

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 1619th
MEETING

Monday, 25 November 1968,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Tribute to the memory of Mr. P. Y. Tsao (China)</i>	1
<i>Agenda item 49:</i>	
<i>World social situation: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolution (concluded)</i>	1

Chairman: Mr. Erik NETTEL (Austria).

Tribute to the memory of Mr. P. Y. Tsao (China)

1. The CHAIRMAN said it was with deep regret that he had to announce the death on Saturday, 23 November 1968, of Mr. P. Y. Tsao, who had represented China on the Third Committee. He requested the representative of China to convey to the Chinese Mission to the United Nations, to his Government and to the family of the deceased the Committee's sincere sympathy at their loss.

2. Mr. CHENG (China) thanked the Chairman and the members of the Committee and said that he would convey their expression of sympathy.

On the proposal of the Chairman, the members of the Committee observed a minute's silence in tribute to the memory of Mr. P. Y. Tsao.

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/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.1624, A/C.3/L.1625, A/C.3/L.1627-1632)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION
(concluded)

3. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that, after studying the comments made during the debate, her delegation had decided to maintain its amendments (A/C.3/L.1632) to the draft resolution on the world social situation (A/C.3/L.1621/Rev.2). The arguments of those who had supported the amendments had been objective, and their soundness was confirmed by the fact that no delegation had denied the validity of the Italian approach. The main arguments against the amendments had been that their adoption would render useless the diligent efforts of the sponsors of the draft resolution to arrive at a text acceptable to all, and that the developing countries needed the recommendations set out in operative paragraph 1. How-

ever, it was precisely in the interests of the developing countries that the Italian amendments referred to the conclusions and suggestions contained in the Secretary-General's report (A/7248 and Corr.1). A number of speakers who had opposed the amendments had nevertheless expressed sympathy with their intended purpose, and that encouraged her delegation to maintain the amendments and have them put to a vote.

4. Even with the help of the Secretary-General's summary (A/7248 and Corr.1), it was difficult to extract from the 1967 Report on the World Social Situation (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) specific recommendations to Governments on targets which could be incorporated in national plans. The intentions of the sponsors of the draft resolution had been admirable, but the time available for such a task was unavoidably short; as the representative of France had said, it was difficult to improve the text which was not the result of a careful and systematic study of the report. The insertion of the words "where appropriate" in the introductory part of paragraph 1, on the basis of the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.1631, para. 1), was good, but in the view of her delegation it did not go far enough. Paragraph 1 was far from perfect; the number of amendments which had been submitted spoke for itself. Its adoption would for the first time place the General Assembly in the position of recommending action to Governments without previous discussion, and would also involve anticipating by means of a rapidly-drafted resolution the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development, the completion of which it had recently been decided to postpone.

5. She believed that her delegation's amendments would avoid that problem by recalling that the draft Declaration was in an advanced stage of preparation and calling the attention of Member States to the material prepared by the Secretariat. The amendments avoided being too specific, calling attention to—rather than recommending—the Secretary-General's conclusions and suggestions, so that no pressure was exerted on Member States which did not agree with them. She therefore hoped that they would command the support of the Committee.

6. Mr. SIRI (El Salvador) said that his delegation's oral amendment to paragraph 1 (b) (see 1618th meeting, para. 37) used wording which had already been adopted in other contexts; he was therefore unable to understand the opposition which had been expressed to it. His delegation believed that a sound population policy should strengthen the family and enhance its dignity, recognizing its importance as a basic unit of society and the fact that the right of parents to determine the number of their children

took precedence over the rights of society as a whole. It would have voted for the existing text of the subparagraph, had it not been for its concern at the opposition of some delegations to the inclusion of a phrase recognizing that right. Such opposition appeared to be a deliberate attempt to weaken the right in question, and he appealed to other delegations to support the amendment.

7. Only responsible parents in decent social and economic circumstances could make wise decisions with regard to the size of their families; there could be no constructive population policy as long as families remained weak, unhealthy, poor and ignorant. Apart from being the basic biological unit of society, the family was also the basic cultural unit; new generations depended to a great extent on the education and example they received at home with regard to morals and social values. The State should therefore strengthen the family by granting increased allowances to those with a large number of children and reducing their taxes, providing pre-natal and post-natal care, housing and educational and recreational facilities, and should do everything in its power to establish a society with sound moral values.

8. The right approach to national development was through the family rather than in opposition to it, enabling it to work for the common good in full exercise of its rights, including the right to decide on the number of children. He believed that support for his amendment was particularly important at a time when it appeared to be the intention of certain international groups to weaken the family.

9. Mr. ARTAZA (Chile) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1621/Rev.2) for the spirit of accommodation they had shown in accepting amendments to paragraph 1. Much had been done to bring the text into line with the views of some of the Latin American countries, and his delegation would support it. It could not therefore vote in favour of the Italian amendments (A/C.3/L.1632) which, although praiseworthy in intent, would remove the sound basis that the present text provided for the activities of Governments.

10. His delegation had agreed to revise its proposal for the insertion of a new operative paragraph (A/C.3/L.1628, para. 2), which should now read:

"Specially recommends the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association, in their studies of lending plans for investment, to consider investment in the fields of industrialization, land reform, health, housing, administration of justice and community development, as they have already done in the field of education, considering the importance of these investments for social development."

The phrase "community development" was intended to mean the establishment of associations and organizations which would act as an intermediary between the people and the Government. It should be noted that the new paragraph did not seek to commit the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or the International Development Association to any new course of action, since it recommended only that

they should consider such investments in their studies of lending plans.

11. Mr. CUESTA (Ecuador) observed that great zeal had been displayed in attempts to improve the text of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, he was concerned about paragraph 1 (b), in which States were encouraged to promote a policy that was not within their competence. The family, which had existed before the State, could not and should not be used for the purposes of the State. He was well aware of the dangers of the population explosion, but that could not excuse any tampering with the rights of the family. The Latin American countries had great faith in man and in the family, for ethical rather than religious reasons. Since the problem was one that had to be solved by parents, and not by the State or by any international organization, it would be better if there were no reference to it in the draft resolution. If, however, a reference to the family was to be included, it should be a positive one, and he therefore endorsed the amendment proposed by the representative of El Salvador.

12. The Chairman invited the Committee to vote on the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1621/Rev.2) and the amendments thereto. He recalled that the amendments of Somalia (A/C.3/L.1624), Poland (A/C.3/L.1629 para. 1) and the fourth amendment of the USSR (A/C.3/L.1631, para. 4) had been orally revised (see 1617th meeting, paras. 6, 11 and 16 respectively). The second amendment of Chile (A/C.3/L.1628, para. 2) had been orally revised at the current meeting (see para. 10 above). The Committee also had before it the oral amendment of El Salvador (see 1618th meeting, para. 37).

The first preambular paragraph was adopted unanimously.

The Guinean amendment (A/C.3/L.1625, para. 1) to the second preambular paragraph was adopted by 48 votes to 9, with 36 abstentions.

The second preambular paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs were adopted unanimously.

The Italian amendment for the addition of a new preambular paragraph (A/C.3/L.1632, para. 1) was rejected by 29 votes to 18, with 41 abstentions.

The preamble as a whole, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

The Italian amendment (A/C.3/L.1632, para. 2) to operative paragraph 1 was rejected by 69 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions.

The introductory part of paragraph 1 was adopted by 90 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.1631, para. 2) to paragraph 1 (a) was adopted by 28 votes to 19, with 44 abstentions.

The USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.1631, para. 3) for the deletion of paragraph 1 (b) was rejected by 68 votes to 11, with 16 abstentions.

The Salvadorian oral amendment to paragraph 1 (b) was adopted by 44 votes to 4, with 43 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 (b), as orally revised and as amended, was adopted by 77 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 (c) was adopted by 92 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

The USSR amendment to paragraph 1 (d) (A/C.3/L.1631, para. 4), as orally revised, was rejected by 25 votes to 24, with 48 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 (d) was adopted by 84 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 (e) and paragraph 1 (f) were adopted by 96 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Polish amendment to paragraph 1 (g) (A/C.3/L.1629, para. 1), as orally revised, was adopted by 42 votes to 7, with 43 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 (g), as amended, was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 (h) was adopted by 96 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

13. Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) requested a separate vote on the word "income" in paragraph 1 (i).

The word "income" was retained by 88 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 (i) was adopted by 89 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

14. Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) requested a separate vote on the words "with emphasis on preventive measures integrated into broader programmes of national development" in paragraph 1 (j).

The words were retained by 78 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 (j) was adopted by 92 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 (k) and paragraph 1 (l) were adopted by 93 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chilean amendment for the insertion in paragraph 1 of a new sub-paragraph (A/C.3/L.1628, para. 1) was adopted by 69 votes to 1, with 20 abstentions, as sub-paragraph (m).

Paragraph 1, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 91 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

15. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Somali amendment (A/C.3/L.1624), as orally revised, and the Bulgarian amendment (A/C.3/L.1630, para. 2), if adopted, would become operative paragraphs 2 and 3 respectively.

At the request of the Syrian representative, the vote on the Somali amendment, as orally revised, was taken by roll-call.

Saudi Arabia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela,

Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway.

The Somali amendment (A/C.3/L.1624), as orally revised, was adopted by 81 votes to none, with 17 abstentions, as paragraph 2.

The Bulgarian amendment (A/C.3/L.1630, para. 2) was adopted by 76 votes to 1, with 17 abstentions, as paragraph 3.

The three-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.1627) to the original paragraph 2 was adopted by 35 votes to 12, with 36 abstentions, as paragraph 4.

The Italian amendment for the insertion of a new operative paragraph (A/C.3/L.1632, para. 3) was adopted by 36 votes to 27, with 24 abstentions, as paragraph 5.

The Italian amendment (A/C.3/L.1632, para. 4) to the original paragraph 3 was rejected by 42 votes to 9, with 39 abstentions.

16. Mr. TORRES-CARRILHO (Brazil) requested a separate vote on the words "as well as those set out in paragraph 1 above" in the original paragraph 3.

The words were retained by 79 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions.

The original paragraph 3 was adopted by 89 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, as paragraph 6.

The original paragraph 4 was adopted unanimously, as paragraph 7.

The original paragraph 5 was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, as paragraph 8.

The Chilean amendment for the insertion of a new operative paragraph (A/C.3/L.1628, para. 2), as orally revised, was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 28 abstentions, as paragraph 9.

The original paragraphs 6 and 7 were adopted unanimously, as paragraphs 10 and 11.

The operative part of the draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 83 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1621/Rev.2), as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 87 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 2 p.m.