



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 50:</i>	
<i>Draft Declaration on Social Development (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (concluded)</i>	1
<i>Procedural discussion</i>	2

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)

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

1. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan) noted that the increasing awareness of the need for scientifically-based social development programmes was evidenced by the fact that the United Nations had designated two successive decades for development and had held various conferences on social development, notably the International Conference of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare.

2. All countries were aware of the wide gap separating developed and developing nations, and one of the major concerns of the Organization was to try to bridge that gap. In that connexion, it should be recognized that the draft Declaration on Social Development (A/7161, annex I) did not concern only the developing countries; it should be made clear that the developed nations, which had contributed the under-development of the now developing countries, had a duty to rectify the wrongs of the past. He noted, moreover, that one half of the vast sums of money being spent on armaments by the developed countries would relieve all the misery borne for so long by the inhabitants of the poor nations.

3. The Sudan, with its limited resources, had been attempting to implement the principles enunciated in the draft Declaration. The document as a whole was acceptable to his delegation, and the text as it stood, despite its deficiencies, provided a sound basis for the formulation of a set of principles, objectives and means for social development and progress. His delegation was ready to co-operate with any others in trying to improve the draft, but it wished to state that, in view of the fact that the Committee had recently adopted the draft convention on the non-applicability of statutory limitation to war crimes and crimes against humanity and the further fact that the impact

of aggression on social development programmes was well known, it deemed it of great importance that paragraph 27 of part III should be adopted.

4. In conclusion, he urged the adoption at the current session of a document which would be a significant contribution to human rights during the International Year for Human Rights.

5. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said he knew from personal experience that one of the main problems in Africa was lack of resources. Although the African States were aware of the problems facing them, their development programmes often did not contain all the necessary social elements; in some areas, social centres were the only social services provided. Another problem was lack of co-ordination and over-lapping at the ministerial level, owing perhaps to the fact that there was no accepted over-all approach to development. Some thought that social development should have precedence over economic development, others that economic development was more important than social progress, and still others that economic and social development were equally important and, indeed, interdependent. Further problems were caused by the fact that the centre of interest was often outside the developing countries, as most experts were imported from abroad and, however interested they might be, they inevitably sought to transpose the realities of their own country into the totally different conditions of the developing country concerned.

6. It had also become apparent that social development was a bottomless well; investments were swallowed up, often without any tangible results. With such a multitude of problems and so much room for improvement, it was important not to go too far and sacrifice quality to quantity.

7. Turning to the text of the draft Declaration, he agreed there was room for stylistic improvement. He would make no specific comments, since he had participated in the drafting from the time when the proposal for the draft had first been submitted. However, he felt that the draft Declaration should be adopted at the current session, not only in order to comply with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2215 (XXI) but also in order that it could form a basis for, and be an integral part of the work of, the second United Nations Development Decade. In that connexion, he noted that the failure of the first Development Decade had to some extent been due to a lack of consideration for the social factors of economic development; the Declaration would help to promote a more integrated approach to the second Decade. It was important, however, that the final text should not conflict with any decisions taken by the Second Committee.

8. In his opinion, the following points should be brought out in the draft Declaration. Firstly, it should emphasize the interdependence of social and economic factors in over-all development. Secondly, it should bring out the need to mobilize all available resources, and especially those at present being wasted on the armaments race. Thirdly, the fundamental right of each nation to establish permanent sovereignty over its natural wealth and resources should be stated unequivocally. Fourthly, as the representative of the Netherlands had stated, it was important to define social development objectives and to decide exactly how those objectives should be achieved. It had been remarked that some elements included in the principles and objectives (parts I and II) were more relevant to means and methods (part III), but it was difficult to separate the one from the other when viewing social development problems as a whole. Fifthly, his delegation felt that the references to colonialism, racism and all other forms of oppression should definitely be retained, as nothing was more important than human freedom and dignity. Lastly, he explained that his delegation had abstained from voting on paragraph 27 of part III in the Commission for Social Development, and would be obliged to abstain in the future, because although it was in general agreement with the substance of the paragraph it objected to its political undertones.

9. Mr. DAMBADARJAA (Mongolia) stressed the importance which his delegation attached to the draft Declaration on Social Development. If adopted, it would promote international co-operation in the social field and represent a major step towards the achievement of the purposes of the United Nations. He agreed that the existing text was a sound basis for discussion and final elaboration.

10. His delegation had noted with satisfaction that the draft Declaration reflected principles which were fundamental to social development, such as national independence based on the right of peoples to self-determination, the immediate and final elimination of all forms of inequality, exploitation, colonialism and racism, and the inalienable sovereignty of States over their natural wealth and resources. Indeed, the objectives enunciated in the draft and the methods for implementing them seemed to take due account of the requirements of social development in an age of national and social revolution.

11. Thus, the draft Declaration made it clear that social and organizational reforms were needed to eliminate exploitation and to encourage rapid economic and social progress. It also emphasized, quite rightly, the interdependence of economic and social development in the wider process of growth and change.

12. The progressive principles and objectives laid down in the draft Declaration were being successfully implemented in Mongolia—which in the forty-seven years of its independence had developed from a backward country entirely dependent on stock-raising to a country with a rapidly developing industry, science culture, and a highly mechanized co-operative agricultural system. Social and economic reforms in agriculture, which was still the backbone of the economy, had been of prime importance in Mongolia's

struggle for economic self-sufficiency. All the countries now emerging from colonial rule needed a modern agricultural system, so that they could supply food to the population and raw materials to industry and increase their export earnings. After independence in Mongolia, the ownership of the land had been transferred from feudal landowners to the State. More recently, following the trend in the country and as a result of legislation adopted by the Government in 1959, small livestock farms had been grouped together into large units and those, together with State agricultural enterprises, had made an important contribution to increased production, as well as making the latest agricultural techniques available to the whole country. Scientific and technological advances had resulted in increased agricultural and cattle production. Mongolia which until recently had been completely dependent upon imports as far as its food grain requirements were concerned, had now become not only self-sufficient but was in a position to export some of its surplus. Workers in agricultural co-operatives received all forms of social security benefits free of charge and, as a result, were able to play a more active part in the economic, political and social life of the country.

13. In spite of the progress it had achieved, Mongolia was still behind the developed countries, largely because it was suffering from the after-effect of feudalism and colonialism. It aimed to shift the emphasis in its economy from agriculture to industry. He wished to stress that the successful transformation of the country's rural economy had been made possible due to the following factors: first, the political basis which had enabled the transformation to take place had been the existence of broader democratic powers for the workers; secondly, the economic basis for the transformation was the concentration in the hands of the people's State of the key economic positions, namely the land and its mineral wealth, industries, transport, communications, foreign trade, etc.; thirdly, the correct foreign policy of the people's State, which rested upon the close and mutually beneficial co-operation with the socialist countries and the support and help received from them. He hoped that Mongolia's experience would serve as an example to other countries and would demonstrate the importance of those provisions of the draft Declaration which related to the immediate abolition of colonialism and the introduction of democratic processes into the political, social and economic life of the country.

14. Although he had spoken on the positive aspects of the draft Declaration, it was not without shortcomings. However, he believed that, once the necessary improvements had been made, it could and should be adopted at the present session.

PROCEDURAL DISCUSSION

15. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to proceed to a detailed consideration of the draft Declaration on Social Development (A/7161, annex I). Amendments previously submitted in the Economic and Social Council or elsewhere would have to be resubmitted in the Third Committee if they were to be discussed or voted upon.

16. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that the Committee's debate had revealed a unanimous recognition of the need to improve the existing text of the draft Declaration. Some delegations felt that the subject of the Declaration should be social welfare or social rights, while others felt that it should embody all the principles, objectives and means and methods laid down in all fields covered by United Nations instruments or activities, even including the exploration of the sea-bed. Her delegation disagreed with both approaches and favoured a Declaration dealing with social development exclusively. In taking that position, it did not deny contemporary realities, nor was it afraid of words; it merely felt that the Declaration's contents should relate exclusively to social development and should be scrutinized with great care. That was why her delegation had suggested at the 1575th meeting that the Committee might ask the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development for its assistance in improving the text. In that connexion, she could not agree with the view expressed by the representative of Iran at the 1577th meeting that the Institute could not do so because it was restricted to research; a prerequisite for social development was research into the complex processes of development of the society. Of course, to refer the draft Declaration to the Institute would mean postponing its adoption until 1969, but in any event she agreed with those delegations which doubted whether the Committee could conclude its work on the draft Declaration at the current session.

17. The Committee should not neglect any possibility of improving the highly imperfect text of the draft Declaration, which mentioned the word "peace" in four paragraphs of the preamble, referred to international co-operation in three paragraphs of part III, and the diversity of social systems in three different paragraphs. She doubted whether the Committee should begin its consideration of the preamble without having all proposed amendments before it, since the draft Declaration should be regarded as a whole and members should have an idea in advance of what its text might become. She therefore suggested that the Committee might consider establishing a time-limit for the submission of amendments before taking up the preamble.

18. She also suggested that the Committee might ask the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee to appear before it to make a short statement on the work being done by the latter Committee on the charter of development.

19. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) suggested that, in view of the Italian representative's comments, the Committee should begin its consideration of the draft Declaration with part I. He considered that that would be a better method of work.

20. Almost all the speakers in the general debate had endorsed his delegation's criticism of the draft's repetitiousness and length. With the exception of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which consisted of thirty articles and seven preambular paragraphs, the Declarations mentioned in the second preambular paragraph of the draft under discussion ranged in length from six to eleven substantive articles and from five to twelve preambular para-

graphs; the Declaration on Social Development would contain fifty-five articles and thirteen preambular paragraphs. While the optimum total of articles could not be laid down arbitrarily in advance, value was often in inverse proportion to length. In order to eliminate needless repetition, he proposed that the Committee should adopt the following procedural motion at the outset of its detailed discussion of the draft Declaration:

"The Committee considers that the same idea must not be developed in two different provisions of the Declaration and decides therefore to delete any repetition in the text either as between different sections or within the same section."

21. His delegation had little objection of substance to make to the text of the draft Declaration; if the modifications of form which he had suggested could be approved, there was no reason why the draft Declaration should not be adopted at the current session. It would not be enough merely to incorporate his delegation's motion in the Committee's report, because the intention was that the Committee should decide on its method of work before proceeding to its detailed consideration of the draft Declaration, in order to preclude subsequent difficulties.

22. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said that, while he had no objection to the Committee's considering part I of the draft before the preamble, he would prefer to begin with the preamble in order to leave more time for consultations on substantive paragraphs. He saw no need to invite the Chairman of the Second Committee to make a statement on the progress of the work on the second Development Decade, since representatives could obtain that information from their colleagues in the Second Committee. However, he supported the Italian representative's constructive proposal concerning a time-limit for the submission of amendments.

23. While it was generally agreed that the draft Declaration was repetitious, he doubted whether the French delegation's motion would facilitate the Committee's study of it. The word "idea" was vague; he wondered whether, for example, the representative of France considered paragraph 6 of part I to be a repetition of the thirteenth preambular paragraph. Moreover, the repetition of principles was often necessary in order to elaborate them or to explain how they should be implemented. In any case, there was no need to adopt the French motion; as the various paragraphs were discussed individually, any delegation could propose the elimination of specific repetitions and leave the matter to be decided by the Committee.

24. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that the Committee should begin its consideration of the draft Declaration with the preamble, which was uncomplicated and acceptable to all. He opposed the idea of inviting the Chairman of the Second Committee to make a statement because he knew from experience how difficult it was for a Chairman to speak on behalf of an entire Committee, whose members held different views. It would be more practical for representatives to consult their colleagues in the Second Committee. He doubted whether the Research Institute would be able to help the Committee; if the Board

of the Institute had had any comments to offer, it could have included them in its annual report to the Secretary-General, and in the absence of such comments there was nothing to indicate that the Institute did not endorse the Declaration.

25. With regard to the French motion, he did not see how the Committee could, by a procedural motion taken in advance, decide on the elimination of any repetition in substantive paragraphs. The adoption of the motion would create practical difficulties, and some important ideas might be dropped from the Declaration altogether. He would therefore vote against the motion, which in any event should be submitted in the form of a draft resolution.

26. Mr. HAQUE (Pakistan) also felt that the Committee should begin with a discussion of the non-controversial preamble. He doubted whether the Chairman of the Second Committee could enlighten the Third Committee, because no decisions had yet been taken on the second Development Decade. He supported the proposal that a time-limit should be set for the submission of amendments.

27. He doubted whether all repetition could be avoided in a document as comprehensive as the draft Declaration. In his view, the number of articles it contained was irrelevant.

28. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that she too would prefer to begin with the preamble. The proposal for the imposition of a time-limit for the submission of amendments to all parts of the draft Declaration was too far-reaching, although she might be able to agree to a time-limit for amendments to the preamble and part I. In her view, the Research Institute was precluded by its terms of reference from commenting on a draft Declaration drawn up by representatives of Governments.

29. With regard to the French motion, she could hardly commit her delegation by a procedural vote to a particular stand on substantive issues. The identity of ideas or the relationship between them was not easy to define. She hoped that the French delegation would not press its motion to a vote, as she would have to vote against it.

30. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regretted that the Committee's time was being wasted in a pointless and unnecessary procedural discussion. Commenting on the Italian delegation's proposals, he said that he saw no point in inviting the Chairman of the Second Committee to make a statement to the Committee, since the Second Committee had not yet taken any decisions regarding the second Development Decade and representatives could always consult other members of their own delegations. He was also opposed to any idea of referring the draft Declaration to the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. He felt that the simplest procedure was for the Committee to start by considering the preamble, which was not controversial and could be disposed of quickly. The question of a time-limit for the submission of amendments was best left to the discretion of the Chairman.

31. He was categorically opposed to the French motion, which would merely complicate the Committee's work. All the parts of the draft Declaration

had the same goal, and it was inevitable that certain ideas would have to be dealt with in more than one part, although of course from different points of view. The Committee already had a good basis for the Declaration, and any necessary amendments or deletions could be made in the course of its discussion. He therefore appealed to the French delegation to withdraw its proposal.

32. Mr. KITI (Kenya) thought that the procedure suggested by the French delegation was an extremely dangerous one, which would tie the Committee's hands and probably lead to a deadlock. He wished also to point out that in certain cases repetition could be justified on the ground that it supplied the necessary emphasis. He joined other representatives in appealing to the French delegation to withdraw its proposal.

33. With regard to the Italian delegation's suggestions, he felt that to invite the Chairman of the Second Committee would lengthen the Committee's work unnecessarily; representatives should contact other members of their delegations and take account of the ideas of the Second Committee where they were relevant to the parts of the text under discussion. While he thought that it would be preferable to start by considering the preamble, he had no strong objection to considering part I first.

34. Mr. ARTAZA (Chile) said that he too was opposed to the motion proposed by France. It should not be forgotten that the Declaration had an important propaganda function and was intended to stir the consciences of Governments and peoples and move them to action. For that purpose, repetition might well be a necessary and justifiable technique, and it was important for the Committee to remain as flexible as possible in its approach.

35. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said he could not agree with the USSR representative that the present discussion was pointless and unnecessary. On the contrary, he thought that it could be very useful in determining how the Committee was to proceed with its consideration of the draft Declaration. He did not feel that it would be desirable to establish a deadline for the submission of amendments, since suggestions for improving the text were often prompted by the discussion itself and could not be ignored because an arbitrary time-limit had expired. The purpose of the French motion was to facilitate the Committee's work and to improve the Declaration by deleting unnecessary repetitions. Most members of the Committee had criticized the draft for its repetitiveness, and there was no real disagreement in the Committee on that score. Consequently, there was no need to press the French motion to a formal decision or vote.

36. He suggested that the Committee should consider the possibility of meeting less frequently during its discussion of the draft Declaration. Past experience had shown that to meet twice a day was not necessarily the most productive way of dealing with a long and difficult question. It was important that delegations should have sufficient time to study the text in great detail, to draft amendments and to hold informal consultations with each other.

37. Mr. SAINT-REMY (Belgium) thought that the French motion was both reasonable and constructive,

and that it was designed to give the text more persuasive force by imparting clarity. It had been suggested that repetition might be necessary for the sake of emphasis, but in his view it merely dulled the effect. He therefore supported the French motion, but suggested that the wording of it should be modified to make it clear that the term "sections" meant the different parts of the Declaration, including the preamble. The representative of Iran had supported the idea behind the French motion but had suggested that there was no need to take any actual decision. He did not agree. In his view, it was perfectly practical for the Committee to adopt the procedure suggested by the French delegation, and the motion should be put to the vote.

38. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) said that he was opposed to the setting of a deadline for the submission of amendments. Delegations should be able to submit amendments at any time during the discussion of the draft. In his view, the opposition aroused by the French motion was based on a misunderstanding of its purpose. It was not directed against the substance of the draft but against its illogical organization, and was merely asserting that the Declaration should not say the same thing twice. That did not, of course, mean that the same idea could not be presented from different points of view.

39. He suggested that the Committee should consider the possibility of establishing a working party to systematize and co-ordinate the text in the light of the ideas expressed by the Committee in the course of its discussion.

40. Mr. AMPAW (Ghana) agreed with the representative of Kenya that it would be dangerous for the Committee to adopt too constrictive an attitude in its consideration of the draft Declaration. There was general agreement in the Committee that the text was

too repetitive, and an attempt should be made to avoid unnecessary repetitions. On occasion, however, it might be necessary to repeat some idea, and the Committee should not bind itself by taking a decision of the kind proposed by the French delegation. With regard to the submission of amendments, he felt that it would be desirable for the Committee to have the texts of the relevant amendments at its disposal when considering each part of the draft.

41. Mr. GARZON VALDEZ (Argentina) said that he supported the French motion; indeed, he would go further and assert that the Declaration should not repeat anything that was contained in other United Nations instruments. Opposition to the motion was based on a misunderstanding; it was merely intended to achieve economy of thought and improve the quality of the text. With regard to the Italian representative's suggestions, he agreed that it would be preferable to leave consideration of the preamble until the end, when the text of the substantive clauses had been finalized. Some time-limit would have to be established for the submission of amendments, but he agreed that the Committee should be able to consider the relevant amendments when discussing the different parts of the Declaration.

42. Mrs. AGBOTON (Dahomey) agreed that the Committee should be able to consider the amendments as a whole, but felt that delegations should simply be asked to submit them as soon as possible and that no fixed time-limit should be established. She found the French motion somewhat vague and confusing and would welcome further clarification. She was not in favour of a complete redrafting of the text, since that would prejudice the possibility of its adoption at the current session.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.