



CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Agenda item 48: | |
| Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (continued) | |
| Part III: Means and methods (continued) | |
| Proposed new paragraphs after paragraph 19 (con- cluded) | 221 |
| Proposed new paragraphs after paragraph 18 | 223 |

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.1697, A/C.3/L.1698, A/C.3/L.1701, A/C.3/L.1706,
A/C.3/L.1707, A/C.3/L.1710-1712, A/C.3/L.1714,
A/C.3/L.1716, A/C.3/L.1718/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1720,
A/C.3/L.1723, A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1726,
A/C.3/L.1729, A/C.3/L.1730 and Corr.1)

PART III: MEANS AND METHODS (continued)

Proposed new paragraphs after paragraph 19 (concluded)

1. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he had abstained in the vote on the new paragraph 21 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723, because it did not draw any distinction between the responsibilities of the developed countries with regard to assistance to the developing countries, but placed on an equal footing the former colonial Powers and those States which, like his own, had never participated in the economic exploitation of other countries. Moreover, the gap between prosperous and destitute social classes and between developed and developing countries was due to the existence of the capitalist system. There was no such gap in the socialist countries, where economic planning by the State in the interests of all citizens ensured the equalization of standards of living. In any case, he wished to make it quite clear that his delegation was by no means opposed to the granting of loans to the developing countries on terms which were advantageous to the latter.

2. Mr. GYARMATI (Hungary) explained that he had abstained in the vote on the new paragraph 21 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723 because the problems affecting the developing countries were primarily attributable to their former colonial status; the former colonial Powers should therefore assume the major share of the responsi-

bility for assisting those countries, yet the text which had been adopted did not draw any distinction in that respect.

3. Mrs. NAZARENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) explained that she had abstained in the vote on the new paragraph 21 because she considered it inadvisable to ask all the developed countries, without distinction, to extend a volume of aid equivalent to 1 per cent of their gross national product to the developing countries. Some countries, such as her own, had never participated in the economic exploitation of any territory, and therefore had no obligation to make amends for the harm which had been done.

4. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) explained that he had voted for the new paragraph 21 because he felt that it was of vital importance to the developing countries.

5. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia), introducing on behalf of the sponsors the new paragraph 22 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723, said that the fundamental characteristic of the modern era was the technological revolution. The progress of mankind was linked to the increased use of science and technology; it was therefore essential to narrow the ever-widening gap separating the developed countries from the developing countries in that sphere, since the developing countries were unable to devote the requisite volume of resources to scientific and technological research. The transfer of technology from the developed to the developing countries was therefore imperative, as had been recognized by the Economic and Social Council, among other bodies, in its resolutions 1429 (XLVI) and 1454 (XLVII), and by the Secretary-General in his report on the arrangements for the transfer of operative technology to developing countries.¹

6. He said that the words "arrangements for" should be inserted before the words "the transfer" in the new paragraph 22 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723.

7. Mrs. BLACK (United States of America) said that she was in favour of the general purpose of the new paragraph 22 but felt that the transfer of patents raised complex legal questions which should be given careful consideration; she therefore asked the sponsors of the amendment to delete the reference to patents from their text.

8. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) felt that the addition to the draft Declaration of the new paragraph 22 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723 would be extremely useful, but, in order to clarify the idea underlying it, he suggested that the second part of the paragraph should read: "the exchange of

¹ Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-sixth Session, Annexes, agenda item 8, document E/4633.

technological experience, know-how and patents among all countries, with particular attention being paid to the needs of developing countries”.

9. Mr. BABAA (Libya) said he attached great importance to the proposed new paragraph 22 and noted that the Secretary-General had recognized that science and technology constituted one of the fundamental means by which countries could achieve economic development. The transfer of science and technology from the developed to the developing countries would help to narrow the gap between the two groups, since, as the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development had observed, only a small fraction of the existing total of scientific and technological resources was being used to meet the needs of the developing countries.

10. Mr. TORRES (Philippines) suggested that the wording of the first part of the new paragraph 22 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723 would be improved if it read “Increased utilization of science and technology”, rather than “Increased use of science and technology and their utilization”. With regard to the second part of the paragraph, he suggested the following wording: “arrangements for the sharing with the developing countries of technological knowledge and skills, including inventions and patents”.

11. Mr. PAOLINI (France) supported the new paragraph 22 now being considered by the Committee and associated himself with the observation of the Philippine representative with regard to the first part of the paragraph.

12. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) felt that the inclusion of the word “arrangements” in the new paragraph 22 should meet the points raised by the representatives of the United States, Poland and the Philippines. On behalf of the sponsors, he accepted the suggestion of the Philippine representative concerning the first part of the paragraph and said that the words “and exchange” should be inserted after the word “transfer”.

13. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the new paragraph 22 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723, as orally revised (see paras. 6 and 12 above).

The new paragraph 22, as orally revised, was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

14. Miss DOBSON (Australia) explained that she had voted for the new paragraphs 20 and 21 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723 because she had been convinced by the explanations and clarifications given by the sponsors. However, she had abstained in the vote on the new paragraph 22 because she felt that some of its elements could not appropriately be included in the draft Declaration and that the Committee was not the body competent to deal with such subjects.

15. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that she had voted for the new paragraphs 20, 21 and 22 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723 because they dealt with problems of vital importance to the developing countries in general terms which were acceptable to most delegations. Nevertheless, she questioned whether it was advisable to include in a draft declaration on social progress and development a

detailed enumeration of means and methods in connexion with economic relations between the industrialized countries and the developing countries. It would have been preferable to modify and expand paragraph 19 of part III of the draft Declaration so as to include the relevant references to external aid and the transfer of science and technology, instead of introducing independent paragraphs on problems within the competence of UNCTAD, thereby disrupting the internal balance of that part. When considering problems falling within the competence of other United Nations bodies, the Committee should take into consideration the stage reached in discussions on the various questions by the bodies concerned.

16. Mrs. KUME (Japan) said she would have voted for the new paragraph 22 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723 if it had not contained a reference to the transfer of patents, which raised extremely complex legal problems. In her country most patents were the property of individuals and private companies and therefore could not be disposed of freely.

17. Miss GICHURU (Kenya) introduced, on behalf of the sponsors, the new paragraph 23 which was proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723 as an addition to the draft Declaration.

18. Mr. PIPARSANIA (India) said that many national and international studies had highlighted the extent to which the developing areas suffered from a lack of adequate means of communication and transport. Mr. Rostow, in his “take-off” theory,² had observed that the construction of railways had been the most powerful factor in initiating “take-off” in France, Germany, Canada, Russia and other countries. Fortunately, both the developed and the developing countries had realized the imperative need to develop means of transport and communication in order to accelerate their economic and social progress. Transport fulfilled an important role in development, because it not only reduced the cost of production but also helped to generate economic and social activities. For example, in Uganda the construction of roads in the cotton-producing areas had made it possible to increase cotton production by 70 per cent. Moreover, transport and communication facilities helped to create markets. A recent study by the Ministry of Transport in India had shown that the construction of a road not only gave impetus to the expansion of national industries but also promoted the importation of a variety of consumer goods for which there had not previously been a demand. Hence the importance of including in the draft Declaration the new paragraph 23 which specifically referred to that question, and which India hoped would be unanimously adopted.

19. Mr. MUSAIBLI (Southern Yemen) fully supported the inclusion of the new paragraph 23 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723, since transport and communications were important as means of promoting civilization and economic advancement.

20. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the new paragraph 23 appearing in document A/C.3/L.1723.

The new paragraph 23 was adopted unanimously.

² See W. W. Rostow, *The Process of Economic Growth*, 2nd ed. (London, Oxford University Press, 1960).

Proposed new paragraphs after paragraph 18

21. Mr. WARIS (Finland) said that his purpose in submitting the new paragraphs in document A/C.3/L.1724 was to repair the omission in part III of an important aspect of social life, namely industrial relations. In view of the fact that those relations varied depending on the economic system prevailing in each country, he had decided, together with the delegations of Iceland and Norway, to submit a new text, shorter and more concise (A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1), in which all reference to specific measures for the development of industrial relations had been deleted. The term "industrial relations" was a technical term in general use and referred specifically to relations between workers and employers; the "appropriate measures" referred to in the new paragraph would be those which each country decided upon in accordance with the economic system it had adopted. He hoped that the new wording, which was of a general nature and whose meaning was clear, would not give rise to difficulties in the Committee. Denmark and Sweden had decided to join in sponsoring the first of the two paragraphs, the addition of which was proposed in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1, and he requested that each of the proposed paragraphs should be dealt with separately.

22. Mr. PAOLINI (France) regretted the extreme brevity of the way in which the idea set forth in the first of the paragraphs proposed in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1 was now being presented. Even so, the concept of industrial relations was perfectly clear and comprehensible. However, in the French version of the new paragraph the words "*rapports de travail*" should be used instead of "*relations industrielles*", which had a different connotation in sociology.

23. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that the meaning of the expression "industrial relations" was also perfectly clear in Italian, and that she would have no difficulty in supporting the new paragraph. However, she agreed with the representative of France that a more complete and detailed text would have been preferable.

24. Mr. KHONSARY (Iran) said that he too would have no difficulty in supporting the first of the new paragraphs proposed in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1.

25. Mr. CUESTA (Ecuador) considered that the concept of industrial relations was sufficiently clear and did not require any explanation; however, the expression "appropriate measures" as it appeared in the new paragraph, was too vague. He therefore wished to propose, as a sub-amendment, the following text:

"Adoption of appropriate measures by the Governments and legislative systems of the countries to improve the relevant legal standards, so as to promote increasing harmony in industrial relations".

26. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) felt that the first new paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1 was incomplete and should preferably mention certain basic elements of industrial relations. He therefore proposed as a sub-amendment the following text, to replace the last part of the new paragraph, after the word "measures": "to encourage collective agreements as a basis for harmonizing

industrial relations between workers' organizations and management".

27. Mr. PIPARSANIA (India) considered that the wording proposed by the representative of Uganda was restrictive because it excluded other equally important means of developing harmonious industrial relations; he therefore proposed that the words "*inter alia*" should be included after the word "encourage".

28. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) pointed out that the words "between workers' organizations and management" in Uganda's oral sub-amendment were entirely superfluous, since that idea was already implicit in the concept of industrial relations; he therefore asked that they should be deleted so that they would not give rise to difficulties for other delegations.

29. Mr. PAOLINI (France) suggested that, in order to dispel the misgivings of some delegations, the text of the Ugandan oral sub-amendment, after the word "encourage", should be replaced by the following: "the conclusion of collective agreements, conciliation or the elaboration of legislative measures as means of harmonizing industrial relations".

30. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) said that he would accept the suggestions made by the representatives of India, the United Kingdom and France. The text of his revised sub-amendment would be the following "to encourage, *inter alia*, the conclusion of collective agreements, conciliation or the elaboration of legislative measures as means of harmonizing industrial relations".

31. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that despite the clarifications offered during the debate, the Committee was not yet in a position to dispose of the amendment submitted in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1 because the various sub-amendments and suggestions which had been put forward made it difficult to reach a wise decision with regard to the text. In any case, his delegation felt that the new paragraph would not introduce any new element into the draft Declaration, since the concepts to which it referred—such as collective bargaining and the workers' right of association—were already included in the various paragraphs of parts II and III of that document.

32. Furthermore, if industrial relations were to be taken to mean, as had been indicated, relations between workers and employers, it would be futile to recommend their harmonization, for the interests of workers and employers were so different, so contrary to each other, that it was quite impossible to achieve any harmony between them. The conflict between the workers on the one hand and the owners of the means of production on the other could be settled only by a radical social and political revolution.

33. Mr. CUESTA (Ecuador) said that, in view of the revision of the Ugandan oral sub-amendment, he would withdraw his own oral sub-amendment to the first new paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1.

34. Mrs. BEGMATOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that it was impossible to achieve the

harmonious agreement between workers and employers sought in the first paragraph in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1, because the differences separating them were too deep and there was no common basis on which they could be brought together. Her delegation was therefore unable to accept that paragraph or the oral sub-amendments to it which had been proposed.

35. After a discussion in which Mr. SANON (Upper Volta), Mr. WARIS (Finland), Mr. TEKLE (Ethiopia), Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia), Mr. CHIPESO (Zambia), Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan), Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom), Mr. PIPARSANIA (India), Mr. NENEMAN (Poland),

Mr. TORRES (Philippines), and Mr. KHONSARY (Iran) took part, Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) withdrew his oral sub-amendment to the first new paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1.

36. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first of the new paragraphs proposed in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1.

The paragraph was adopted by 82 votes to 3, with 12 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.