



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 48:	
Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development <i>(continued)</i>	
Part III: Means and methods <i>(continued)</i>	
Paragraph 6 <i>(concluded)</i> . . . . .	169
Paragraph 7 . . . . .	171

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

**AGENDA ITEM 48**

**Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development  
*(continued)* (A/7235 and Add.1 and 2, A/7648, A/C.3/  
 L.1696-1698, A/C.3/L.1700-1704, A/C.3/L.1706-1712,  
 A/C.3/L.1714-1716, A/C.3/L.1718-1721, A/C.3/L.1722  
 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.1723-1727)**

**PART III: MEANS AND METHODS *(continued)***

*Paragraph 6 (concluded)*

1. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) said that the Committee should adopt a draft declaration which would be compatible with all legal systems and to which all Governments could subscribe. The amendment in document A/C.3/L.1703, submitted by Poland and the Soviet Union, contained in the English text a number of terms which were not readily adaptable to common law legal systems. For example, in English the word "usufruct" referred solely to a concept of Roman law, and was not used in Anglo-Saxon law. If the purpose of the amendment was to state that those who cultivated the land were entitled to the produce thereof, he fully agreed with that idea, but would prefer to see the word "lease" or "tenancy" in the English text. Similarly, the word "redemption", which in English meant to pay off a mortgage, seemed to be used in document A/C.3/L.1703 in a different sense, as indicating the right of the landowner to terminate a lease. If that interpretation was correct, he would agree that the farmer should be protected against unjustified eviction—and United Kingdom law did indeed contain provisions to that effect; on the other hand, there were cases where the landowner might have valid reasons for regaining possession of his land, for example if he had rented it on a provisional basis, or if the farmer was farming it badly. The landowner must therefore have the right in certain circumstances to regain possession of his land. The phrase "the person who works it" was vague and ambiguous. If it was intended to exclude absentee landlords, he supported it without reservation.

However, he wondered whether it did not also exclude managing farmers, co-operatives and the State, which might also own land. Finally, he would like to know what exactly was meant by the phrase "adverse conditions of tenancy".

2. The difficulties which the amendment of Poland and the Soviet Union raised for his delegation were of a legal rather than a political nature, and he would like the text to be worded in terms compatible with the common law system.

3. Mr. LEW (China) noted that paragraph 6 was of great importance to the developing countries, since it dealt with the struggle against hunger, and he was grateful to delegations which had drawn attention in their amendments to the need for agrarian reform, an undertaking which had been successfully completed in Taiwan. He agreed with the views of the United Kingdom representative on the text submitted by Poland and the Soviet Union (A/C.3/L.1703). With regard to the amendment to paragraph 6 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, he agreed with the representatives of Sierra Leone and Jamaica that some reference should be made to diversification of agricultural production. The need for better methods of agricultural production and food distribution should also be stressed, since with modern agricultural methods it should be possible to achieve both a quantitative and a qualitative increase in agriculture production. He therefore proposed that in the amendment to paragraph 6 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 the following text should be added after the words "for the entire population" at the end of the paragraph: "particularly by international technical co-operation, the training of personnel, the improvement of seed strains and the introduction of scientific methods of irrigation". He also proposed, to prevent any misunderstanding, that the word "equitable" should be inserted before "agrarian reforms".

4. Mrs. DE PINOCHET (Chile) said that agrarian reform was very important, not only because it was a means for the developing countries to increase their agricultural production, but also and above all because it changed the land ownership system and enabled peasants to participate in the economic and social life of their countries. In Chile, agrarian reform had been one of the main tasks undertaken by the present Government, which had tried to improve the living conditions of the peasants and to encourage their integration in the country's economic and social development by means of loans, improvements in rural housing, irrigation schemes, the establishment of agricultural co-operatives, the dissemination of information on agricultural methods, and social welfare measures. Thousands of peasants had benefited from the reform, which had been carried out in an atmosphere of legality, justice and freedom.

5. She supported the amendment to paragraph 6 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, the amendments proposed by Sierra Leone (A/C.3/L.1704, para. 2) and Iraq (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 3) and the oral amendment proposed by China.

6. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) said that the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 had revised their proposed text for paragraph 6 in order to take into account, as far as possible, the comments made during the discussions. The revised text read as follows:

“The adoption of measures to boost agricultural production through, *inter alia*, the implementation of agrarian reforms, to ensure an adequate and well-balanced supply and equitable distribution of food for the entire population and to improve nutritional standards.”

7. The new text incorporated the amendments of Sierra Leone (A/C.3/L.1709, para. 2) and of Czechoslovakia contained in document A/C.3/L.1725, and the suggestions made by Jamaica. The sponsors regretted that they had been unable to take into account all suggestions—such as the proposal for a reference to the diversification of agriculture—but they hoped that the new text would satisfy the majority of delegations.

8. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) was glad to note that the words “agrarian reforms” appeared in the new text proposed by the representative of Uganda, which was a considerable improvement on the initial text. However, what the developing countries needed was not only a reform of agricultural techniques, but a radical change in the land ownership system. He wished to make a distinction therefore between “agrarian reform”, which was required in order to increase agricultural production, and “land reform”, which was essential in order to emancipate the peasants. He supported the new text of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, as proposed by the representative of Uganda, as well as the amendments proposed by Poland and the Soviet Union (A/C.3/L.1703), Iraq (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 3) and Czechoslovakia (A/C.3/L.1725).

9. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) withdrew his amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 3).

10. Mr. PECHACEK (Czechoslovakia) also withdrew his amendment to paragraph 6 contained in document A/C.3/L.1725, since it had been incorporated in the proposed new text.

11. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) said that the question of agrarian reform should certainly be discussed in the general context of social progress and development. Paragraph 6 of the draft dealt solely with food supply. However, if a country wanted an adequate food supply, it would have to advance from a subsistence agriculture to a market agriculture; and, for that, agrarian reform was essential in many countries.

12. The Polish and Soviet delegations would be prepared to revise the text of their amendment (A/C.3/L.1703) to make it clearer, since it seemed to present difficulties for some delegations; but they were also prepared to withdraw

it if the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 would agree to add the words “based on the principle that land should be transferred to the ownership or use of those who work it” after the words “agrarian reforms”.

13. Mr. GUZMAN (Peru) supported the Polish representative’s suggestion. He stressed the importance of agrarian reform, which was an essential precondition for the industrialization of countries.

14. Mrs. NICOL (Sierra Leone) thanked the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 for incorporating her amendment in their new revised text. She withdrew her own amendment (A/C.3/L.1709, para. 2), and supported the text read out by the representative of Uganda, although she felt that the concept of nutrition had not been sufficiently stressed.

15. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) supported the revised text of paragraph 6 submitted by the representative of Uganda, but wished to suggest a minor stylistic amendment in the last part of the text, which might perhaps be drafted as follows: “. . . to ensure the adequate and well-balanced supply of food, its equitable distribution among the whole population and the improvement of nutrition standards”.

16. The amendment submitted by the Polish and Soviet delegations (A/C.3/L.1703) contained some extremely interesting ideas, but should more appropriately be considered during the discussion on part III, paragraph 13.

17. Mr. OTHMAN (Jordan) said that the revised text was an improvement on the original text, but still omitted two important ideas. First, as the representative of Syria had pointed out, a distinction should be made between “land reform” and “agrarian reform”, and both of those concepts should appear in the text of paragraph 6. Secondly, as the representative of Jamaica had indicated, the idea of diversification of agriculture should be included, since the developing countries should not have to go on relying on one or a few basic commodities.

18. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendment to paragraph 6 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, as revised orally, said that, while he appreciated the importance of the text submitted by the delegations of Poland and the USSR (A/C.3/L.1703), it would be preferable to consider that text in connexion with paragraph 13. The idea of economic diversification was, by implication, contained in the revised text of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, and there did not seem to be any need for a further reference to it. Finally, on behalf of the sponsors, he accepted the drafting change proposed by the representative of Cyprus.

19. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) thanked the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, as revised orally, for the spirit of co-operation which they had displayed by including various suggestions in their text.

20. When she had mentioned diversification, she had not been thinking of economic diversification, which meant the transition from a basically agricultural economy to an industrial economy, but rather of agricultural diversifica-

tion, i.e. the change-over from a single-crop to a multi-crop system. When talking of food supply it was obviously essential to stress agricultural, rather than economic, diversification.

21. Her delegation regretted that Poland and the USSR seemed to be thinking of withdrawing their amendment, since the idea of agrarian reform was highly relevant in a declaration on social progress and development. On the other hand, it was not exclusively related to the subject under consideration, and the amendment proposed by Poland and the USSR should therefore be contained in a separate paragraph.

22. She agreed with the Sierra Leonean representative that the revised text did not sufficiently stress the idea of nutrition. Also, the text suggested that measures to boost agricultural production were the only means of ensuring an adequate supply and equitable distribution of food and improved nutritional standards. However, it was quite clear that boosting agricultural production would not be enough to achieve those three objectives. She asked the sponsors whether they could possibly revise the text to take that point into account.

23. Mr. PIPARSANIA (India), speaking as a co-sponsor of the revised amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, said that the sponsors had wished to confine themselves to the question of food supply, which was the subject of paragraph 6, and had not intended, in their text, to list measures likely to improve agriculture. He proposed that the amendment submitted by Poland and the USSR should be considered together with paragraph 13, which dealt specifically with agrarian reform.

24. Mrs. BEGMATOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that the Polish and USSR delegations had thought that paragraph 6 of the draft should be replaced with a new text. The existing text was quite inadequate, as it failed to mention any specific measures for securing an adequate supply of food for the entire population. Amendment A/C.3/L.1703 was broader in scope and indicated means and methods of attaining the desired objective.

25. It had been said that the first phrase in amendment A/C.3/L.1703 was open to misinterpretation; however, the sponsors had intentionally included the word “democratic” before “agrarian reforms” to prevent any misunderstanding. As the Polish representative had said, the sponsors would agree to the incorporation of part of their amendment in the text of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, as revised; and it would then be possible, as some delegations had proposed, to consider the rest of the Polish-Soviet amendment together with the other amendments to paragraph 13.

26. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) said that amendment A/C.3/L.1703, of which he was a co-sponsor, could become a sub-amendment to the USSR amendment to paragraph 13 (A/C.3/L.1696, para. 3). With regard to the revised text of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, he hoped that the co-sponsors would agree to insert the word “democratic” before the words “agrarian reforms”.

27. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) said that the sponsors agreed to the insertion of the word “democratic”, which was in keeping with the spirit of the amendment. He moved the closure of the debate on paragraph 6.

28. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that she was opposed to the closure of the debate since she had a brief statement to make.

*The motion for the closure of the debate was adopted by 28 votes to 22, with 36 abstentions.*

29. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) proposed, as a sub-amendment to the revised amendment read out by the representative of Uganda, that the words “and diversify” should be added after the word “boost”.

30. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) said that he was not sure whether the rules of procedure permitted the submission of a sub-amendment after the closure of the debate.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that the rules of procedure did not deal expressly with the question of the submission of a sub-amendment after the closure of a debate. The Committee could apply the rules of procedure with a greater or lesser degree of flexibility, as it wished. If there were no objections, she would take it that the Committee was prepared to consider the sub-amendment proposed by Jamaica.

32. Since the amendment proposed by Poland and the USSR (A/C.3/L.1703) was to become a sub-amendment to the USSR amendment to paragraph 13 (A/C.3/L.1696, para. 3), the only amendments to be voted on were the sub-amendment proposed orally by Jamaica (see para. 29 above), and then the amendment to paragraph 6 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, as revised orally.

*The oral sub-amendment by Jamaica was adopted by 73 votes to 2 with 18 abstentions.*

33. Mr. LUTEM (Secretary of the Committee) said that the amendment to paragraph 6 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, as revised orally and amended, now read:

“The adoption of measures to boost and diversify agricultural production through, *inter alia*, the implementation of democratic agrarian reforms, to ensure an adequate and well-balanced supply of food, its equitable distribution among the whole population and the improvement of nutritional standards.”

*The amendment, as orally revised and amended, was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

#### *Paragraph 7*

34. The CHAIRMAN said that three amendments, to be found in documents A/C.3/L.1704, A/C.3/L.1709 and A/C.3/L.1723, had been submitted to paragraph 7 of the draft.

35. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) introducing the amendment to paragraph 7 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 on behalf of the sponsors, said that it was intended mainly

to make the text of paragraph 7 shorter and clearer. However, the sponsors had also wished to stress that knowledge and training were essential in order to ensure that the programmes initiated were understood by the population and effectively implemented.

36. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia), introducing the amendment proposed by Mongolia and the USSR (A/C.3/L.1704), said that it was designed to eliminate part of paragraph 7, not because the sponsors were opposed to the idea in question, but because the passage already appeared in article 4 of part I.

37. Mrs. NICOL (Sierra Leone) said she was glad that the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 stressed the importance of training and education; she was, in fact, prepared to include that idea in her own amendment (A/C.3/L.1709, para. 3). Although the question of family planning was already dealt with in article 4 of part I, it should be mentioned again in part III, from the standpoint of means and methods, in order to show Governments how the general principle should be applied in the light of the culture and conditions peculiar to each country. The Sierra Leonean amendment would not greatly alter the text of paragraph 7, which had been drafted with considerable care by the Commission for Social Development.

38. On the subject of family planning she said that the decision rested exclusively with individual families; that was

a fundamental right, and any encroachment upon the free exercise of it would be intolerable. Unfortunately, in many countries, women had neither the knowledge nor the means necessary to exercise it, and were compelled to resign themselves either to having very large families or to seeking clandestine abortions. In order to remedy that situation, which was particularly serious in the developing countries, various countries, even in Africa, had already adopted national family planning programmes. There was no official programme in Sierra Leone, but the Government approved of a voluntary family planning association. At the forty-seventh session of the Economic and Social Council, the Secretary-General of the United Nations himself had declared that the United Nations was now ready to make a major contribution in that field. It was fundamentally a human problem, and one which affected the rights of the individual.

39. The Sierra Leonean amendment was designed, first, to eliminate the words "as needed", because the need for population programmes did undoubtedly exist. Secondly, the term "families" should be replaced by "individuals", since an essentially individual right was involved. She was, however, prepared to let the word "families" stand if the Committee so wished. Finally, the amendment referred to the role of family planning within the welfare medical services.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*