United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION
Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE, 1684th MEETING

Wednesday, 29 October 1969, at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 48:	
Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development *(continued)*	
Part III: Means and methods *(continued)*	
Paragraph 7 *(concluded)*	185
Paragraph 8	187
Paragraph 9	188
Proposed new paragraph after paragraph 9	188

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.1706-1708, A/C.3/L.1709/Amend.1, A/C.3/L.1710-1712, 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 7 (concluded)

1. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) withdrew the amendment to paragraph 7 (A/C.3/L.1704) submitted jointly by her delegation and that of the Soviet Union.

2. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) suggested that, at the end of the text of paragraph 7 proposed by Sierra Leone (A/C.3/L.1709/Amend.1), the words after "right to" should be replaced by the expression "determine freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children", which was used in part I, paragraph 4, of the draft Declaration[1] and in resolution XVIII of the International Conference on Human Rights.[2]

3. Mrs. NICOL (Sierra Leone) read out the text of her amendment to paragraph 7 (A/C.3/L.1709/Amend.1) with the sub-amendments that she had incorporated in it. The revised text read as follows:

"The formulation and establishment, as needed, of programmes in the field of population, within the framework of national demographic policies and as part of the welfare medical services, including education, training of personnel and the provision to families of the knowledge and means necessary to enable them to exercise their right to determine freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children".

4. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) and Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) withdrew their oral sub-amendments to the Sierra Leonean amendment (A/C.3/L.1709/Amend.1).

5. Mr. POWER (Ireland) requested a separate vote on the words "and means" in the text read out by the representative of Sierra Leone.

6. Mrs. NAZARENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) asked for a separate vote on the second part of the orally revised Sierra Leonean amendment, from the words "and as part of the welfare . . ." to the end of the paragraph.

7. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the 1682nd meeting the representative of Argentina had requested a roll-call vote on paragraph 7 and all the amendments and sub-amendments thereto. He put to the vote the words "and means" in the text read out by the representative of Sierra Leone (see para. 3 above).

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

In favour: Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Algeria, Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, India.

Against: Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia.

Abstaining: Israel, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Gabon, Guinea, Guyana.

The Committee decided by 60 votes to 16, with 17 abstentions, to retain the words "and means" in the text of

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

2 See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), p. 14.

the Sierra Leonean amendment (A/C.3/L.1709/Amend.1), as orally revised.

8. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second part of the orally revised Sierra Leonean amendment, from the words "and as part of the welfare . . ." to the end of the paragraph.

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

In favour: Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Algeria, Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Burundi, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone.

Against: Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ireland, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, Romania.

Abstaining: Burma, Central African Republic, China, Gabon, Guyana, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Laos, Madagascar, Philippines, Poland, Rwanda.

The Committee decided by 64 votes to 20, with 13 abstentions, to retain the second part of the Sierra Leonean amendment.

9. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Sierra Leonean amendment to paragraph 7 (A/C.3/L.1709/Amend.1), as orally revised (see para. 3 above).

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

In favour: Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guinea.

Against: Nicaragua, Portugal, Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Gabon.

Abstaining: Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Austria, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Guyana.

The amendment, as orally revised, was adopted by 67 votes to 6, with 26 abstentions.

10. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) explained that he had requested a separate vote on the second part of the Sierra Leonean amendment and had voted against that part, not because he objected to families having the right to determine the number of their children–a right which was recognized in his own country–but because the original conception of paragraph 7 had been distorted as a result of the innumerable changes. The second part of the amendment had no logical connexion with the first; he had therefore abstained in the final vote.

11. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he too had abstained in the vote on the revised Sierra Leonean amendment. He agreed with the Ukrainian representative that the second part of the amendment bore no relation to the first; moreover, it repeated provisions laid down in part I, article 4, relating to principles.

12. Mr. TEKLE (Ethiopia) said that, although his country could not accept birth control as a national policy, it had voted in favour of the Sierra Leonean amendment because it thought the wording was sufficiently flexible.

13. Mrs. RAOELINA (Madagascar) said that she had abstained in every vote because she still preferred the original text of paragraph 7.

14. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) said that he wished to place on record that, had he not been absent during the voting, he would have voted in favour of the amendment by Sierra Leone, as orally revised.

15. Mr. LEW (China) said that he had abstained in the voting on the amendment because, as a people and as a nation, China had an ethical concept of family planning which was not reflected in the text adopted.

16. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that she had abstained in the voting on the revised amendment because, once the reference to religious and cultural circumstances had been dropped, the drafting had lost the necessary flexibility.

17. Mr. CHARKAOUI (Morocco) said that he had voted in favour of the revised Sierra Leonean amendment because it was a compromise solution which could command the support of a large majority.

18. Mr. TORRES (Philippines) said that he had abstained in the voting because he still thought that the original text of paragraph 7 was better.

19. Mr. NAVON (Israel) said that he had abstained in the voting on the revised Sierra Leonean amendment because he considered the original text of paragraph 7 preferable.

20. Mr. GUIAGOUSSOU (Chad) said that, although he represented a sparsely populated country, he had voted in favour of the revised proposal by Sierra Leone, because it seemed to him sufficiently flexible to accommodate any kind of national population policy.

Paragraph 8

21. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) introduced, on behalf of the sponsors, the amendment to paragraph 8 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723. The sponsors had wished to improve the original text by making it clearer and more comprehensible; to that end they had drafted a text which should not cause the Committee any difficulty.

22. Mr. PECHACEK (Czechoslovakia) introduced, on behalf of his own and the Mongolian delegation, an amendment (A/C.3/L.1700) which was designed to make the wording of the last part of part III, paragraph 8 (see A/7648, annex II), consistent with the wording adopted by the Committee at its 1673rd meeting for part II, paragraph 7, which also referred to the implementation of social security and social welfare services. The proposed amendment was fully compatible with the amendment to the same paragraph contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, since the latter would change only the first part of the text. That being so, the delegations of Czechoslovakia and Mongolia were willing to withdraw their amendment, provided that the sponsors of document A/C.3/L.1723 agreed to incorporate it in their proposed new drafting.

23. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said that, as one of the sponsors of the amendment to paragraph 8 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, he would have no difficulty in incorporating the amendment proposed by Czechoslovakia and Mongolia (A/C.3/L.1700) in it.

24. Mrs. DAES (Greece) said that she could support both the Czechoslovak-Mongolian amendment (A/C.3/L.1700) and the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723. She suggested, however, that the sponsors of the latter might consider replacing the word "co-ordination" in their text by the word "harmonization", which would better convey the idea that legislation and administrative regulations should be brought into line.

25. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) felt that the drafting of the amendment to paragraph 8 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 was preferable to the original text of the paragraph, because it brought out the more important aspects of the matter, namely, the co-ordination of legislation and administrative regulations. As the Cypriot Minister for Social Welfare had stressed at the International Conference of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare, held in New York from 3 to 12 September 1968, one of the main reasons why social progress usually lagged behind economic progress lay in the lack of a single authority at the ministerial level who was responsible for co-ordinating the multifarious social aspects of development. Consequently, he felt that the wording used in the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, was satisfactory and he appealed to the representative of Greece not to press her suggestion.

26. Mrs. FRANCK (Central African Republic) asked the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 whether they would agree to add the words "and the improvement and co-ordination of existing structures" at the end of their text.

27. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that they would be happy to incorporate the change proposed by Czechoslovakia and Mongolia (A/C.3/L.1700) in their amendment to paragraph 8 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, revising it to read "social security schemes" instead of "social security services".

28. He also accepted the suggestion made by the representative of the Central African Republic, although it would disrupt the logical sequence of ideas in the original text of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723. Since the incorporation of the sentence proposed by the Central African Republic would require the deletion of the words "co-ordination and improvement" in the first part of the text, the change suggested by Greece, which he considered sensible, would no longer apply.

29. With the inclusion of the suggestions accepted by the sponsors, the amendment would read as follows:

> "The enactment and establishment of legislative measures and administrative regulations with a view to the implementation of comprehensive programmes of social security schemes and social welfare services and to the improvement and co-ordination of existing structures."

30. Mr. PECHACEK (Czechoslovakia) said that he found the revised version of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, satisfactory and therefore withdrew the amendment which his delegation had submitted jointly with the Mongolian delegation (A/C.3/L.1700).

31. Mrs. DAES (Greece) said that she considered the revised version of the amendment to paragraph 8 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 a great improvement on the original text. She felt, however, that the insertion of the words "and harmonization" after the word "establishment" at the beginning of the text would add an important element to paragraph 8, namely, the need to adapt possible future social welfare legislation to the existing legislation.

32. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) maintained that the insertion suggested by the Greek delegation was unnecessary since the idea of harmonization was implicit in the much broader concept of improvement.

33. Mr. PAOLINI (France) suggested, for stylistic reasons, that the words *"mesures législatives et de règlements d'administration"* in the French text should be shortened to *"mesures législatives et règlementaires"* and that the word "structures" at the end of the paragraph should be replaced by "services".

34. Mr. CEAUSU (Romania) thought that the word "enactment" at the beginning of the revised version of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 should be deleted, since the term referred exclusively to the promulgation of laws and was not used in relation to other kinds of legislative and administrative measures.

35. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) accepted the suggestions made by the representative of France but could not accept the Romanian suggestion, because the legislative and administrative measures referred to in the amendment also covered legislation in the strict sense of the word.

36. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment to paragraph 8 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, as orally revised (see paras. 29 and 35 above).

The amendment, as orally revised, was adopted by 99 votes to none.

Paragraph 9

37. Mr. PIPARSANIA (India) introduced the amendment to paragraph 9 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 and explained that it was designed purely to introduce drafting changes in the original text (see A/7648, annex II) which would not necessarily affect the text in all the official languages. At the same time, he urged the Committee unreservedly to adopt the paragraph under consideration which had a profound humanitarian content.

38. Mr. GUZMAN (Peru) did not think that the first change proposed in the amendment was correct as far as the Spanish version of paragraph 9 was concerned, since the reference to *"institución"* ("institution") instead of *"adopción"* ("taking") of measures was not logical.

39. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that a vote need not be taken on an amendment which only affected some of the official versions and said that the Secretariat would see to it that the necessary corrections were made. Since there were no other objections, she took it that the Committee adopted the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, and she would immediately proceed to the vote on paragraph 9 of part III of the draft Declaration (see A/7648, annex II), as amended.

Paragraph 9, as amended, was adopted by 95 votes to none.

Proposed new paragraph after paragraph 9

40. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) introduced her amendment (A/C.3/L.1718, para. 1), which provided for the insertion of a new paragraph after paragraph 9 of part III. Migration was not a new phenomenon, but had assumed unexpected proportions and importance in the last few decades because of such factors as urbanization and over-population in some depressed areas. It was a very complex problem which entailed a series of links between the country of origin and the host country and between the latter and the mig ants and their families. The amendment did not enter into such complex relations, but merely dealt with the humanitarian aspects of the problem; the word "migrants" was used in it to cover not only emigration to foreign countries but also internal population movements.

41. The Soviet Union delegation had introduced a similar proposal (A/C.3/L.1696, para. 4) as an amendment to paragraph 15 of part III of the draft Declaration. However, the term "interests" in that text was too broad and vague and she therefore appealed to the delegation of the Soviet Union to withdraw its amendment in favour of the Italian amendment.

42. In conclusion, she pointed out that the words "and their families" should be inserted at the end of her amendment.

43. Mr. IDDIR (Algeria) said that he would like the meaning of the word "migrants" to be made clear. As he understood the term it applied to persons who were temporarily obliged to work abroad, generally in industrialized countries, but who intended to return to their own country at some future date. If that was the sense of the word "migrants" in the Italian amendment (A/C.3/L.1718, para. 1), he would have no difficulty in supporting it. He would also like a definition of the scope of the term "interests" in the virtually identical amendment submitted by the Soviet Union to paragraph 15 of part III of the draft Declaration (A/C.3/L.1696, para. 4).

44. Furthermore, the International Labour Organisation might take the necessary measures to improve the status of migrant workers, by ensuring that the relevant conventions were applied. He therefore proposed that the words "in conformity with the provisions of Convention No. 97, as revised in 1949, of the International Labour Conference relating to migrant workers" should be inserted at the end of the Italian amendment.

45. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) said that he could not understand the purpose of the Italian amendment (A/C.3/L.1718, para. 1), because it did not specify the particular kind of migration to which it referred. Furthermore, the question of social welfare to migrants was adequately covered in paragraph 8 of part III which had already been adopted by the Committee and which made no distinction between nationals and aliens.

46. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) considered that the Italian amendment reflected a humanitarian concern which her country also shared. Nevertheless, like the representative of Uganda, she wondered whether the provision of social welfare services to migrants was not already included in paragraph 8 of part III. In any case, if a specific reference to such a problem was considered necessary, the position of another group of displaced persons, namely refugees, should also be mentioned.

47. With regard to the amendment proposed by the Soviet Union to paragraph 15 of part III (A/C.3/L.1696, para. 4), inspired by the same feeling of concern, she did not think it was the best place to include a reference to the problems of migrants since it might seem in that context to be confined to the internal movement of the rural population.

48. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) appealed to the representative of Italy to withdraw her amendment (A/C.3/L.1718, para. 1), which was too restrictive since it referred only to the provision of social welfare services to migrants. On the other hand, the addition proposed by his delegation to paragraph 15 of part III (A/C.3/L.1696, para. 4) was designed to ensure the protection of "interests", a term which covered all aspects of the migrants' living conditions. The fact that his amendment had been submitted in connexion with para-

graph 15 did not mean that it should be considered limited in scope, as the representative of Jamaica had suggested, since there was not a single reservation in the text.

49. Mr. SADRY (Iran) said that in principle he thought that the inclusion of a specific reference to migrants would constitute a kind of discrimination in the absence of any reference to the difficulties experienced by other social groups. Moreover, it was basically a national problem since the people working abroad continued to enjoy protection from their country of origin through their diplomatic or consular representatives. He would therefore find it difficult to accept the Italian amendment (A/C.3/L.1718, para. 1), unless the status of refugees was also mentioned.

50. Mrs. CADIEUX (Canada) said that her country received a great number of immigrants every year and she therefore considered that a specific reference to their problems in the draft Declaration was most appropriate. She did not think that it constituted discrimination since immigrants were faced with social problems in their countries of residence where, at least in the initial stages of their stay, they were not usually protected by social legislation. She therefore suggested that a reference should be made in the Italian amendment (A/C.3/L.1718, para. 1) to the services designed to promote the adaptation and welfare of migrants and their families.

51. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy), taking into account the suggestions and proposals made by various delegations, revised her amendment to read:

> "The adoption of measures and the provision of services aimed at facilitating the adaptation and welfare of migrants and their families, in conformity with the Convention No. 97, as revised in 1949, of the International Labour Conference concerning the migrant workers".

52. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that the inclusion in the draft Declaration of the new paragraph proposed by Italy implied a dual discrimination, inasmuch as it referred exclusively to migrants and was limited to the provision of social welfare services. He therefore proposed a more general wording to read:

> "The assurance of basic human rights and the provision of social and economic protection to immigrants, refugees, and religious and other minorities".

53. Mr. AL-JABIRI (Iraq) said that the draft Declaration applied to all Governments and individuals without distinction, and it was therefore inappropriate to give preferential treatment to a group of persons who, as in the present case, decided of their own free will to emigrate in order to settle and work in another country. There were obviously other persons, such as students and visitors, who might be in a similar situation abroad, but there was no justification for devoting a paragraph of the draft Declaration to them. For those reasons, he hoped that the representative of Italy would agree to withdraw her amendment (A/C.3/L.1718, para. 1) and to bring up her proposal again in connexion with paragraph 15 of part III.

54. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) suggested that the following clause should be added to the new paragraph proposed by Italy: "the adoption of measures to abolish discriminatory practices against migrants".

55. Mr. MOUSSA (United Arab Republic) urged the representative of Italy to accept the Iraqi representative's request and to agree to consideration of her amendment in connexion with paragraph 15 of part III.

56. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) was unable to agree that the new paragraph she had proposed constituted discrimination in favour of migrants. She felt that at the current stage in the debate it was inadvisable to postpone consideration of her amendment. She would rather have it put to the vote.

57. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) took it that the purpose of the Italian amendment was to prevent discrimination against migrant workers. While he appreciated the arguments of certain delegations that there was need to go further, and discriminate in their favour, that could be discussed under paragraph 15. He felt that the discussion should be confined to the original aim of the amendment, which was to prevent discrimination against migrants.

58. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) formally moved the adjournment of the meeting.

59. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) opposed the motion by the representative of Cyprus. He moved that the meeting should not be adjourned but that the debate on the Italian amendment should be closed.

The motion of the representative of Cyprus was adopted by 52 votes to 11, with 19 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.