



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 48:	
Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (<i>continued</i>)	
Part II: Objectives (<i>continued</i>)	97

Chairman: Mrs. Turkia OULD DADDAH
(Mauritania).

AGENDA ITEM 48

**Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development
(continued) (A/7235 and Add.1 and 2, A/7648, A/C.3/
L.1666-1668, A/C.3/L.1669 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.1670,
A/C.3/L.1671, A/C.3/L.1672 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.1673/
Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1674, A/C.3/L.1675/Rev.1, A/C.3/
L.1676-1684, A/C.3/L.1686-1688, A/C.3/L.1689/Rev.1)**

PART II: OBJECTIVES (*continued*)

1. Mr. LEW (China) said that the Declaration on Social Progress and Development should reflect a recognition that the most basic economic needs of people in every land must be satisfied and that humanity aspired to higher material and spiritual levels of living in order to ensure the best possible conditions for the development of the human personality in harmony with the best interests of the nation and of the world community. However, scientific and technological progress was not synonymous with social progress. In fact, man had so far been unable to cope with the challenge of the scientific and technical progress he had made; in some countries, moral degradation seemed to accompany material development. Many of the innovations that could be anticipated during the remaining third of the twentieth century were expected to raise controversial moral issues concerning privacy, governmental or private power over individuals, over-centralization, dangerous new capabilities, and change too cataclysmic for smooth adjustment. He had called attention to those developments, not to criticize or condemn the developed countries or to denigrate the importance of technological or economic development, but to stress that the Committee must try to ensure that the social conditions accompanying great technological and economic change did not create worldwide anarchy.

2. All countries without exception were confronted by a common adversary, human degradation. No country was immune from attacks on the moral health of its people, nor was any country so invulnerable that it could afford to be self-righteous and complacent. Having adopted a resolution

on youth, the Committee must continue to concern itself with the welfare of young people and their potential contribution to social progress and development. The discussion on the present item should rise above ideology and politics; it concerned the upward direction of human society and all its members. If social development was the ultimate aim of all development, then moral development and the raising of ethical standards were no less indispensable than higher economic standards. He therefore supported the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1677.

3. Mr. TEPAVICHAROV (Bulgaria) observed that, although amendment A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 might improve the form and presentation of part II of the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (see A/7648, annex II), provided that other amendments could be fitted into it, there would nevertheless be some disadvantages to taking it as the basis of discussion. However desirable improvements of form might be, they were not essential if they detracted from the sense of the passage they sought to modify. In seeking to eliminate repetition and make the text more consistent, the sponsors of the amendment had omitted some important points in the original text which they believed belonged more properly to part III, concerning means and methods. If their amendment had related to the whole of parts II and III, the Committee would have been able to judge whether their contention was valid; since it related only to part II, the points that had been omitted might simply be lost unless the Committee took as its basis the whole draft as prepared by the Commission for Social Development and forwarded by the Economic and Social Council,¹ and reproduced in document A/7648, annex II. Moreover, if the Committee changed its method of work it would be faced with a flood of new amendments and might even have to reopen the general debate, because part III could no doubt also be reduced to two or three articles. The Committee could hardly ask the sponsors of amendments already submitted to withdraw their texts and resubmit them, or to work on the basis of a totally new text instead of on the basis of one long known in advance. All delegations would have to request fresh instructions from their Governments on amendment A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1, thus occasioning still further delay. He could see no advantage in adopting that amendment as the basis for the Committee's discussion instead of the original text, which had been carefully worked out and approved by the Commission for Social Development and submitted by the Economic and Social Council.

4. His delegation, together with the Mongolian delegation, had submitted an amendment (A/C.3/L.1683) to draw

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 5*, annex I.

attention to a general objective which they felt should be incorporated in the Declaration as the prerequisite for any social progress. While such an amendment could be inserted in the text set out in document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1, it would in that case have to be so general in wording as to be totally meaningless to the Governments to which it was directed.

5. Mr. LISITSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) pointed out that the Committee had not yet begun its work on the draft Declaration and said that, if it continued to use its time inefficiently, it might have to devote more meetings to the item under discussion than it had anticipated. The Committee must therefore begin its discussion of part II immediately. There was no reason for delay; it already had the text as drafted by the Commission for Social Development (see A/7648, annex II) and numerous amendments to it, one of which—the text in document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1—concerned the form as well as the content of part II of the draft Declaration. While his delegation, like others, would wish the Declaration to be as systematic and logical as possible, its content was more important than its form, and the Committee should concern itself first with the question of content. No one apparently objected to the content of the draft prepared by the Commission for Social Development; all delegations wished merely to improve it and make it more comprehensive.

6. His delegation considered that the original text provided a good basis for the Committee's work; it was more complete and finished than the amendment, and it had been carefully prepared by the Commission for Social Development. If the Committee rejected that text as the basis of its discussion, it would be casting undeserved doubt on the Commission's work. That draft had been studied carefully and at length by Governments. In his view, the Committee should begin immediately to consider the ideas set out in the Commission's draft, one by one, in the light of the relevant amendments. For example, when beginning with the idea of the elimination of hunger, it could consider the basic text and the amendments in documents A/C.3/L.1666, A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1676 and A/C.3/L.1678. He therefore proposed that the Committee should immediately begin its consideration of part II of the text drafted by the Commission for Social Development.

7. Mr. RESICH (Poland) recalled that the Committee had decided not to resume the general debate, but to begin the discussion of part II of the draft Declaration prepared by the Commission for Social Development. Thus, it had already taken a decision on which document would be the basis for its discussion.

8. While the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 attempted to systematize part II by dividing that part into the general and the specific, that was not the only criterion that could be adopted; moreover, the division into those categories made in the amendment was open to question. In any case, the question of form should be considered after the question of substance.

9. With regard to the introductory sentence of part II, his delegation supported amendment A/C.3/L.1672 and Corr.1 because it correctly defined social progress and development by stressing the need for a continuous raising of the

material and spiritual level of living of all members of society on the basis of an equitable distribution of the products and benefits of economic progress and by calling attention to the fact that States must actively take measures to improve the lot of their citizens. On the other hand, it could not support the Italian amendment (A/C.3/L.1675/Rev.1) because it dwelt only on equality of opportunity, which his delegation considered too minimal a demand.

10. Mrs. CABRERA (Mexico) said that, by incorporating in part II of the Declaration the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1677, of which Mexico was a sponsor, the Committee would fulfil a wish expressed in resolution XI of the International Conference on Human Rights² and in article II of UNESCO Declaration of the Principles of International Cultural Co-operation.³ The sponsors, which now included Nepal, would consider any suggestions regarding the positioning of the amendment in the text.

11. In her view, amendment A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 improved both the form and the content of the original text and eliminated much repetition. She urged the Committee to take it as the basis of its discussion, since all the amendments that had been submitted could be fitted into it.

12. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Committee should proceed immediately to consider part II of the text of the draft Declaration forwarded by the Economic and Social Council (see A/7648, annex II), as it had decided at its 1661st meeting.

13. His delegation, together with the Mongolian delegation, had submitted the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1667, which was self-explanatory. The word "industrial" before the word "health" in the proposed new paragraph 4 might be better translated in English by the word "occupational". The sponsors were prepared to enter into consultations with other delegations which had submitted amendments on the same subject with a view to agreeing on a consolidated text.

14. The amendment to paragraph 5 submitted by the same two delegations (A/C.3/L.1668) proposed the insertion of the words "Assurance of the right to education", for the sake of consistency; the additional sentence at the end of paragraph 5 was designed to strengthen the paragraph and to reflect the desire of many delegations to ensure the application of science and technology to social development. His delegation had also submitted an amendment to paragraph 7 (A/C.3/L.1669 and Corr.1) and was prepared to co-operate with other delegations in seeking a way of modifying the phrase "without any deduction", in order to make the amendment generally acceptable. In his view, the amendment to paragraph 9 sponsored by Mongolia, Poland and the USSR (A/C.3/L.1670) would strengthen part II of the draft Declaration and would be conducive to social development. The sponsors were prepared to co-operate

² See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), p. 12.

³ See United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, *Records of the General Conference, Fourteenth Session, Resolutions* (Paris, 1967), p. 86.

with the Swedish delegation, which had also introduced an amendment to paragraph 9 (A/C.3/L.1679, para. 2), with a view to combining the two amendments.

15. His delegation was prepared to support the amendments submitted by Mongolia and Romania (A/C.3/L.1672 and Corr.1), Sierra Leone (A/C.3/L.1676) and Ghana (A/C.3/L.1681) although in the latter case some clarification would be needed with regard to the amendment to paragraph 3.

16. His delegation was not in favour of using document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 as the basic working document. All the paragraphs except two differed substantially from the provisions of the Economic and Social Council text (see A/7648, annex II). His delegation had no objection in principle to redrafting part II and combining various paragraphs, but it was categorically opposed to any change in substance, which would only weaken the draft Declaration. His delegation would co-operate with others, and in particular with those whose amendments would improve and strengthen the substance of the draft Declaration, but amendment A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 was a retrograde step. The Committee should proceed as soon as possible to its substantive work, in a spirit of co-operation and understanding, on the basis of the Economic and Social Council text.

17. Mr. Nagendera SINGH (India) said that there were three possible methods of dealing with the amendments before the Committee. The first was to vote on each and every amendment which would be extremely complicated and confusing because there were so many of them. The Committee should resort to that method only if all else failed. The second method was an article-by-article study of the various documents before the Committee, which would be too time-consuming. The third and most appropriate way of dealing with the amendments would be for the Committee to appoint an amendments committee composed of those delegations which had submitted amendments and five or six others appointed by the Chairman to ensure that it was fully representative. However, before such a committee could begin work, the full Committee would have to take a decision on the basic issue of which draft of part II it was to use as its working document. The amendments committee could then meet and reduce the number of amendments by eliminating repetition and duplication.

18. Mr. GYARMATI (Hungary) said that he would like to know the precise nature of document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1. It might be thought that it was intended to constitute articles 10 and 11 of part I of the draft Declaration or that it could be regarded as an independent proposal, in which case the Committee, if it were to adopt it, might set a dangerous precedent.

19. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) said that document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 was more than a rearrangement of the provisions of the original text. Although the rearrangement of articles presented no difficulty for his delegation, the substantive changes made in that document and the omission of certain well-balanced provisions which had been carefully studied by a functional commission of the Economic and Social Council were not acceptable. If the

Committee decided to take amendment A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 as its basic working document, many delegations would feel bound to submit sub-amendments in order to reintroduce essential elements of the original text which were frequently the subject of national legislation and which were omitted from the amendment. Furthermore, the introductory sentence of the proposed article 10 needed reformulating, since it gave the impression that social progress and development were to be considered entirely in terms of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

20. His delegation supported the amendments proposed by Mongolia and Romania (A/C.3/L.1672 and Corr.1) and by Iraq (A/C.3/L.1678). It considered that the second part of the Italian amendment (A/C.3/L.1675/Rev.1) was a statement of procedures rather than objectives and was therefore more suitable for inclusion in part III of the draft Declaration. In order to clarify and simplify the Committee's work, he suggested that the Secretariat should prepare, as soon as possible, a comparative table of the amendments that had been submitted.⁴

21. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation was in favour of using document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 as the basic text. That formulation made it quite clear that the supreme objective was the advancement of the individual, and every effort should be made to ensure that Governments acted to achieve the objectives set out therein.

22. She hoped that the sponsors of that text would agree to incorporate in it various other amendments, particularly those contained in documents A/C.3/L.1666, A/C.3/L.1682 and A/C.3/L.1677. Furthermore, in order to take into account the concern expressed in the Committee, she proposed that the word "free" should be inserted before the word "education" in the fifth paragraph of the proposed article 10.

23. She was sure that the Committee would simplify its work if it followed the same procedure as at the preceding session and took the comprehensive amendment as the basic working document.

24. Mr. COLL (Venezuela) felt that the original text (see A/7648, annex II) should be taken as the basic working document. As a member of the Commission for Social Development and of the Working Party which had drafted that text, his delegation thought that the Committee should begin its consideration and analysis of it forthwith.

25. Mr. ZAHEDI (Iran) and Mr. IDDIR (Algeria) said that they agreed with the Indian delegation's suggestion, which would help to reduce the number of amendments.

26. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) pointed out that all the amendments had been submitted to the original text, for which no amendment, however comprehensive, could be considered a substitute. If the Committee nevertheless decided to use the text in document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1, many of the amendments which had been submitted would have to be resubmitted.

⁴ Subsequently circulated as document A/C.3/L.1691.

27. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) said that, although he did not object in principle to the ideas set forth in document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1, Governments were already committed to the Economic and Social Council text, and the Committee should therefore consider the new version simply an amendment which, if adopted, would be incorporated in the draft Declaration. Furthermore, all the amendments submitted related to the original text. In order to expedite its work, the Committee should follow the procedure suggested by the representative of India and urge the sponsors of amendments to hold consultations with a view to reducing the number of proposals before the Committee.

28. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) pointed out that, in addition to the original text forwarded by the Economic and Social Council, there were before the Committee two amendments which constituted complete redrafts—documents A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.1689/Rev.1. If the Committee decided to take either of the comprehensive amendments as its basic working document, many of the amendments to the original text would be resubmitted as sub-amendments and the time-limit for the submission of amendments would not apply.

29. Mr. LEMAITRE (Colombia) said that, having considered all the texts before the Committee, his delegation considered that document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 should be taken as the basis for the Committee's work. He did not agree with the USSR representative that it was a less progressive text; in substance, it was the equal of the original version. Its advantages were that its structure was more rational and logical, that it was shorter, more elegant and more intelligible, and that it did not have the drafting defects of the Economic and Social Council text.

30. He supported the Indian suggestion and thought that delegations should engage in consultations as soon as possible, in order to expedite the Committee's work.

31. Mr. GHAOUCY (Afghanistan) agreed that the Committee should take a decision at once regarding which text it was to use as the basis for its deliberations. He also supported the Indian representative's suggestion.

32. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that amendment A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 was so similar to the original draft prepared by the Commission for Social Development that the sponsors believed it could serve as the basic document. Should the Committee take a decision to that effect, all other amendments which had been submitted would automatically refer to that text and not to the original draft.

33. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) recalled that at the 1664th meeting she had expressed the hope that the sponsors of the various amendments would meet with a view to submitting a common text. Unfortunately, amendments had continued to proliferate, and the situation was now complicated further by a second document (A/C.3/L.1689/Rev.1) apparently designed to replace the whole of part II of the draft Declaration. The sponsors of that text should state whether they wished it to be regarded as the basic document or whether it was merely an amendment to the original draft.

34. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) replied that document A/C.3/L.1689/Rev.1 was a far-reaching amendment in which the sponsors had endeavoured to incorporate and synthesize some of the amendments submitted by other delegations. However, the draft forwarded by the Economic and Social Council would still stand as the original text.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that the Chair could not take a decision on behalf of the Committee, which must decide whether document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 should be regarded as an amendment or as the basic text. If it was deemed to be an amendment, then clearly the dead-line for the submission of amendments had passed and the original draft would therefore constitute the basis of discussion. On the other hand, if some members felt that it should be used in the manner suggested by the sponsors, the Committee must take a vote on the matter.

36. Mr. PARDOS (Spain) supported by Mrs. AMONOO-NEIZER (Ghana), said that, if the Committee was to use a new basic document, all the amendments would have to be reformulated. Consequently, it would be better to examine the draft prepared by the Commission for Social Development article by article, and he appealed to the sponsors of amendment A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 not to press for a vote.

37. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) agreed with the representative of Spain but said it was her understanding that, if document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 was to be considered an amendment to the original draft, no time-limit had been set for the submission of sub-amendments.

38. Mr. GYARMATI (Hungary) said that, in his view, the Committee had before it only one basic document (see A/7648, annex II). If, however, the Committee voted in favour of using another text, his delegation would require further time to consider the relevant documents.

39. The CHAIRMAN felt that the Indian suggestion that an amendments committee should be set up was most valuable, as it would greatly facilitate the task of the Committee if all the sponsors met to harmonize their views and produce either a single text or fewer amendments.

40. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) agreed with the Chairman, but considered that the sponsors should meet informally; otherwise, their discussions might be hampered by procedural and other difficulties.

41. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) observed that the delegations which had submitted documents A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.1689/Rev.1 had stated that their texts were amendments. Consequently, the Committee faced no problem, and she was of the opinion that sponsors could meet with a view to producing a smaller number of amendments or a joint text. It should be an easy matter for some representatives to withdraw their proposals.

42. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that the sponsors of document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 were all agreed on the necessity of holding consultations with other delegations in an effort to arrive at a satisfactory text. Nevertheless, it would not be advisable to establish a subsidiary committee, even informally, as it would produce a new version which might in turn be regarded as a basic document. The

delegations which had submitted document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 were fully prepared to contact the sponsors of the various amendments and would give careful consideration to all suggestions, but they still considered that their formulation should be used by the Committee as the basic document—a course which, as pointed out earlier, would not preclude discussion of all the other amendments, since the latter would automatically apply to document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1. Furthermore, the original draft could always be used for reference purposes.

43. Mr. BABAA (Libya) agreed that the sponsors of amendments should hold discussions with one another. However, since they would probably need to hold more than one meeting, it might be useful to entrust them with the task of arriving at an agreed text, and the Committee could in the meantime take up another item.

44. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan) expressed his admiration for the patience and wisdom with which the Chairman had guided the Committee, and said that the draft forwarded by the Economic and Social Council should form the basis of discussion. Since a formally established committee might not reach agreement, the best course would be for all the sponsors of amendments to meet informally.

45. Mr. BARRY (Guinea) remarked that amendments had been submitted on the understanding that they related to the version prepared by the Commission for Social Development, which therefore constituted the basic document. In order to avoid putting the matter to the vote, it would be advisable for the various groups to meet, and he supported the idea of establishing a committee.

46. Mr. CEAUSU (Romania), speaking on a point of order, stated that, since the Committee had accepted amendments submitted to part II of the draft Declaration as reproduced in document A/7648, annex II, it should agree that the text prepared by the Commission for Social

Development formed the basis of its work. He requested the Chairman to give a ruling under rule 114 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

47. The CHAIRMAN said she had understood initially that the Committee wished to consider the text contained in document A/7648, annex II, and the amendments thereto. The problem with which the Committee was faced could be solved by arranging an informal meeting of all the sponsors. However, if the delegations which had submitted document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 wished it to be regarded as a basic document, the Committee would decide the matter by taking a vote.

48. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) formally proposed that the text contained in document A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.1 should be considered the basic document for the Committee's consideration of part II of the draft Declaration.

49. Mr. TEPAVICHAROV (Bulgaria) felt that a vote should be taken on both texts and, in the case of the draft contained in document A/7648, annex II, by roll-call. However, he would leave the matter entirely in the hands of the Chairman.

50. The CHAIRMAN replied that it was not necessary to vote on the question of using the original draft, as it had been submitted to the Committee by the Economic and Social Council.

The Upper Volta proposal was rejected by 47 votes to 32, with 21 abstentions.

51. The CHAIRMAN said that, in its future consideration of the item, the Committee would deal with the text of part II of the draft Declaration reproduced in document A/7648, annex II, paragraph by paragraph.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.