

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1616th
MEETING**

Thursday, 21 November 1968,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 49:

Page

World social situation: report of the Secretary-General (continued)

Consideration of draft resolution (continued) 1

Chairman: Mr. Erik NETTEL (Austria).

AGENDA ITEM 49

World social situation: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/7203, chap. X, sect. A; A/7203/Add.1, chap. VI, sect. A; A/7248 and Corr.1, E/4590 and Corr.1, A/C.3/609, E/CN.5/417 and Corr.1, E/CN.5/417/Add.1 and Corr.1, E/CN.5/417/Add.2, E/CN.5/417/Summary, A/C.3/L.1621 and Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1624, A/C.3/L.1625, A/C.3/L.1627-1632)

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION
(continued)**

1. Mr. RAOELINA (Madagascar) said that her delegation generally supported the ideas expressed in the draft resolution on the world social situation (A/C.3/L.1621), since all her country's resources and energies were being directed towards improving the well-being and security of its citizens. She supported paragraphs 2, 4 and 5 in particular, because she was convinced that the problems facing mankind could be solved through international co-operation and solidarity. The world social situation was indeed distressing; even in the United Nations Development Decade the flow of capital was still, paradoxically, not from the rich to the poor but from the poor to the rich. In the circumstances, assistance from the more advanced countries and the international organizations to the developing countries was only reasonable.

2. In her view, paragraph 1 should lay down guidelines to help countries to select their development objectives. With regard to sub-paragraph (b), her delegation felt that each Government should determine the population policy it would follow in the light of its own economic, cultural and religious circumstances and in conditions ensuring respect for human dignity. Although the rate of population growth might be alarming in some countries, in Madagascar it was a factor of development and the Government was doing its utmost to protect the family as the basic unit of society. It therefore considered that intervention by the State or by international organizations in the matter of population growth was an infringement of individual freedom; the role of the State should be merely to increase food production and improve economic and social conditions.

3. Her delegation would support any amendments to the draft resolution which were consistent with the views she had outlined, including those already submitted by Somalia (A/C.3/L.1624) and by Argentina, Uruguay and Venezuela (A/C.3/L.1627).

4. Miss GUEVARA ACHAVAL (Argentina) said that her delegation was aware of the legitimate concern which many countries felt over the population explosion and agreed that the variety of problems existing throughout the world in that respect necessitated a similar variety of solutions. Her delegation had always opposed the inclusion in the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development of any reference that might imply intervention by the State or by international organizations with the aim of reducing the birth-rate. Consequently, it could not agree that family planning should be understood to mean an unconditional and universal reduction of the birth-rate.

5. In its present form, paragraph 1 (b) of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1621) would recommend that all States should include plans and programmes to encourage a certain rate of population growth in order to attain objectives which were neither universally applicable nor universally acceptable. General recommendations applying to all States could hardly be made on the basis of premises that were not universally acceptable, nor could the United Nations impose objectives that Member States must incorporate in their action programmes. The Committee should be more cautious in seeking to lay down common objectives. Paragraph 1 (b) would also imply acceptance of the idea of State interference with the right of everyone to determine the number of his children, in contravention of article 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The affirmation of the inviolability of the private life of the individual vis-à-vis other individuals and public authorities alike was one of the century's greatest achievements in the field of human rights.

6. Even if paragraph 1 (b) was made a separate paragraph, her delegation would have the same difficulties with it. She therefore again appealed to the sponsors not to press that provision to a vote, in order that the draft resolution might be adopted unanimously.

7. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) said that she had misgivings about the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1621), mainly because it attempted to cover too much ground and dealt—though not in the same words—with many of the subjects the Committee had discussed at length during the debate on the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development. If the Committee were to try to bring the draft into line with the articles of the draft Declaration thus far

adopted,^{1/} it would have to devote an inordinate amount of time to that task. For example, the Somali amendment (A/C.3/L.1624) raised a controversial subject which had been thoroughly thrashed out in the debate on the draft Declaration, and she hoped that, in the interests of working out a text acceptable to all, it would not be maintained. The suggestions made at the preceding meeting by the representative of Italy would solve many difficulties.

8. In the draft resolution, the Committee also seemed to be straying beyond its competence, especially in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4. While she did not object to the general sentiment expressed in paragraph 2 and had great sympathy with the objectives of reducing the gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots", the United Kingdom delegation to the second session of UNCTAD had made it clear when voting for resolution 27 (II)^{2/} that, while the United Kingdom Government would endeavour to meet the aid target of 1 per cent of gross national product, it could not specify a definite date for achieving that target. At the 1614th meeting, the representative of the Upper Volta had referred to aid as a right of the developing countries and a debt owed by the developed, but there had been many other exploitations besides colonialism in the long history of the world. That kind of statement did not encourage developed countries to be more generous with aid and did not give Governments the help they needed in order to persuade their parliaments to provide increased appropriations.

9. She welcomed the proposal, in paragraph 7 of the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1621/Rev.1), that the Secretary-General should be requested to submit the next report on the world social situation in 1970, at the beginning of the Second United Nations Development Decade. However, since the reports covered the whole world and involved an immense amount of work, she thought that it might be more realistic after 1970 to issue them at five-yearly intervals.

10. The operative word in paragraph 1 (b) was "consistent", and the meaning was quite plain; densely populated countries should encourage a slower rate of population growth, while underpopulated areas should encourage a faster one. No family planning organization failed to take account of the religious or ethnical convictions of the countries in which they operated or tried to impose their ideas.

11. In his statement at the preceding meeting, the representative of Chile had implied that advice on family planning from the developed countries was tied to economic aid, and was even a substitute for it. She wished to point out that the United Kingdom Government for one did not preach what it did not itself practise; and it was encouraging the dissemination of information on family planning in its own country. Moreover, it gave assistance and advice on family planning only to countries which specially requested it. Wild talk of family planning's leading logically to euthanasia was an insult to the intelligence

of members of the Committee. It was a little unworthy of a representative to accuse either countries or organizations of base motives in the matter.

12. Mr. MEHIRI (Tunisia) commended the sponsors of the draft resolution on their efforts to formulate, on the basis of the various documents submitted for the Committee's consideration, recommendations for action to solve the many and varied social problems of the world. As the representative of Cyprus had conceded, the text was far from perfect, but he was sure that the various amendments submitted would do much to improve it.

13. He agreed with the representative of France that more explicit reference should be made in the operative part of the draft resolution to the need to promote the training of personnel in the fields of health and education. On the other hand, his delegation had noted with satisfaction the inclusion in the draft resolution of two fundamental concepts of social development, namely, the urgent need to involve all social groups, and young people in particular, in national development, and the need, in all areas of social development, for co-ordination and planning, based on accurate assessments of the requirements of each country.

14. That fundamental need for over-all planning was, indeed, the connecting thread running through the whole draft resolution, including operative paragraph 1 (b), which was a reaffirmation of the need for planning in the field of population and which left States quite free to decide what form they wished that planning to take. There again, however, he agreed with the representative of France; the wording was somewhat misleading, and it might be better to speak of encouraging the stabilization of rates of population growth, in order not to give the impression that a limitation of population growth was being advocated or that an attempt was being made to impose planning in that field, which might not be acceptable or applicable to some countries. His delegation believed that family planning was an essential factor of social development and was vital for the protection of human dignity, but it recognized that the interests of individual States would vary widely. Consequently, although he sympathized with the intentions of the sponsors, he felt that it might be better to defer to those delegations which were strongly opposed to paragraph 1 (b) and not to press for its retention.

15. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus), introducing the revised version of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1621/Rev.1) on behalf of the sponsors, said that an attempt had been made to incorporate any acceptable suggestions, whether made formally or informally. Consultations were still being held with regard to the amendments which had been submitted so far and, once all the proposed amendments were known, the sponsors would be able to take a final decision on them.

16. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) said that his delegation's amendment to paragraph 1 (g) (A/C.3/L.1629) involved only minor changes, which were intended to increase the forcefulness of the text. Some delegations had expressed the view that the word "opportunities", which Poland proposed should be deleted, indicated a more open approach to the subject of the sub-

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Annexes, agenda item 50, document A/7374, para. 133.

^{2/} See Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Second Session, vol. I and Corr.1 and Add.1, Report and Annexes (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.II.D.14), p. 38.

paragraph, but he felt that the text had been qualified sufficiently by the words "and promoting programmes".

17. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria), introducing his delegation's amendments (A/C.3/L.1630), said that the adoption of the first amendment would strengthen the text of paragraph 1 (e) of the revised draft resolution. The addition of a new operative paragraph confirming the right of all countries to sovereignty over their national resources, as proposed in the second amendment, was desirable in view of the fact that such sovereignty was one of the richest sources of income to be used in realizing social development programmes.

18. The draft resolution as a whole had two major drawbacks. First, it did not deal with certain important aspects of the question. For example, it made no reference to the structural changes in society which, as many delegations had said during the general debate, were essential if the rate of social development was to be accelerated, nor did it mention such obstacles as colonialism, discrimination, apartheid and economic exploitation; there seemed to be no reason why Governments could not be specifically recommended to develop policies which would eliminate such obstacles to progress. In addition, the draft resolution failed to place sufficient stress on the need for full employment, which as indicated in section VI of the Secretary-General's report (A/7248 and Corr.1), would be one of the major problems of the next decade. Labour ranked with sovereignty over natural resources as a basic source of the means for development; yet the wording of paragraph 1 of the existing text merely recommended Member States "to incorporate in their national plans, programmes and research, social as well as economic objectives and targets, giving appropriate attention to ... increasing opportunities for full and more productive employment". There was a danger that action in that area might be confined entirely to research aimed at increasing opportunities, whereas the aim of government plans should be to ensure full productive employment.

19. The other major drawback of the draft resolution was linked to the first. No indications were given of how the work of compiling the reports on the world social situation should proceed, although it was clear that future reports must cover precisely those questions which he had enumerated as being absent from or inadequately emphasized in the draft resolution. His delegation therefore urged the sponsors to consider the possibility of including such indications in the text.

20. Doubts had been expressed as to the desirability of retaining paragraph 1 (b). His delegation believed that the formulation of the sub-paragraph could be improved, since the present wording was open to different interpretations with regard to the methods to be used for controlling population growth and patterns of population distribution. The text raised many problems which could not be answered within the context of the draft resolution, and his delegation agreed that the problem must at the present stage

be solved by individual countries in the light of their own needs.

21. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) introduced her delegation's amendments (A/C.3/L.1632), the reasons for which she had outlined at the preceding meeting. She wished to add, with regard to the amendment to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, that, while her delegation believed the guidelines contained in Economic and Social Council resolution 1320 (XLIV) to be good and generally acceptable, it felt that they should be further elaborated in order to provide a more detailed outline for activities which would strengthen the social aspects of the over-all strategy for the coming decade—a purpose which would also be served by contacts between the Committee for Development Planning and the Commission for Social Development.

22. Mr. KALANGALI (Uganda) supported the Somali amendment (A/C.3/L.1624), which drew attention to a necessary condition for social development. Some of the suggestions which his delegation had made at the preceding meeting, particularly with regard to paragraph 1 (d) (e) and (h), had not been accepted by the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1621/Rev.1); since those suggestions were reflected to some extent in the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.1631), his delegation would co-sponsor the latter.

23. Mrs. OGATA (Japan) agreed with the representatives of the USSR and France that, in order to be able to enumerate a series of objectives in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the Committee would have to consider all other unmentioned but equally important items, thus duplicating its general debate on the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development. She therefore supported the first two of the Italian amendments (A/C.3/L.1632).

24. With regard to paragraph 2, her country considered economic assistance to the developing countries not merely a moral duty to former colonies or a form of humanitarianism; the development of supply and demand in the developing countries, as markets for and suppliers of the developed countries, was also in the interest of the latter. Although Japan subscribed to the aid target laid down in UNCTAD resolution 27 (II), its aid capacity was limited, inasmuch as it ranked only twenty-first in the world in per capita income. The relative capacity of the developed countries to increase their levels of economic assistance should be taken into account in asking them to do so. At the time of the adoption of the UNCTAD resolution, her delegation had stated that it could not support the time-table for giving effect to the stipulated target and that it felt that both the volume of aid and the rate of its absolute growth should be taken into account.

25. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) moved the adjournment of the meeting to allow for consultations between the sponsors of the draft resolution and of the amendments.

The motion was adopted.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.