" should be inserted before the words "in achieving the common goals", since it was a generally recognized fact that there must be genuine participation not only in achieving goals but also in defining them.

31. She also wished to make a change in the oral amendment to that paragraph which her delegation

had submitted at the preceding meeting; the words "granting timely aid on an equal basis" should be replaced by "shall take into consideration the principle of providing equal aid".

32. She agreed with the representative of France that the Bulgarian sub-amendment appeared to be an amendment to the original text of article 5, rather than to the French amendment, and she felt that the Committee should decide which text was to be used as the basis for its work.

33. Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru) said that he preferred the original text of article 5 because the French amendment gave rise to difficulties of interpretation, particularly in the case of the second paragraph with its reference to the community and its further reference to the dissemination of information, which appeared to presuppose the existence of an entity responsible for carrying on such activities. If what was meant was that social progress and development required the free circulation of information, a wording more closely reflecting that idea should be used.

34. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the revised version of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4) had not taken into account the objections voiced by his delegation to both the second paragraph and the third; the latter omitted to mention governmental participation, which was so important, since Governments were the parties responsible for preparing and implementing social development plans. Nor did he understand why the reference to fundamental freedoms in that third paragraph was limited to those established in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and did not include, for example, those set forth in the United Nations Charter or in the International Covenants on Human Rights.

35. The Bulgarian sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1610), on the other hand, considerably improved the French amendment while retaining some very valuable concepts from the original text of article 5.

36. His delegation would have no difficulty in agreeing to the sub-amendment of the Latin American countries (A/C.3/L.1603/Rev.1) with the changes proposed by the representative of the United Arab Republic (A/C.3/L.1611), as orally revised, and unlike other delegations it would prefer the word "underprivileged", rather than "disadvantaged", in the English version.

37. The meaning of the Italian sub-amendment was not clear, and its reference to measures of a preventive nature would be more appropriate in a panel than in a social context.

38. Mr. BASCOUR (Belgium) said that the Bulgarian sub-amendment would have the effect of restoring the original text of article 5, disregarding the whole debate on the subject which had taken place in the Committee. The revised French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4), on the other hand, did not reflect the wishes of only one delegation but summarized views expressed during the discussion. For those reasons, he could not support the Bulgarian amendment and would in favour of the French amendment.

39. Mrs. RAOELINA (Madagascar) said that she could not support the Bulgarian amendment, which,

in calling for the full employment of the population and the active and total participation of all elements of society in an endeavour to achieve common social objectives, might provide an excuse for the complete enslavement of man by the State in the interest of its own goals, rather than in the interest of society. She favoured the French amendment, on which a consensus seemed to have been reached.

40. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that the attempts to co-ordinate and combine the numerous ideas that had been proposed for incorporation into the original text of article 5, which was not perfect but was at least comprehensible, had not produced very satisfactory results. Nevertheless, she could agree to the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.4), although she felt that the first two paragraphs constituted means and methods rather than principles. She had no objection to the inclusion of the words "and in their own community" in the second paragraph, but she felt that the text would be equally clear without them. With regard to the third paragraph of the French amendment, she suggested that the expression "elements of society"—which, judging by the following words, referred to individuals—should be replaced by "members of society". Although she considered that the existing wording clearly expressed the basic idea of the paragraph, namely, that the participation of individuals in social development was necessary but should not be mandatory, she proposed that the words "with respect for" should be replaced by "with due regard to", an expression traditionally used in the United Nations when it was necessary to balance ideas.

41. She believed that nearly all the ideas embodied in the Bulgarian sub-amendment were also to be found in the French amendment, and she was surprised that some delegations could defend one and attack the other. In her view, full employment was an objective, and not a principle, of social development, and it could not be laid down as a prerequisite for social progress. Consequently, she could not agree to the inclusion of the Bulgarian text in part I (Principles) of the draft Declaration. Furthermore, she was puzzled about the positioning of the phrase proposed by India which was not connected with the recognition of fundamental freedoms, but rather with the participation of individuals in social development.

42. She had no difficulty in supporting the Latin American amendment, with the sub-amendment submitted by the United Arab Republic, since she had no doubt about the meaning of the expression "marginal sectors of the population".

43. With regard to the Italian oral sub-amendment, she agreed that the provision of social welfare services was a basic principle of social development, but she felt that that idea was out of place in the article under discussion.

44. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the protracted debate had caused the Committee to lose sight of the main purpose of its work, namely, to enunciate clearly and precisely

the basic principles of social development. Although he realized that the intention of the delegations which had spoken was to improve the original text (A/7161, annex I), he felt that their efforts had produced the opposite effect. For example, the French amendment sought to divide the original article 5 into three paragraphs, the sub-amendment of the Latin American countries and the United Arab Republic would add a fourth, and the Italian oral sub-amendment sought to add a fifth—all of which served only to complicate the original text. In order to remedy that unsatisfactory situation, the Committee had two alternatives: it could take the original text of article 5 as a basis and adopt amendments which improved it, or it could use the text proposed by Bulgaria, which incorporated the basic ideas of the original text and the suggestions made during the debate.

45. Mr. TSAO (China) agreed with the representative of Jamaica that the word "elements", in the last paragraph of the French amendment should be replaced by the word "members". Although he had no objection to the second change in the same paragraph proposed by Jamaica, he would prefer the retention of the words "with respect for" and the insertion of the word "full" before "respect", which would make the wording more forceful. Lastly, he disapproved of using the word "established" in connexion with fundamental freedoms in the English version of the paragraph, since he considered that those freedoms were inalienable and had always existed.

46. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) expressed surprise at the French delegation's interpretation of his sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1610), and observed that attempts should not be made to read into the text ideas which it did not state. His delegation's sub-amendment, like the French amendment, was based on the original text, and both therefore expressed the same ideas. The Bulgarian sub-amendment merely sought to emphasize one of the basic ideas which must be included in the draft Declaration, namely, that the mass of the population should participate in social progress in the freest possible way and in the appropriate manner. The idea of full employment was not new; it was mentioned in the Charter of the United Nations and had been stressed in other United Nations documents. In his view, full employment was an important, if not an immediate, objective of social progress. In deference to the comments which had been made in that connexion, he had decided that the words inserted in his sub-amendment at the suggestion of India should be preceded by the words "and the need to create".

47. It had been suggested that the words "and in their own community" and "individually or through associations", in the second and third paragraphs of the French amendment, should be deleted; in his view, that would improve the text considerably. Although he preferred his own sub-amendment, he would consider not pressing it, provided that the French delegation agreed to those deletions.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.