



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 48:	
Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development ( <i>continued</i> )	
Part III: Means and methods ( <i>continued</i> )	
Paragraph 4 ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	165
Paragraph 5 . . . . .	166
Paragraph 6 . . . . .	167

*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.1696-1704, A/C.3/L.1706-1712, A/C.3/L.1714-1716,  
A/C.3/L.1717/Rev.1, 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 (*concluded*)

Paragraph 4 (*concluded*)

1. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) agreed with the French and Philippine representatives that the meaning of his delegation's proposal was not identical to that of paragraph 4 of part III of the draft Declaration (see A/7648, annex II). Concerning the amendment to paragraph 4 submitted in document A/C.3/L.1723, he failed to understand why the sponsors had deleted the first phrase of the original text of paragraph 4, since co-operation among the family and teaching institutions was a matter of great importance in the field of education. Although he considered that the original text was clearer and more specific, he had no objections to the substance of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 and would vote in favour of it, provided that it incorporated the first phrase of the original paragraph.

2. Miss ARGUELLO (Nicaragua) felt that the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment to the proposal contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, as further amended by the Indian delegation did not take sufficient account of the needs of the developing countries, which required more effective measures to eradicate ignorance and illiteracy. Consequently, she proposed that her delegation's amendment (A/C.3/L.1717/Rev.1) to paragraph 4 of part III of the draft Declaration, with the change proposed by Dahomey, should constitute a sub-amendment to the proposal submitted in document A/C.3/L.1723, in the form of an

additional paragraph. However, in the Spanish version of the Nicaraguan text, the words "*de familia*" after the word "*padres*" would be deleted.

3. Mr. MOUSSA (United Arab Republic) said that he considered the first part of the sub-amendment introduced by Saudi Arabia, as revised by India, to be a very useful addition to the amendment to paragraph 4 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 and a logical consequence of the amendment to paragraph 3 of part III, submitted by the Iraqi delegation (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 1). The concepts underlying the second part of that sub-amendment were also highly relevant. On the other hand, the Italian sub-amendment, while it might be valuable for the developed countries would be difficult to apply in the developing countries.

4. As for the ideas contained in the amendment proposed by Nicaragua (A/C.3/L.1717/Rev.1), he thought that, in essence, they were already covered in other parts of the draft Declaration.

5. Mr. BASELE (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that, although the original text of paragraph 4 was of undoubted value, the amendments to it also contained very useful elements. He had some difficulty in accepting the substance of the Nicaraguan amendment (A/C.3/L.1717/Rev.1), since it appeared to deal with an objective rather than a means or a method, and also the form, at least in the French version. His delegation was prepared to support the amendment to paragraph 4 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, provided that it incorporated the sub-amendments which had been proposed, as they helped to strengthen the text.

6. Mrs. RAOELINA (Madagascar) endorsed the comments made by the representatives of France, the Philippines and Iraq regarding the proliferation of amendments to paragraph 4 and appealed to the sponsors of the various proposals to withdraw them in favour of the text transmitted by the Economic and Social Council.

7. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendment to paragraph 4 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, accepted the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment, as revised by India (see 1679th meeting, para. 31). The sponsors could not, however, accept the amendment submitted by Italy or the Nicaraguan proposal, since the ideas contained therein were already covered by other parts of the draft Declaration.

8. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) pointed out that she had not introduced any formal sub-amendment. She had merely suggested a formula which took account of the ideas set

forth in the Nicaraguan amendment (A/C.3/L.1717/Rev.1), which were truly means and methods.

9. Mr. LEMAITRE (Colombia) said that the amendment to paragraph 4 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 expressed fundamentally the same ideas as those in the original text, except for the deletion of the first phrase of that paragraph. However, that first phrase was an important concept which appeared in no other part of the draft Declaration and he could see no valid reasons for deleting it. Accordingly, he suggested that the paragraph should be put directly to the vote.

10. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Nicaraguan sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1717/Rev.1), as orally revised by the sponsor (see para. 2 above).

*The sub-amendment was rejected by 27 votes to 4, with 56 abstentions.*

11. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the text of paragraph 4 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1723, as orally revised (see para. 7 above).

12. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that in the English version, the word "its" before the word "participation" should be replaced by "their".

*The amendment to paragraph 4 appearing in document A/C.3/L.1723, as orally revised, was adopted by 68 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.*

#### Paragraph 5

13. Mr. PECHACEK (Czechoslovakia) said that the purpose of his amendment (A/C.3/L.1699) was to bring the wording of paragraph 5 into line with that adopted for the corresponding provisions in part II (Objectives). Although he considered it advisable in part III to allow for the possibility of choosing between several methods, his preference was for medical services which were free of charge. Nevertheless, as that idea was clearly expressed in the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 2), he was prepared to withdraw his own proposal, although he reserved the right to submit it again should that concept be modified or fail to meet with acceptance.

14. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) stated that, in addition to the ideas contained in the original text, his amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 2) included the concept of free medical and health services. The developing countries needed to raise the general level of health, which was an important factor in development. One way of accelerating development was to provide free health services for the whole population, a task which was essentially the responsibility of the State. In conclusion, he said that he had decided to insert in his amendment the phrase "and welfare medical services" before the word "accessible".

15. Mrs. NICOL (Sierra Leone) withdrew her amendment to paragraph 5 (A/C.3/L.1709, para. 1) in favour of the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 2). Welfare medical services were not only of a preventive and curative character but also included family and child welfare and

child care. She felt that the expressions "*médecine sociale*" and "*servicios médicos de asistencia social*" in the French and Spanish versions, respectively, were not a satisfactory translation of the phrase "welfare medical services".

16. Mrs. AMONOO-NEIZER (Ghana) said that she fully supported the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 2), as orally revised. Health was a question of crucial importance to all countries, and Governments must assume the responsibility for providing health services of the highest possible calibre for the whole population. She therefore favoured the Sierra Leonean suggestion that mention should be made of welfare medical services, which also covered maternal and child health, pre-natal and post-natal care, child care and family and child welfare.

17. Miss PILGRIM (Barbados) agreed with the representative of Sierra Leone concerning the importance of welfare medical services. With the passage of time, health programmes had become increasingly complex. As well as including services of a preventive and curative nature, they aimed at dealing with other problems encountered by the patient, such as care of his family while he was in the hospital, and rehabilitation or training for other work in cases where he could not return to his former employment.

18. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) explained that the purpose of the amendment to paragraph 5 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 was to delete the second part of the original paragraph 5, which was redundant. The sponsors had included the word "medical" in order to cover all types of preventive and curative services, and they were also prepared to consider the possibility of incorporating the idea of "free" services.

19. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said he found the text proposed by Iraq (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 2) acceptable; however, he would prefer the Czechoslovak delegation's wording (A/C.3/L.1699), which was more in keeping with other similar provisions of the draft Declaration. He accordingly hoped that the representative of Iraq would take those views into account.

20. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) regretted that he could not comply with the request made by the representative of France.

21. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) said that the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 2) was very commendable; however, in the interests of consistency, he supported the view of the representative of France. In part III, a certain amount of flexibility should be allowed with regard to the selection of methods for achieving a particular goal. He therefore supported the insertion of the words "to the extent possible" or some other phrase that would convey the same idea.

22. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda), on behalf of the sponsors, withdrew the amendment to paragraph 5 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, in favour of that appearing in paragraph 2 of document A/C.3/L.1711.

23. Mr. IDER (Mongolia) supported the amendment submitted by Iraq (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 2), since health services would be accessible to the whole population only when they were provided free of charge.

24. Mr. KHODR (Yemen) considered that the concept emphasized in the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 2)—namely the provision of free health services to the whole population—was one of the most important principles of social justice. However straitened a country's financial circumstances might be, its Government had the obligation to do all in its power to ensure that the people enjoyed good health. He therefore strongly supported the amendment submitted by Iraq and would vote in favour of it if it was put to the vote.

25. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) said that, with the various oral amendments that had been made to it, the text proposed by his delegation (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 2) to replace paragraph 5 now read:

“The provision of free health services to the whole population and of adequate preventive and curative facilities and welfare medical services accessible to all”.

26. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda), supported by Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq), proposed that the discussion on paragraph 5 and the amendments to it should be closed and that a vote should be taken on the texts.

27. At the request of Mr. PAOLINI (France), the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the word “free” contained in the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 2).

*The Committee decided by 68 votes to 3, with 8 abstentions, to retain the word “free”.*

28. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the text of paragraph 5 proposed in the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 2), as orally revised (see para. 25 above).

*The amendment, as orally revised, was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

29. Mr. PAOLINI (France) explained that he had voted against the inclusion of the word “free” in the Iraqi text and, after the word had been accepted, had abstained from voting on the amendment as a whole because he felt that the wording which had been approved conflicted with a provision in part II of the draft Declaration.

#### *Paragraph 6*

30. Mr. RESICH (Poland), introducing the amendment of his delegation and that of the Soviet Union to paragraph 6 (A/C.3/L.1703), pointed out that the original text of the paragraph was inadequate, since it confined itself to a general recommendation concerning the adoption of measures for the assurance of food supply, without specifying in detail the methods whereby such an end could be achieved. The proposed new wording listed specific measures for increasing and improving food production, such as the introduction of democratic land reforms aimed at transferring ownership of the land to those who worked it. In fact, the adoption of that measure, and of the others mentioned in his amendment, would be necessary if the principle set forth in part I, article 7 of the instrument under discussion<sup>1</sup> was to become a reality.

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

31. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) considered it inappropriate to recommend, in paragraph 6, specific measures such as land reforms for the assurance of food supply; an attempt to give details of specific measures might entail the risk of excluding others which were equally valid. In submitting the amendment contained in paragraph 3 of document A/C.3/L.1711, he wished to state that the inclusion—in various paragraphs of part II of the draft Declaration, such as paragraphs 2 and 5—of provisions on the subject of raising the standard of living made it necessary to add a reference to that concept in the paragraph under discussion, as his delegation proposed. There was no doubt that social progress and development could be achieved by improving the standard of living of society.

32. Mrs. NICOL (Sierra Leone), introducing the amendment contained in paragraph 2 of document A/C.3/L.1709, said that the importance of the paragraph under consideration called for a brief and simple formulation, so that its impact should not be weakened. The introduction, as proposed in the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 3), of such a broad concept as raising the standard of living, which covered a large number of factors, would undoubtedly overburden the text, with a resulting loss of clarity and force. With regard to the amendment of Poland and the Soviet Union (A/C.3/L.1703), she wished to point out that paragraph 13 of part III of the draft Declaration (see A/7648, annex II) dealt with the promotion of social and institutional reforms, including agrarian reform; she therefore suggested that the sponsors of the amendment should consider the possibility of withholding their proposal until that passage was discussed. She felt, however, that the concept of promoting agricultural production was pertinent to paragraph 6; it might perhaps be possible to incorporate it into her amendment (A/C.3/L.1709, para. 2).

33. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) introduced the amendment to paragraph 6 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, which was aimed at broadening the scope of the original text of paragraph 6. The passage under consideration was too concise and should be supplemented by the introduction of additional ideas, such as promoting and implementing agrarian reforms and boosting agricultural production. Similarly, it was not enough to ensure the production of an adequate supply of food; it was also necessary to ensure that food would be distributed equitably to the entire population.

34. The reference to boosting agricultural production contained in the amendment to paragraph 6 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 placed no restriction on the methods to be applied towards that end, and thus encompassed those specified in the amendment submitted by Poland and the Soviet Union (A/C.3/L.1703), and possibly others as well. With regard to the amendment proposed by the delegation of Sierra Leone (A/C.3/L.1709, para. 2), he considered that the idea of assuring an adequate, well-balanced food supply for the whole population was embodied in the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, particularly in the phrase in which it was recommended that an adequate supply and equitable distribution of food for the entire population should be ensured.

35. Mr. PECHACEK (Czechoslovakia) explained that the amendment to paragraph 6 contained in document A/C.3/

L.1725 was designed to emphasize the problem of quality of food; that problem concerned the developing and the developed countries alike. While the need to improve levels of nutrition in the former was coupled with the problem of producing an adequate food supply, in the latter, where the supply of food-stuffs in sufficient quantity generally posed no major problems, dietetic balance was usually neglected. While he insisted on the necessity of including that idea in the paragraph under consideration, his position regarding the terms to be used was not inflexible, and he was prepared to participate in consultations on the matter and was even willing to consider the possibility of withdrawing his amendment in favour of another formulation which would achieve the same objective.

36. In conclusion, he believed that a reference to agrarian reform should also be included in paragraph 6.

37. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said she would be able to support both the Czechoslovak amendment to paragraph 6 contained in document A/C.3/L.1725 and the Sierra Leonean amendment (A/C.3/L.1709, para. 2). However, she wondered if it was appropriate to combine in a single text the concept of boosting agricultural production by such methods as agrarian reform and the very different idea of ensuring an adequate food supply and the quality of food. Such a juxtaposition of concepts might give rise to the erroneous interpretation that an increase in agricultural production would be sufficient to solve all problems concerning the food supply and to improve nutritional standards. In reality, that would involve many other factors. She suggested, therefore, that those concepts should be dealt with in two separate paragraphs, one following the other. The separation would also ensure that the original purpose of paragraph 6, namely the adoption of measures to eliminate hunger, would not be lost from sight in a text overloaded with additional ideas.

38. In conclusion, she said that she could not agree with the comment made by the representative of Uganda to the effect that the Sierra Leonean amendment (A/C.3/L.1709, para. 2) was embodied in the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723. The phrase "well-balanced food supply" in the former referred to the quality of nutrition; that was not mentioned in the last part of the text proposed in the latter amendment, which placed greater emphasis on an equitable distribution of food for the entire population.

39. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) considered that, in paragraph 6 of the draft, particular emphasis should be placed on the need for accelerating the increase in food production, which was a necessary prerequisite for solving the problems of hunger and malnutrition; and the institution of agrarian reforms should be clearly specified as an appropriate means of achieving that objective. Although the problem of food supply concerned primarily the developing countries, where it was aggravated by high rates of population growth, the developed nations should also participate in efforts to solve it. Indeed, if agricultural

production was not increased, all aspects of development, including social progress, would be retarded.

40. Mrs. NICOL (Sierra Leone), supporting the views expressed by the Jamaican representative, said that the problem of malnutrition was not so much one of quantity as of quality; consequently it could not be solved by such measures as agrarian reform or by boosting agricultural production, but only by measures designed to correct dietetic imbalances, such as, for example, increased protein production.

41. Mr. CUESTA (Ecuador) considered that the ideas contained in the amendments to part III, paragraph 6 of the draft Declaration were extremely valuable. In view of the close relationship between them, he suggested the following combined formulation:

"Adoption of measures to ensure the improvement of levels of nutrition and the equitable and rational distribution of food to the entire population, as well as the progressive raising of its standard of living".

The idea of agrarian reform was in itself one connotation of the means and methods the paragraph was intended to provide for.

42. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) suggested that the word "to" should be inserted before the words "boost" and "ensure" in the English version of the amendment to paragraph 6 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723. She also suggested that the words "and diversify" should be inserted after the word "boost" and that a reference should be made to the improvement of nutritional standards either in the text proposed by Sierra Leone, in which "well-balanced" would be inserted after the word "adequate", or in the one proposed by Czechoslovakia, in which the phrase "and for improvement of nutritional standards" would come after the word "population". She considered that measures relating to an improvement in nutrition should take precedence in the context of the paragraph over those concerning agrarian reform.

43. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan) said that the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1703, which referred to agrarian reform, could be incorporated in the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 by adding the words "based on the principle that the land should be transferred to the ownership or usufruct of the person who works it" after the words "agrarian reforms" in the latter amendment.

44. In addition, he supported the Jamaican suggestion concerning the diversification of agriculture, as well as the idea proposed by Sierra Leone.

45. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, accepted the inclusion of the word "well-balanced" after the word "adequate".

*The meeting rose at 6 p.m.*