



Wednesday, 29 November 1967,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Tribute to the memory of Mr. Léon Mba, President of the Gabonese Republic</i>	373
<i>Agenda item 49:</i>	
<i>World social situation: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued)</i>	373

Chairman: Mrs. Mara RADIĆ (Yugoslavia).

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Léon Mba, President of the Gabonese Republic

1. The CHAIRMAN extended condolences on behalf of the Committee to the Government and people of Gabon on the death of their President, Mr. Léon Mba.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the members of the Committee observed a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of the President of the Gabonese Republic.

AGENDA ITEM 49

World social situation: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/6703 and Corr.1, chap. VI, sect. III and chap. XI, sect. I; A/6826, E/4324 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.1495, A/C.3/L.1496/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.1497/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1499)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued)

2. Mr. PIPARSANIA (India) introduced, on behalf of the sponsors, a revised text of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1496/Rev.2); he said that they took into account the suggestion made at the previous meeting by the representative of Upper Volta to delete the last phrase of operative paragraph 4 and that the other suggestions were still being considered.

3. Mrs. MUTER (Indonesia) said she would support the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1496/Rev.2) because she thought it would help to accelerate social progress; she was also in favour of the seven-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1497/Rev.1), which nicely supplemented the joint draft resolution.

4. Mr. A. A. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) emphasized the complexity of the item under discussion, which, he said, would be unproductive if it did not address itself to specific points, since the general nature of the subject-matter made any over-all consideration of the world social situation useless. He therefore welcomed the fact that the second statement of the Director of the Social Development Division, at the

1530th meeting, had drawn attention to such concrete questions as land reform and planning techniques, and for the same reason he believed that the Report on the World Social Situation should not be drafted in general terms but should be broken down into specific topics, with detailed indications of the activities of the United Nations bodies in the various sectors.

5. Referring to the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1496/Rev.2) he expressed surprise that it had been put forward, in view of the fact that 1967 was an interim year so far as the Report on the World Social Situation was concerned. What was more, the draft resolution served no purpose because while it referred to various problems in the social field it offered no solutions and nothing else of a constructive nature.

6. Referring to the amendments submitted by his delegation (A/C.3/L.1499), as the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution stated that the world social situation remained unsatisfactory but did not specify the reasons, he had proposed that the paragraph should be replaced by a new text. He also suggested that a new paragraph should be added to the preamble, with a corresponding paragraph in the operative part, which would underline the responsibilities assumed by Member States under the Charter with respect to international co-operation in the solution of international social and economic problems, an aspect which appeared to be reflected in the seven-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1497/Rev.1), but not in adequate terms since the need for a considerable expansion of international assistance was linked to the success of the next United Nations Development Decade. His delegation had submitted amendments that were more outspoken and forthright because it did not think there was anything wrong in asking Governments to fulfil the obligations they had assumed.

7. Lastly, in connexion with operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, he considered premature expressions of appreciation to the Commission for Social Development on the progress achieved in preparing the draft declaration on social development, when it had not even submitted a preliminary draft, and that opinion was reflected in the relevant amendment submitted by his delegation.

8. Miss O'LEARY (Ireland) said that her delegation supported the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1496/Rev.2), the seven-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1497/Rev.1) and the Nigerian amendments (A/C.3/L.1499), subject to certain considerations. In the case of the new operative paragraph 3 proposed by the seven Powers, her delegation would vote for it on the understanding that its provisions did not prejudge other resolutions of the General Assembly, or their implementation, or the position of Governments in relation to such

decisions. It would also vote for operative paragraph 4 of the joint draft resolution on the understanding that the "high priority" it referred to did not imply undue haste of a kind that would jeopardize careful and thorough consideration of the draft declaration. In particular, the Irish delegation wished to associate itself with the many delegations which during the general debate had expressed the view that the draft declaration should be referred to Governments for comments. It was particularly important for Governments whose delegations were not members of the Commission for Social Development to be able to consider and comment on the draft declaration before it was presented to the General Assembly.

9. The Irish delegation considered that the statement of the Director of the Social Development Division (A/C.3/L.1495) should be included in the documents to be transmitted to the Commission for Social Development in connexion with the preparation of the draft declaration, and suggested the insertion of the words "together with the statement, *in extenso*, of the Director of the Social Development Division (A/C.3/L.1495)" after the words "World social situation" in operative paragraph 5 of the joint draft resolution.

10. Miss AFNAN (Iraq) said with reference to the remarks of the representative of Nigeria that the main responsibility of delegations was to consider the item on the world social situation, which in her view was one of the most important items on the agenda, whether or not it was more or less vague.

11. The Iraqi delegation believed that it was still too early to assess the results of the re-evaluation by the Commission for Social Development, and that was why no reference was made to it in the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1496/Rev.2), of which Iraq was a co-sponsor. As to the request made to the Secretary-General in operative paragraph 3 of that draft resolution, its purpose was to emphasize the interest with which the General Assembly looked forward to the next report on the world social situation.

12. Referring to the amendments proposed by Nigeria (A/C.3/L.1499), she did not agree with the approach adopted in the proposed new operative paragraph. There was a United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); it was Governments which made requests to that body for the assistance they considered appropriate, and it was Governments which decided whether such assistance should be used for social development or for other purposes; therefore, it was not for the Committee to tell Governments or UNDP how the available funds should be used. As to the Nigerian amendments to operative paragraph 4 of the joint draft resolution, she said that the appreciation expressed in that paragraph on the progress achieved by the Commission for Social Development in the preparation of the draft declaration was very sincere. The progress was real, for the preamble, the principles, the objectives, and the procedures and methods (E/4324 and Corr.1, chap. III and annex III, appendix 1) had already been drafted.

13. She considered the suggestion of the representative of Ireland concerning the statement by the Director of the Social Development Division very

useful but pointed out that there were not one but two statements by the Director which should be mentioned. The seven-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1497/Rev.1) contained some very constructive notions; recognition of the interdependence of the economic and social aspects of development was an idea that should be acceptable to the sponsors of the draft resolution. She welcomed the clarification that had been made in the revised version of the new operative paragraph 4 proposed by the seven Powers by the inclusion of the reference, in connexion with the needs of developing countries in the social field, to requests by Governments.

14. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said there no need to prove that Governments were more interested in economic development than social development, and therefore his delegation supported the joint draft resolution. He wished to thank the representative of India for accepting his suggestion concerning operative paragraph 4. He regretted, however, that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had not included the other suggestions he had made at the previous meeting.

15. Referring to the revised seven-Power amendments, he observed that the new operative paragraphs 3 and 4 might be reworded so as to meet the wishes of the representative of Nigeria.

16. As to the Nigerian amendments, he felt that, while many delegations would agree that his ideas were correct, others might object to the way in which they were put, particularly as concerned the reference to the contribution of developed countries in the new text proposed for the second preambular paragraph and he thought that if the relevant provision of the seven-Power amendment was suitably modified, that of Nigeria could be dispensed with provided that the Nigerian representative agreed.

17. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that her delegation welcomed the draft resolution and the amendments thereto, since they reflected the concern expressed by several delegations during the general debate, and the wish that the Committee should give continuous consideration to the world social situation. In a spirit of co-operation with the sponsors, she would like, however, to make a few comments on some of the provisions. With reference to the third paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution, which mentioned the lack of co-ordination among projects for technical assistance in the social field, the representative of Upper Volta had pointed out at the previous meeting that some steps had already been made towards better co-ordination; one of those steps was the review of technical co-operation activities in that field, and her delegation considered that reference should be made to that in the draft resolution. Another, even more important, step were the new procedures approved by the Governing Council of UNDP at its fourth session. In view of those two steps, her delegation considered that, instead of deploring the lack of co-ordination, the draft resolution should welcome the arrangements that had been made and, above all, express the hope that the specialized agencies would co-operate fully to develop a country approach to social needs rather than a sectoral one. She therefore supported the Upper Volta representa-

tive's proposal, and suggested in turn that the sponsors of the draft resolution should consider the possibility of inserting between operative paragraphs 2 and 3 a new paragraph calling upon the United Nations and the specialized agencies to develop such a co-ordinated approach on a country basis.

18. So far as concerned operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, her delegation had already drawn attention to the desirability of sending the draft declaration on social development to all Member States for their comments. She would therefore like to express her appreciation to the sponsors of the draft resolution for deleting the last part of the paragraph relating to the submission of the draft declaration to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session. Since, moreover, some delegations had referred in the general debate to the social, economic and political systems of their countries, she considered that the transmission of the summary records to the Commission for Social Development should be confined to those parts which strictly dealt with the draft declaration.

19. With reference to the new operative paragraph 3 proposed by the seven Powers in which the Member States were requested to respond to the Secretary-General's appeal for an expansion of international assistance for development, she observed that a similar request was to be found in the report of the Second Committee.^{1/} Her delegation had voted for that request in the Second Committee and was prepared to take up the same position if the new paragraph in question was put to the vote in the Third Committee. It was nevertheless her opinion that such a request did not properly fall within the competence of the Third Committee, which should be concerned with the share of international assistance for social projects, rather than with the level of such assistance. She therefore suggested that the sponsors of the new paragraph should amend it accordingly.

20. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution, and the seven Powers for accepting the suggestions that had been made to them. She shared the views of the representative of Upper Volta and regarded as constructive the proposal that had been made by the representative of Ireland. She shared the views of the Iraqi representative on the new operative paragraph and the amendments to operative paragraph 4 submitted by Nigeria. Lastly, with reference to new text of the second preambular paragraph proposed by Nigeria, she said that though she was perfectly aware of the shortage of international assistance, it was in her opinion a delusion to regard that as the only reason for the unsatisfactoriness of the present world social situation. Other factors, such as military expenditure and the misuse of resources in the developing countries, were also important.

21. Mr. NETTEL (Austria) said he did not consider satisfactory the proposal in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. It seemed to him that the summary records of the discussions on such an important item as the world social situation would in any case be

transmitted by the Secretary-General to the Commission for Social Development, without its being necessary for an Assembly resolution to ask him to do so. The paragraph therefore added unnecessarily to the text. He also asked that the oral amendments that had been presented should be submitted in writing.

22. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that, though its aim was laudable, the draft resolution seemed to him partly procedural and partly purely academic. It was procedural because it asked the Commission for Social Development to prepare a declaration on social development. And it was academic because it asked for an increase in aid to the developing countries when such an increase could only be infinitesimal. The developed countries themselves were in a difficult position. On the one hand, military budgets and expenditure on activities such as space exploration were exerting pressure on their resources; and, on the other hand, the taxpayers were unwilling to pay for assistance to the developing countries. Many developed countries were also faced with the problem of the devaluation of the currency. The important problem of population growth in the developing countries had been mentioned neither in the draft resolution nor in the amendments. Furthermore, the peoples of the developing countries wanted an easier life and were asking for more assistance from the developed countries; but fights could not be made compulsory.

23. He agreed that there should be more co-ordination between United Nations bodies. For example, the work of the First Committee on disarmament had not been considered in the Third Committee, despite its important bearing on the subjects which that Committee had to consider. He emphasized the need for all assistance to the developing countries to be channelled through the United Nations. He agreed with the representative of Ireland that the statement by the Director of the Social Development Division should be included or at least mentioned in the resolution that was adopted. Lastly, he emphasized that the resources being spent on war and defence should be allocated to development.

Mr. Nettel (Austria), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

24. Mr. VASS (Hungary), after expressing support for the draft resolution, said that he could not accept the amendments presented by the seven Powers because they placed exclusive emphasis on the importance of international co-operation in development. International co-operation was not enough, and his delegation would like the Argentine and other delegations to include in the seven-Power amendments the factors that had been mentioned by an illustrious Argentinian, Mr. Raúl Prebisch, in his statement on 15 November 1967 at the 1146th meeting of the Second Committee, and particularly the importance of structural changes in society. Various seminars on development had been unanimous in the importance they attached to such changes. Those observations also applied to the amendments presented by Nigeria.

25. Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that draft resolutions could not be submitted on items that had not been discussed in substance. Furthermore, the draft resolution was

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes, agenda item 46, document A/6916.

procedural and related to an item to be considered by the Committee in the following year.

26. With reference to the seven-Power amendments, he said that the solution of the problems of development depended mainly on the mobilization of domestic resources, and that external assistance, contrary to what was suggested in the first of the amendments, was purely auxiliary. Nor could he support the new operative paragraph 3, for it related to matters which were within the competence of the Second Committee and with which it would be difficult for the Third Committee to deal without knowing the details of the discussion that had taken place in the Second Committee. The new operative paragraph 4 had the support of his delegation.

27. As to the amendments submitted by Nigeria, his delegation considered that the new preambular paragraph, which derived from Article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations, was correct. It did not, on the other hand, seem proper to him to refer in the new text proposed for the second preambular paragraph to General Assembly resolutions 1522 (XV) and 1711 (XVI). First, those resolutions had originated in the Second Committee, and it did not seem appropriate that they should be mentioned in the Third Committee; and, second, the content of the resolutions was not altogether relevant. Resolution 1522 (XV) recommended the acceleration of the flow of capital; and while that flow was a help to development, it also represented an outflow of resources in the form of dividends. The same applied to resolution 1711 (XVI), which also referred to other matters. Moreover, it was difficult to reconcile what was suggested in the new text of the second preambular paragraph with the statement that the main factor in development was the effort made by the developing countries themselves.

28. His delegation would like the Nigerian representative, if possible, to change his amendment to operative paragraph 3, relating to the obstacles to development; for he considered that the words "directed towards" were very important and should not be deleted. The causes of those obstacles should be carefully analysed. He also did not consider it advisable to delete the reference to the progress that had been made by the Commission for Social Development as proposed in the first Nigerian amendment to operative paragraph 4, and he was therefore unable to give that amendment his support. If the reference in the operative part of the draft resolution was not

considered sufficient, it could be transferred to the preamble. Lastly, he could not support the suggestion made by Ireland, because, though his delegation recognized the value of the work done by the Director of the Social Development Division, it was not possible to make a decision of that kind on a draft resolution for reasons of courtesy.

29. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) exercising her right of reply, said that the Nigerian representative should remember that when an increase in aid to the developing countries was proposed in the United Kingdom Parliament, they were not helped by the fact that the countries in question were continuously attacking or insulting the United Kingdom. The developing countries must surely be held responsible for what happened in their countries, just as were the developed countries for what took place in theirs. She had been impressed by the speech of the representative of the Philippines who had made a plea for a revolution in the attitude of all members of the international community to the problem of aid. There must be a partnership between the developed and developing countries.

30. Mr. QUADRI (Argentina), exercising his right of reply, said that Mr. Raúl Prebisch was an international civil servant and his statements did not represent the official position of the Government of the Argentine Republic.

31. The amendments submitted by the seven Powers, of which his delegation was a sponsor, represented a constructive contribution to the draft resolution, a contribution which accorded with the traditional attitude maintained by his Government and whose only purpose was to appeal to all Member States for an expansion of international assistance for development.

32. Mr. A. A. MOHAMMED (Nigeria), exercising his right of reply, said that his remarks had not been intended to minimize the assistance granted by the United Kingdom to the developing countries—even though it was actually less, proportionally, than that granted for example, by Sweden, which had never been a colonial Power—but only to draw attention to the shortage of international aid for that purpose.

33. Mrs. THORSSON (Secretariat), replying to a question by the representative of Italy, said there would be no difficulty in preparing the separate report referred to in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.