



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 48:	
Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development <i>(concluded)</i>	
Consideration of draft resolution <i>(concluded)</i> . . . . .	403
Agenda items 59 and 60:	
International Year for Human Rights: report of the Secretary-General <i>(concluded)</i>	} 403
Implementation of the recommendations of the Inter- national Conference on Human Rights: report of the Secretary-General <i>(concluded)</i>	
Consideration of draft resolutions <i>(concluded)</i> . . . . .	
Agenda item 21:	
Problems of the human environment: report of the Secretary-General . . . . .	405

**Chairman:** Mrs. Turkia OULD DADDAH  
(Mauritania).

**AGENDA ITEM 48**

**Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development  
*(concluded)* (A/7235 and Add.1 and 2, A/7648)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION  
*(concluded)***

1. Mr. MEDEIROS (Brazil) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution adopted at the preceding meeting (A/C.3/L.1736 and Add.1 and 2), as orally revised and as amended. Nevertheless, it wished to place on record its reservations regarding operative paragraphs 1 and 6 of the draft resolution in the context of paragraph 32 of part III of the draft Declaration (see A/C.3/L.1742, annex).
2. His delegation had voted against paragraph 32 because it was convinced that family planning was the exclusive right of parents, as was clearly stated in article 4 of the draft Declaration. The population problem pertained exclusively to the field of national sovereignty of each country, and his delegation was therefore not in a position to agree to the inclusion of such a paragraph in any international document, even though it was only of a declaratory character. His Government would be unable to comply in that respect with operative paragraphs 1 and 6 of the draft resolution, since the provisions of the draft Declaration relating to family planning ran counter to its policy.
3. Mr. BASCON (Bolivia) said that his delegation would have voted for the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1736 and

Add.1 and 2) if it had been present at the preceding meeting.

**AGENDA ITEMS 59 AND 60**

**International Year for Human Rights: report  
of the Secretary-General *(concluded)*\* (A/7666 and Add.1)**

**Implementation of the recommendations of the Inter-  
national Conference on Human Rights: report of the  
Secretary-General *(concluded)*\* (A/7661, A/C.3/L.1744/  
Rev.1)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS  
*(concluded)***

4. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) introduced, on behalf of the sponsors, a revised version (A/C.3/L.1744/Rev.1) of the draft resolution on implementation of the resolutions of the International Conference on Human Rights (A/C.3/L.1744), which took into account comments made by various delegations. He also announced the following revisions in the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1744/Rev.1): in the second preambular paragraph, the words "especially in southern Africa" were added after the word "decolonization"; in the sixth preambular paragraph, the words "arising from the continued refusal by the colonial régimes and other Governments to comply with these resolutions" were replaced by "arising from the non-implementation of these resolutions"; in the seventh preambular paragraph, the words "and territories" were deleted after the words "of countries"; the words "which supports the liberation movements in southern Africa and elsewhere in their legitimate struggle for freedom and independence" were added at the end of operative paragraph 2; in operative paragraph 5, the words "the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa" were added after "Namibia"; and operative paragraph 7 was reworded to read as follows:

"*Decides* to review at its twenty-fifth session the progress in the implementation of resolution VIII<sup>1</sup> of the International Conference on Human Rights and the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the subject."

5. Mrs. DE PINOCHET (Chile) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 6.
6. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that his delegation could no longer co-sponsor the draft resolution, since it could not

\* Resumed from the 1717th meeting.

<sup>1</sup> See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), p. 9.

accept the revised wording of what was now paragraph 6. However, it would be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

7. Mr. IDDIR (Algeria) said that his delegation, as a co-sponsor, agreed with the Iranian delegation and wished to enter a reservation with regard to paragraph 6.

8. Mrs. SCHIM VAN DER LOEFF-MACKAAY (Netherlands) said that her delegation would not participate in the voting because, as it had already stated, it did not consider the Committee competent to deal with the subject-matter of the draft resolution.

9. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that she rather doubted whether the Third Committee was the appropriate body to review the progress in the implementation of resolutions relating to decolonization. She therefore requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 7.

10. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) observed that, in his view, the Third Committee was the one best placed to consider matters which had been discussed at the Teheran Conference. Resolution VIII of the Conference was, in fact, concerned with the right of peoples to self-determination—one of the most important of human rights. However, the question which Committee was to review the progress in the implementation of that and other relevant resolutions would be decided in due course by the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the General Committee.

11. Mr. COLL (Venezuela) feared that the text of the draft resolution might raise the question whether matters which were similar in nature were to be discussed by more than one Main Committee of the General Assembly. Nevertheless, his delegation was in general agreement with its substance and would vote in favour of it.

*Operative paragraph 6 of the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1744/Rev.1) was adopted by 49 votes to 3, with 31 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 7 of the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1744/Rev.1), as orally revised, was adopted by 57 votes to 1, with 34 abstentions.*

*At the request of the representatives of Pakistan and the Sudan, a recorded vote was taken on the revised draft resolution as a whole, as orally revised.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Zambia.

*Against:* Portugal.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*The revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1744/Rev.1) as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted by 66 votes to 1, with 26 abstentions.*

12. Mr. FERNANDEZ-LONGORIA (Spain), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that his delegation had supported the adoption of the draft resolution. However, it had reservations regarding the orally revised version of paragraph 2, which it felt was an incitement to violence. As a member of the Security Council, his country preferred negotiated settlements. If the paragraph in question had been voted on separately, his delegation would have abstained.

13. Miss GUEVARA (Argentina) said that she had abstained from voting, because the Third Committee was not the appropriate forum for the discussion of problems of decolonization. She hoped that at the next session the Committee would confine itself to matters which fell within its competence.

14. Mr. JHA (India) said that his delegation interpreted paragraph 7 as 14. Mr. JHA (India) said that his delegation interpreted paragraph 7 as of resolution VIII of the International Conference on Human Rights. It was on that understanding that he had voted for the retention of the paragraph.

15. Mrs. CADIEUX (Canada) said that, although she appreciated the link between resolution VIII of the Conference and decolonization, she was far from convinced that the latter was a subject that came within the terms of reference of the Third Committee. As a matter of principle, she had therefore abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

16. Mr. HJELDE (Norway) observed that preparations were under way for a review by the Fourth Committee, in 1970, of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Third Committee had for many years past been unable to complete the consideration of the agenda items referred to it, and matters, sometimes of high priority, had constantly had to be deferred from session to session. Thus, it was inappropriate to broaden the Committee's area of responsibility at the present time, and his delegation had accordingly abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

17. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) said that his delegation could have supported certain parts of the draft resolution, particularly paragraph 1, which was perhaps the most important provision. However, as the United Kingdom delegation at the Teheran Conference had abstained from voting on resolution VIII, he himself had done likewise in the present instance. The General Assembly had considered

the question of follow-up action in connexion with resolution VIII at the time of the adoption of its resolution 2446 (XXIII), and he did not feel that any further provision for discussion of the matter was required.

18. Mrs. DE BROMLEY (Honduras) said that her delegation had consistently condemned the evils of colonialism. It had none the less abstained from voting because it considered that the matter dealt with in the draft resolution was outside the terms of reference of the Committee, which already had a very heavy agenda.

19. Mr. BABAA (Libya) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution on the understanding that its provisions were applicable to all areas of the world where the right of self-determination was denied.

20. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that the focal point of the text adopted by the Committee was resolution VIII of the International Conference on Human Rights, which contained judgements, particularly in operative paragraphs 11, 12 and 13, that were unacceptable to her country. Accordingly, she had abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

21. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said he wished to place on record that, had he not been unavoidably absent, he would have voted for draft resolution A/C.3/L.1744/Rev.1.

## AGENDA ITEM 21

### **Problems of the human environment: report of the Secretary-General (A/7514, A/7603, chap. V, sect. D, A/7707, A/7760, A/7780)**

22. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the General Assembly had decided that agenda item 21, which had been referred to the Second Committee, should also be considered by the Third Committee (see A/C.3/612). The Second Committee had considered the item at its 1276th, 1278th and 1282nd meetings, on 10, 12 and 14 November 1970, and had adopted draft resolution A/C.2/L.1069 and Add.1.

23. Mr. ÅSTRÖM (Sweden) said that the decision taken by the General Assembly in its resolution 2398 (XXIII) to convene in 1972 a United Nations Conference on the Human Environment had signified both the international community's recognition of the warnings of scientists and scholars that the large-scale application of technology had some deleterious effects and its concern at the deterioration of the physical and biological environment in many parts of the world. However, that decision also showed an awareness that modern scientific and technological developments, if employed wisely, offered unprecedented opportunities for man to change and shape his environment so as to achieve physical, mental and social well-being and the enjoyment of basic human rights. In the same resolution, the Secretary-General had been requested to produce a report for submission to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session, through the Economic and Social Council. The report of the Secretary-General,<sup>2</sup> which was excellent,

clearly defined all important aspects of the question, including those which were outside the scope of the present international effort.

24. The General Assembly had also decided that the two main types of problems to be discussed at the Conference would be the changes in the natural surroundings of man brought about by increasing population and by the use without adequate control of modern technological advances in industry and agriculture, on the one hand, and the impact of those changes on man himself, his health, and his working and living conditions, on the other. The emphasis would therefore be placed on the consequences of human action on the environment, thus excluding purely natural phenomena, even if they might affect man. Socio-cultural environmental problems would also be considered if they were directly related to the physico-biological changes of the environment; those that were only indirectly related to such changes would be excluded.

25. At the current session, the Second Committee had discussed the question on the basis of the reports of the Secretary-General<sup>2</sup> and the Economic and Social Council (see A/7603, chap. V, sect. D) and had adopted draft resolution A/C.2/L.1069 and Add.1, sponsored by fifty-six countries, paragraph 2 of which contained a statement of what should be the main purpose of the Conference. The Second Committee also recommended, in paragraph 14 of the draft resolution, that the General Assembly should accept the invitation of the Government of Sweden (see A/7514) to hold the Conference in Sweden in June 1972, and he assured the Committee that if the General Assembly decided to do so his Government would take all the practical action in its power to ensure the Conference's success. Consultations were in progress to determine which twenty-seven countries would be represented in the Preparatory Committee to be set up under paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, and the outcome would be announced shortly in the Second Committee. A small conference secretariat would also be set up under the terms of paragraph 5.

26. As soon as the General Assembly had taken its final action on the draft resolution, substantive preparations for the Conference would begin. The organizational aspects of the Conference, including its agenda, would be determined in close consultation with Governments. Many suggestions regarding the agenda had already been made in the Secretary-General's report and during the debates in the Economic and Social Council and the Second Committee. In particular, many delegations in the Second Committee had submitted general suggestions regarding the social content of the Conference and several developing countries had stressed the importance of regulating the social consequences of unplanned urban growth, a problem with regard to which they hoped that the Conference would be able to furnish guidelines. All the suggestions made would be part of the background material to be considered by the Secretary-General and the Preparatory Committee. Naturally, the Preparatory Committee would have to recommend priorities, bearing in mind the limited duration of the Conference.

27. In his delegation's view, the preparations for the Conference would be as important as the Conference itself,

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-seventh Session, document E/4667.*

because they would represent not only a continuing dialogue between the Secretariat, the Preparatory Committee and Member Governments and a continuing exchange of views between Governments themselves on the problems of the human environment but also an opportunity to make public opinion and Governments increasingly aware of the nature and urgency of those problems. It could therefore be hoped that Governments and international agencies would begin to take action on the problems posed by the human environment even during the preparatory stage of the Conference.

28. He suggested that the Third Committee should take note of the discussion on the item in the Second Committee and of its draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1069 and Add.1) and recommend the adoption of the latter by the General Assembly.

29. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) expressed appreciation of the Swedish delegation's action in bringing before the United Nations the problems of the human environment, which were depicted in the Secretary-General's report in such striking and frightening terms that they might well be called the problems of the inhuman environment.

30. His delegation attached particular importance to two points. First, it should be made perfectly clear that efforts to control pollution should not be regarded as directed against science and technology, which, although they had negative aspects, had also been responsible for much social progress. The information campaign referred to in the report should not, therefore, give the public a frightening picture of science and technology. Secondly, in no case should the campaign against pollution have the effect of penalizing the developing countries by lowering their rate of economic and social development. He agreed that only those socio-cultural problems that were directly related to physico-biological changes of the environment should be discussed at the Conference, which would be too short to allow for the discussion of other aspects, however great their importance. The Conference should be not the end but the beginning of international efforts to preserve the human environment and would undoubtedly be followed by seminars and meetings at which particular socio-cultural problems indirectly related to such changes could be discussed.

31. He supported the Swedish representative's suggestion concerning the action to be taken by the Third Committee.

32. Mr. JHA (India) said that the item under discussion, which involved a subject that had been taken for granted for far too long, was potentially of supreme importance to mankind, because an environment steadily built up over hundreds of millions of years was perilously close to being destroyed within a few generations.

33. It was apparent from the Secretary-General's report that, if current trends continued, they would seriously undermine the quality of life on earth and eventually imperil the survival of man himself. It was therefore necessary to focus attention on what those trends were and what action could be taken to reverse them. Clearly, man's survival depended on a complex interrelationship between living organisms on the earth—the so-called balance of

nature, which had a remarkable capacity for regeneration, provided that it was not tampered with by man. That man was tampering with it had, however, for long been apparent in the explosive growth of human population, in the deterioration of agricultural land, in the unplanned extension of urban areas, in the decrease of available space and in the growing danger of the extinction of many forms of animal and plant life.

34. In four centuries, the world's population had increased from 500 million to 3,500 million; during the same period, 1,500 million acres of arable land had been lost through erosion and salinization, two thirds of the world's forest area had been lost to production, and 150 types of birds and animals had become extinct. In particular, the indiscriminate use of insecticides had wreaked havoc on animal and vegetable life. Minute amounts of such pesticides as DDT had been found to inhibit photosynthesis in marine plants by as much as 75 per cent. Increased pollution of the atmosphere could, through the "hothouse" effect, eventually melt the polar ice-cap, raise the level of the world's seas and wash away coastal cities. Combustion of fossil fuels had brought a 10 per cent increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide over the past century; with increased rates of combustion, that could rise to 25 per cent by the year 2000.

35. The problems of urbanization were most acute in developing countries and, unless solved, would condemn millions of human beings to life in a subhuman environment. The urban population of the developing countries was expected to increase from 100 million in 1920 to 2,000 million in the year 2000.

36. In India, progressive deforestation had contributed to soil erosion; the north-western desert, until recently, had been spreading by one mile a year, and many wildlife species had already become extinct. Even well-intentioned measures of flood control could result in the discontinuance of the deposit of fertile soil. India was even experiencing water and air pollution. The Prime Minister of India was concerned with the current environmental crisis throughout the world and she had stated recently that she would favour a universal declaration for the protection of the physical environment and wildlife.

37. The developing countries hoped to benefit from the experience of the developed countries and from the solutions they had found. If the Conference was to be successful the agenda should be so devised as to be of interest to all countries, and if its conclusions were to be intelligible to laymen the composition of delegations should not be restricted to technicians. The Conference should not only study the problems of the human environment but should also suggest follow-up measures. Policies to preserve the human environment should be viewed, not as a restriction on progress in general and on that of the developing countries in particular or as an attack on science and technology, but rather as a part of long-term plans for the development of resources. If that approach was adopted, the human environment could serve mankind for centuries to come.

38. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) observed that increased material resources did not automatically raise the

standard of living. The problems of the human environment confronted the developed and the developing countries alike, and their solution must be found internationally and collectively. Science and technology should be the allies of man, and not a threat to his very existence.

39. The thorough debate in the Second Committee on the item relieved the Third Committee of the need for lengthy discussion. He hoped that the Third Committee would endorse the draft resolution adopted by the Second Committee and recommend its adoption to the General Assembly.

40. Miss DOBSON (Australia) said that her delegation had made its views on the item clear in its statements at the 1759th plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 22 September 1969 and the 1276th meeting of the Second Committee and she would not, therefore, repeat them. As the matter had been fully debated in the Second Committee, her delegation supported the Swedish suggestion.

41. Mr. PAOLINI (France) regretted that, for lack of time, the Committee had been unable to discuss the item, which had been referred to the Second Committee not because of the nature of the problems involved but because the Third Committee's agenda was overburdened.

42. In his view, the problems posed by the human environment were entirely social in nature. The issue for the Conference should be how to limit the harmful social consequences of industrial and scientific advances, whose positive consequences had accounted for so much social and economic progress. All social progress had been achieved by measures which had seemed almost anti-economic at the time when they had been adopted, because they had imposed obligations and set limitations on the free play of economic forces in the general interest or in the interest of the less favoured sectors of the population. The Conference had its origin in a universal concern that the most essential elements of the human environment were being menaced or invaded by pollution. The problems of the human environment were not confined to science and technology or to industrialization, and they were of concern to all countries, whatever their level of development. Accordingly, the Conference should adopt an essentially social approach to the study of them.

43. In the Second Committee, his delegation had expressed its views regarding the criteria on which the Conference should base its work. The agenda should include only those problems which already affected or might be expected shortly to affect both developing and developed countries, and which might be solved by action at the international level or by national public authorities. The topics for discussion should be specific and should be chosen on the basis of the availability of relevant scientific and technological information and the preliminary work done by Governments and by the United Nations family. The typically social aspects of the problems would be brought out by stressing the role to be played by the public authorities of the participating countries. The Conference should be more than a mere exchange of views; it should be designed to develop and define measures to be taken at the national and the international level.

44. The Third Committee was not in a position to undertake a substantial discussion on the question of the human environment at the current session. It should therefore take note of the debates in the Second Committee and recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution approved by the Second Committee (A/C.2/L.1069 and Add.1). The Third Committee itself should not vote on the draft resolution, particularly since it had not been able to discuss it in depth.

45. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had already explained its position on the question of the problems of the human environment in the Second Committee, and agreed that the Third Committee should not proceed to an extensive debate on the item, even though that item had been referred to it precisely because of its serious social aspects.

46. His delegation considered that the success of the Conference would depend largely on the degree to which the principle of universality was applied both in the planning stages and at the Conference itself. It was therefore essential that all interested countries should be allowed to participate.

47. He agreed that the Third Committee should not vote on the draft resolution adopted by the Second Committee but should endorse it and recommend its adoption by the General Assembly.

48. Mr. UMRATH (Netherlands) pointed out that the problems of the human environment were not a new topic. They had been discussed for decades under the heading "social cost of private enterprise". However, the social cost no longer resulted solely from private initiative, but also from public sectors responsible for economic development. The population explosion, urbanization and industrialization had all played their part in increasing the problems of the human environment. Science and technology had also played a significant role. His country in particular faced several serious problems. On the one hand, because of rapid industrialization, the River Rhine had become a vast sewer; on the other hand, with the help of modern science and technology, his country had been able to reclaim vast tracts of land from the sea. However, the waste disposal problems resulting from that change in the balance of nature were now costing his country vast sums of money, and it was paying the social cost of technological development and being obliged to make amends for what had originally been considered an excellent initiative.

49. The task facing the world today was not only to identify the causes of the problems of the human environment and to work out solutions for them, but increasingly to look ahead and anticipate the possible adverse effects of large undertakings requiring vast investment before those undertakings were begun. The Stockholm Conference should therefore pay special attention to the elaboration of preventive measures designed to safeguard countries from further problems in the future.

50. His delegation wished to endorse the draft resolution adopted by the Second Committee.

51. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that his delegation had already stated its position on the item in the Second

Committee. However, it wished to thank the Swedish Government and people for their interest in the problems of the human environment and for their invitation to hold the Conference in their country.

52. Mr. TORRES (Philippines) said the main paradox of the twentieth century was that man had made significant progress in science and technology, but had threatened his own existence. The benefits derived from improved health conditions were offset by the problems resulting from the population explosion. Similarly, the urbanization process had led to an exodus from the rural areas. Such phenomena were the main reasons for the environmental menace. His delegation attached particular importance to the problems of the human environment because, if problems of such urgency were not tackled immediately, man's own inhumanity to his environment might bring him to his doom.

53. The interest displayed by Governments in the problems of the human environment was totally devoid of any political or ideological implications. It merely reflected their realization that the human race had jeopardized its own survival. The international community should therefore ensure that the balance of nature upon which life depended was not destroyed.

54. His country had paid particular attention to the wise utilization of its resources through enforcement of laws and education of the people. The Philippines had been a sponsor both of General Assembly resolution 2398 (XXIII) and of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1069 and Add.1. It fully endorsed paragraph 13 of the latter and would stress that the forthcoming Conference should concentrate on working out plans of action at the national, regional and international levels for controlling the human environment. His delegation approved of the establishment of a Preparatory Committee, which should be composed of experts in all aspects of the question, and of a small conference secretariat. He agreed that the Third Committee should recommend the draft resolution to the General Assembly for adoption.

55. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) said he shared the general view that the Third Committee should avoid a detailed discussion and a separate vote on the draft resolution which had been unanimously adopted by the Second Committee.

56. His delegation wished to place on record its gratitude to the Government and people of Sweden for their invitation to hold the Conference there in 1972. It supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.1069 and Add.1 and hoped that, particularly in the preparatory stages, every effort would be made to ensure the complete success of the Conference.

57. Mrs. EL-TELLAWY (United Arab Republic) expressed appreciation to the Government of Sweden for its invitation to hold the Conference at Stockholm.

58. Her delegation considered that discussion in the Third Committee of the social, cultural and moral aspects of the problem would contribute to the work of the Second Committee and to the effort to achieve a better human environment.

59. It had been suggested that the problems of the human environment concerned mainly the developed countries. In

her view, the question had national and international implications of equal importance to all countries. On the national level, Governments faced such problems as the population explosion, urbanization, water resources and soil protection, which were of interest to many developing countries and affected their policies in, for instance, the fields of employment, housing and transportation. On the international level, the possible danger of radioactive pollution of the atmosphere by nuclear tests in the atmosphere and in outer space, and of the seas by under-water tests, were of great concern not only to developed but to developing countries. International action and co-operation was essential for the solution of those problems.

60. However, it was true to say that the developed and the developing countries faced different problems with regard to the effects of industrialization on the human environment. It was only reasonable that countries in the initial phases of industrial development should have the benefit of the experience and knowledge of the more developed countries, in order to avoid the errors of those who had preceded them. It was therefore important that the 1972 Conference should take into consideration the problems and needs of the developing countries.

61. The Conference should also address itself to the social, cultural and moral aspects of the problems. It should be borne in mind that the International Conference on Human Rights had recommended, in its resolution XI,<sup>3</sup> that the organizations of the United Nations family should undertake a study of the problems with respect to human rights arising from developments in science and technology, particularly with regard, *inter alia*, to the protection of the human personality in view of the progress in biology, medicine and biochemistry. The impact of industrialization on the family, and particularly the gradual dissolution of the traditional social unit, should also be studied. Lastly, it should be borne in mind that the developing countries in particular were rapidly moving from an agricultural to an industrialized society without any period of transition, and that they usually lacked the resources to help the individual to adapt himself to the new material environment. She hoped that the Conference would include in its agenda some of the aspects she had mentioned.

62. The CHAIRMAN said it was clear that the Committee recognized the importance and urgency of the problems of the human environment and the necessity of beginning the preparations for the Conference at once. She suggested that the Committee should decide to associate itself with draft resolution A/C.2/L.1069 and Add.1, recommended by the Second Committee for adoption by the General Assembly, so that the Assembly might proceed to consider it in plenary meeting.<sup>4</sup>

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.*

<sup>3</sup> See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), p. 12.

<sup>4</sup> At its 1834th plenary meeting, on 15 December 1969, the General Assembly considered the draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee (see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 21, document A/7866, para. 12) and adopted it unanimously (resolution 2581 (XXIV)).