



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 48:	
Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (continued)	
Consideration of the report of the Working Group . . .	393

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.1731, A/C.3/L.1734, A/C.3/L.1735, A/C.3/L.1736 and
 Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.1737, A/C.3/L.1742)**

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE
 WORKING GROUP

1. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta), introducing the report of the Working Group on the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (A/C.3/L.1742), said that the rearrangement proposed was the result of a compromise and should be considered as such by the Committee. The Working Group had rearranged in separate articles all the paragraphs in parts II and III (A/C.3/L.1735) which dealt with the same subject from different aspects. It had endeavoured to improve the style and presentation of the text by deleting repetitions, condensing certain passages and inserting short introductory and connecting sentences.

2. With regard to part II of the draft, the general introductory sentence, which was identical to that adopted by the Third Committee, had been repeated in shortened form to introduce articles 11, 12 and 13.

3. Article 10, which was the first article in part II, consisted of six paragraphs, which dealt with the most important questions—the right to work, the elimination of hunger, the elimination of poverty, health, education and housing. The original order of the paragraphs had been slightly changed: paragraph 5 in document A/C.3/L.1735 had become paragraph (1) in article 10. Some drafting changes had also been made in the interests of precision and logic. Article 11 dealt with all the measures relating to social security, the protection of individuals belonging to disadvantaged groups, and the need to make all individuals aware of their rights and obligations and provide them with the necessary aid to exercise those rights. Article 12 dealt with development problems, particularly in the developing countries, and factors which could impede harmonious

economic development. Article 13 concerned the various aspects of science and technology and the problem of the human environment, which was directly related to scientific development. A major change had been made in that article: paragraph (16) of document A/C.3/L.1742 reproduced the former paragraph (7) of document A/C.3/L.1735 and an idea embodied in the last part of the former paragraph (6).

4. In part III, which dealt with means and methods, the opening sentence, which was identical to that adopted by the Committee, introduced the whole of part III and not just articles 14 to 17, as the remainder of the text contained paragraphs which were as applicable in a national as in an international context. Article 14 dealt with planning, article 15 with the development of human resources, article 16 with economic and financial means and article 17 with the process of industrialization, the problems of urbanization and the proper balance between rural and urban development. Article 18 dealt with appropriate institutional reforms, article 19 with social services, article 20 with all measures relating to work, article 21 with education and training and the “brain drain”, article 22 with the family and its problems, articles 23 and 24 with international co-operation, article 25 with the problems of the human environment, article 26 with compensation for war damage and article 27 with disarmament. The latter article reflected the aspirations and hopes of the contemporary world.

5. Mr. JHA (India) congratulated the Chairman and members of the Working Group. However, he had some suggestions to make with regard to the proposed order (A/C.3/L.1742) in parts II and III of the draft. Paragraphs (2) and (3) in article 10 should precede paragraph (1) because the elimination of poverty and hunger was the principal aim of social development and even more important than the right to work. Furthermore, paragraph (9) was out of place in article 16 because it dealt with a specific and limited subject whereas paragraphs (8), (10) and (11) concerned very general questions. It would therefore be better to insert it in article 14 after the new paragraph (2). In article 20, paragraph (26) should come before paragraphs (24) and (25), which were its logical sequel. He also suggested that, in article 23, the order of paragraphs (36) and (38) should be reversed. Paragraph (41), now included in article 24, should logically follow paragraph (38) which, according to his suggestion, would become paragraph (36).

6. Mr. UMRATH (Netherlands) commended the Working Group for its excellent work. The text proposed by the Working Group clearly could not satisfy every delegation; his own, for one, could make many suggestions. He proposed, however, that the Committee should adopt the Working Group's text without reopening the debate be-

cause document A/C.3/L.1742 was, in fact, the result of numerous compromises. The order of the paragraphs in article 10, for example, was the result of a compromise which took account of a Ukrainian proposal. He would not oppose the Indian representative's suggestions, provided that the sponsors of the draft could accept them without debate or a vote.

7. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) paid tribute to the Working Group. He shared the views of the Netherlands representative and would therefore make no suggestions.

8. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) congratulated the Working Group on having reduced such tautological language to coherent form. The result was not perfect but an over-zealous approach might only serve to upset the delicate balance which the Working Group had achieved. It must also be borne in mind that the order followed in the articles was less important than their content.

9. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus), referring to paragraph 8 of the Working Group's report (A/C.3/L.1742), asked why hyphens had been replaced by letters in part I but by numbers in parts II and III. The layout of part I should be taken as a model for that of parts II and III. He, too, would refrain from making any suggestions concerning the order of the articles.

10. Mrs. NICOL (Sierra Leone) warmly congratulated the members of the Working Group. She merely wished to know whether the existence of introductory sentences before certain articles had a special significance, and why part III contained only two such introductory sentences.

11. Miss MAKOLO (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that her delegation had no comments to make on the proposed text, and she congratulated the Working Group on their success in making the text of the draft Declaration more logical. Her delegation wished, however, to state that it still had the same reservations concerning article 26 as it had had when that article had been put to the vote.

12. Mrs. RADIC (Yugoslavia) said that she was aware of the difficulties encountered by the members of the Working Group and would therefore not propose any amendments to the text before the Committee.

13. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regretted that the Working Group had been unable to take into account the proposals put forward by his delegation; but although he was not entirely satisfied with the proposed rearrangement, he would raise no objection, in order to facilitate the work of the Committee. He considered, however, that the introductory sentences added before each article served no useful purpose, since the preamble of the draft Declaration already served as an introduction to the three parts, and he therefore formally proposed that the introductory sentences should be deleted.

14. Mr. PAOLINI (France) stated that the report of the Working Group was the result of long discussions and delicate compromises, and that it did not necessarily meet the wishes of each of the delegations that were members of the Working Group. In particular, the French delegation

had put forward its own proposals for a solution in amendments A/C.3/L.1673/Rev.2 and A/C.3/L.1712. He therefore requested the USSR representative not to propose any formal amendments which would undo the compromise worked out. The introductory sentences had been added to make the text clearer. Their inclusion was purely a matter of drafting; they served only to link the text and make it easier to read. He suggested the use of different printing types to show clearly that the introductory sentences were merely connecting links.

15. He thanked the Indian delegation for not proposing any formal amendments, and appealed to the USSR delegation to withdraw its amendment. Otherwise, each delegation would be entitled to raise objections or make suggestions, and the French delegation would also request a vote on its own amendments.

16. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta), referring to the Indian representative's suggestions, said that the reasons advanced in support of a change in the order of the paragraphs in article 10 were sound; however, it should be borne in mind that the Working Group had reached agreement after very long discussions, and as the result of compromises. Moreover, it was quite clear that the order of priority varied according to the needs of countries. With regard to the other suggestions made by the Indian representative, he said that the Working Group had preferred to place the paragraphs dealing with the same question in one single article, rather than arrange them in the sequence of cause and effect.

17. For the benefit of the representative of Cyprus, he explained that the numbers assigned to the paragraphs in parts II and III would be replaced by letters in the final version. The figures served merely to facilitate the presentation of the report.

18. In reply to the question asked by the representative of Sierra Leone, which had already been answered by the French representative, he said that the introductory sentences merely facilitated the reading of the article. That explanation should also meet the objection of the USSR representative, and he very much hoped that the USSR representative would agree to withdraw his proposal.

19. He wished to thank the representative of the Ukrainian SSR for the spirit of co-operation which he had shown. In fact, the Ukrainian representative would have liked paragraphs (1), (2), (4), (6) and (9) of document A/C.3/L.1735 to form a single article, paragraph (5) to form a separate article, and paragraph (27) to be included in the article on planning, but it had agreed to withdraw those amendments. It had also considered that paragraph (31) was out of place in the article on work, but it had agreed to its inclusion in that article.

20. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that she was pleased that the Working Group had agreed on a compromise text, and she would not mention the few reservations which she could have expressed on certain minor points. However, recalling that the French delegation had proposed sub-headings purely as a working basis for the rearrangement of the paragraphs in part III, she thought that the Committee might consider the inclusion of those sub-headings in the

draft Declaration, in order to clarify the text of part III, which was very long, and to make it more usable as a working instrument.

21. Mr. KUEI (China) said that he fully approved of the text proposed by the Working Group. He regretted, however, that it had not been issued in Chinese and he indicated his delegation's readiness to extend every assistance to the Secretariat so that a Chinese version could be prepared before the draft Declaration was considered at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

22. Mr. LEMAITRE (Colombia) recalled that the Working Group, which had had the double task of rearranging the different paragraphs in a logical sequence and improving the presentation of the text, had received many suggestions, and that the text before the Committee was the outcome of a number of compromises between radically different points of view.

23. Some members of the Committee had proposed the deletion of the introductory sentences. However, the text of part III was very compressed, and at least in Spanish, English and French the introductory sentences made the text clearer, and were essential.

24. He pointed out that in paragraph (38) the English words "buffer stocks" had been translated into Spanish by "*existencias reguladoras*". The word "*existencias*" was not an economic term and was ambiguous. It would be preferable to use the word "stocks" in Spanish, as in French.

25. Mrs. BEGMATOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet delegation, in a spirit of compromise, was withdrawing its proposal.

26. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) pointed out that, in the Working Group, his delegation had requested that the former paragraph (5) of part II, concerning the right to work, should form a separate article. It had then agreed to the Ugandan proposal that the paragraph should become paragraph 1 in article 10.

27. Mr. NETTEL (Austria) moved the closure of the debate.

28. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) opposed the closure as she would like the Committee to consider her suggestion that sub-titles should be introduced in part III.

29. Mrs. RADIC (Yugoslavia) supported the motion for the closure of the debate.

The motion for the closure of the debate was adopted by 61 votes to 9, with 18 abstentions.

30. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote first on the rearrangement of the paragraphs in parts II and III proposed in the report of the Working Group (A/C.3/L.1742), next on part II and then part III of the draft and, lastly, on the draft Declaration as a whole.

The rearrangement proposed in the report of the Working Group (A/C.3/L.1742, annex) was adopted unanimously.

Part II of the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (see A/C.3/L.1742, annex) was adopted unanimously.

At the request of the United States representative, the vote on part III of the draft Declaration was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg.

Part III of the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (see A/C.3/L.1742, annex) was adopted by 77 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

31. Mr. BABAA (Libya) and Mr. JHA (India) proposed that the draft Declaration as a whole should be adopted by acclamation.

32. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) said he, too, would like the draft Declaration to be adopted by acclamation; otherwise he would request a roll-call vote.

33. Miss GUEVARA (Argentina) and Mr. FERNANDEZ-LONGORIA (Spain) said that they did not object to the draft Declaration being adopted by acclamation, but they had reservations concerning paragraph 32 in article 22.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the circumstances, the text could not be adopted by acclamation. She therefore put to the vote the text of the preamble and part I¹ and that of parts II and III (A/C.3/L.1742, annex).

The vote was taken by roll-call.

Upper Volta, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria,

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

Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America.

The draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development as a whole was adopted unanimously.

35. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan), exercising his right of reply, refuted the statements which had been made in the Committee in an attempt to draw a distinction between colonialism and foreign domination. He objected to such assertions, which lowered the tone of the discussion, and wondered what motives could prompt certain speakers to question the integrity of the countries that were combating colonialism. He failed to understand how those Afro-Asian countries which were striving to eradicate colonialism could be accused of dishonesty, and declared that foreign domination should be eliminated all over the world. His delegation had endeavoured to remain silent and was indignant over the fact that the only response to its attitude had been further calumny.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.