



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 48:	
Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (continued)	
Part II: Objectives (concluded)	151
Part III: Means and methods	151
Introductory sentence	152

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.1688, A/C.3/L.1696-1725)

PART II: OBJECTIVES (concluded)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the document containing the text of the paragraphs of part II of the draft Declaration, as adopted by the Committee, was to be circulated soon.¹

2. Mrs. CABRERA (Mexico) wished to explain why her delegation had proposed an oral sub-amendment to the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1688). Her delegation was convinced that the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination was a prerequisite of development. In her country, the spirit of the revolution had been maintained through the introduction of strict control over foreign capital, and foreign monopolies in particular. Consequently, it was not national considerations which had led her country to propose its sub-amendment, but the desire to exclude from the text of the Declaration any controversial elements which might prevent it from being accepted and applied by countries.

PART III: MEANS AND METHODS

3. Mr. PAOLINI (France), introducing his delegation's amendment to part III of the draft Declaration (A/C.3/L.1712), said that the changes he was proposing related to form: the intention was to regroup most of the paragraphs of the text submitted by the Commission for Social Development (see A/7648, annex II), on the basis of six main ideas. It seemed particularly useful to recast part III, which was very long and contained very varied provisions. The proposal of the Netherlands (see A/7235/Add.1), contained in the comments by Member States on the draft

Declaration, to make a functional classification in part III was consonant with the aim of the French amendment. Obviously, the Committee would be called on to determine the order of the paragraphs only after it had adopted the text.

4. The need for integrated planning of social development and economic development was fully accepted and his delegation would therefore like to combine in a single article paragraphs 1, 12, 14, 17, 15 and 7 of the original text, which concerned measures for general planning measures. Paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 11, concerning the development and utilization of human resources, would form the subject of another article which could possibly include various amendments relating to labour problems. After some improvements, paragraphs 25, 26, 13, 30, 20 and 29, would constitute an article on legislative provisions and regulations, while an article relating to infrastructure would combine paragraphs 6, 18, 5, 8 and 9. Paragraphs 10, 16 and 24 would form an article on economic and financial methods and he was happy to note that some delegations intended to make very important proposals on that subject. Lastly, paragraphs 21, 22, 28 and 19 would be combined in a single article dealing with international co-operation; in that connexion, he expressed the hope that some amendments would refer to the adoption of international conventions. It was in the field of labour that international law had made most progress—precisely as the result of the adoption of conventions under the auspices of the ILO.

5. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) proposed that the various amendments to part III of the draft Declaration should be introduced and considered as the Committee came to study the paragraphs to which they related. So far as the French amendment was concerned, he noted that the Committee would be able to decide on the order of the paragraphs in part III only after it had studied and adopted the text of each paragraph.

6. Mr. CEAUSU (Romania), Mr. PECHACEK (Czechoslovakia), Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) and Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) supported the proposal of the Polish representative.

7. The CHAIRMAN stated that a list of all the amendments to part III of the draft Declaration would be circulated later.² She invited the Committee to continue its work by using the method proposed by the Polish representative and to examine first the introductory sentence to part III.

Mrs. Sipilä (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

8. Mr. NTAWIHA (Rwanda) withdrew the amendment to paragraph 27 proposed by his delegation in document

¹ Subsequently circulated as document A/C.3/L.1726.

² Subsequently circulated as document A/C.3/L.1727.

A/C.3/L.1713, for the proposal might encroach on the work of other organs, in particular the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression.

Introductory sentence

9. Mrs. BEGMATOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the amendment submitted by her delegation (A/C.3/L.1696, para. 1) was designed to broaden the scope of the introductory sentence by deleting the expression “mobilization of the necessary resources”, which applied solely to human and material resources and did not take account of exchanges of views and experience.

10. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) said that the purpose of the amendment to the introductory sentence contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, of which his delegation was a sponsor, was to bring the text of the sentence into line with the remainder of the draft Declaration, in conformity with the decision taken by the Committee at the previous session to replace the words “social development” with the words “social progress and development”.

11. Mr. LISITSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) observed that the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.1696, para. 1) already took account of that change. The words “progress and” had been omitted in the English text of the Soviet proposal.

12. Mrs. NICOL (Sierra Leone) supported the amendment of the Soviet Union, which she felt was clearer and more concise than the original text of the introductory sentence.

13. Mr. IDDIR (Algeria) approved of the amendment of the Soviet Union, but thought it essential to insist on action in favour of the developing countries. He therefore asked the representative of the Soviet Union to insert in her amendment a phrase emphasizing that point.

14. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) agreed that the draft Declaration was addressed to the developing countries in the first instance. However, measures to be taken in favour of those countries already appeared in various paragraphs of part III. He therefore considered it unnecessary to mention them in the introductory sentence and asked the Algerian representative to withdraw his proposal.

15. Mr. LEW (China) proposed that the expression “national and international action” should be replaced by “national action and international co-operation”, since he considered the concept of international co-operation to be extremely important.

16. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said he could not accept the formula proposed by the representative of China, as he considered that “international action” was stronger than the somewhat overworked expression “international co-operation”.

17. Mr. PIPARSANIA (India) agreed with the Pakistan representative.

18. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) supported the amendment of the Soviet Union and said that, like the representatives of

Pakistan and India, he considered the expression “international action” preferable to “international co-operation”.

19. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) was also opposed to the formulation proposed by China. The expression “international co-operation” was a general formula covering all aspects of international life whilst the term “international action” was more exact in the context of economic and social development.

20. Mr. LEW (China) pointed out that the concept of “international co-operation” guaranteed respect for the national sovereignty of the developing countries.

21. Mrs. KUME (Japan) supported the Chinese proposal.

22. Mr. LEMAITRE (Colombia) considered that, in the Spanish text of the amendment of the Soviet Union, the words “*prestar atención*” were far too weak and suggested that they should be replaced by a more forceful term.

23. Mrs. CABRERA (Mexico), on behalf of the Spanish-speaking delegations, endorsed the Colombian representative’s observation.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would take note of that observation.

25. Mrs. D. N. J. DANIELI (United Republic of Tanzania) did not think it necessary to delete the words “mobilization of the necessary resources”, since the developing countries possessed many undeveloped material and human resources, the mobilization of which was essential for their economic and social progress.

26. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) agreed with the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania.

27. Mr. SEE (Singapore) approved the amendment of the Soviet Union and thought that the concept of the mobilization of resources was more suitable for inclusion in one of the paragraphs in part III than in the introductory sentence.

28. Mrs. RADIC (Yugoslavia), in the light of the views expressed by the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania and Uganda, formally proposed that the words “and full mobilization of the human and material resources” should be inserted after the word “action” in the Soviet amendment. That was a formal sub-amendment.

29. Mr. PIPARSANIA (India) supported the Yugoslav proposal.

30. Mrs. BEGMATOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, for the reasons she had just given, she preferred not to speak of the mobilization of resources which, in her opinion, would limit the scope of the paragraph proposed by her delegation.

31. Mr. LEW (China) wished to revise orally his sub-amendment to read “national and international co-operative action”.

32. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) failed to see how one could speak of national co-operation.

33. Mr. MUSAIBLI (Southern Yemen) supported the USSR amendment as it stood in document A/C.3/L.1696, paragraph 1. In his opinion, the Chinese sub-amendment was too vague and was capable of too many interpretations.

34. Mrs. D. N. J. DANIELI (United Republic of Tanzania) supported the sub-amendment proposed by the Yugoslav delegation although she preferred the text submitted by the Commission for Social Development (see A/7648, annex II). She moved that the debate should be closed and a vote taken.

35. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) supported that motion.

36. Mr. GUZMAN (Peru) thought it would be premature to close the debate at that stage.

37. Mr. TEKLE (Ethiopia) also considered that the Committee needed more time to consider all the amendments and sub-amendments.

The motion for the closure of the debate was rejected by 30 votes to 8, with 57 abstentions.

38. Mr. MOUSSA (United Arab Republic) supported the sub-amendment submitted by the Yugoslav delegation. It was essential to stress the need to mobilize all available resources. He therefore urged the representative of the Soviet Union to accept the sub-amendment.

39. He preferred the first version of the amendment submitted by the Chinese representative, namely "national action and international co-operation".

40. Mrs. JOSHI (Nepal) suggested that the word "by" before the word "national" in the original text (see A/7648, annex II) should be replaced by the word "and".

41. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it was too late to submit amendments to the original text.

42. Mrs. DAES (Greece) supported the Yugoslav delegation's sub-amendment which made the text clearer and more precise. However, she thought it would be better to insert it in a different part of the sentence and to say "the achievement of the objectives of social progress and development requires the full mobilization of the human and material resources and national and international action".

43. Mrs. BEGMATOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in a spirit of co-operation, she was withdrawing her amendment (A/C.3/L.1696, para. 1).

44. Mrs. RADIC (Yugoslavia) withdrew her sub-amendment.

45. Mr. LEW (China) requested that his sub-amendment should be considered an amendment to the original text.

46. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it was too late to submit amendments to the original text. The only amendment still before the Committee was the one introduced by Uganda (A/C.3/L.1723), which added "progress and" between "social" and "development".

47. Miss MUTER (Indonesia) suggested that the amendment should be adopted by acclamation without being put to the vote.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that the result of the vote would make it even clearer that the Committee's decision was unanimous.

The amendment to the introductory sentence in document A/C.3/L.1723 was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.