



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 48:	
Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (continued)	
Part III: Means and methods (continued)	
Proposed new paragraphs after paragraph 10 (con- cluded) . . . . .	201
Paragraph 11 . . . . .	201
Paragraph 12 . . . . .	203

*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.1701-1703, A/C.3/L.1706-1708,  
A/C.3/L.1710-1712, A/C.3/L.1714-1716, A/C.3/L.1718/  
Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1720, A/C.3/L.1721, A/C.3/L.1722 and  
Corr.1, A/C.3/L.1723-1727)**

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

*Proposed new paragraphs after paragraph 10 (concluded)*

1. Mr. HJELDE (Norway) said that he had voted for the Ceylonese sub-amendment to the amendment submitted by Czechoslovakia in document A/C.3/L.1725, as he thought that the Ceylonese proposal improved the Czechoslovakian text. However, he had been obliged to abstain on the Czechoslovak amendment, in spite of his sympathy for the idea contained in that text, because the question of the outflow of capital, which was at present under consideration by the Economic and Social Council and UNCTAD, did not come within the provision of the Third Committee and was too complex a problem for hasty decisions. Moreover, the text of the amendment did not seem to be very clear, and he would have liked to have had time to consult his Government before voting on it.

*Paragraph 11*

2. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Chile) said that amendment A/C.3/L.1715 submitted by his delegation was, apart from a few minor changes, based on an amendment which the Chilean delegation had submitted during the discussion on part II of the draft Declaration, and which it had finally agreed to withdraw at the request of certain delegations which had felt that it should more appropriately be incorporated in part III. The fact that some sectors of the population were unable to participate in the life of their respective countries

was a serious obstacle to economic and social development. It was therefore important to ensure that all sectors of the population participated in the economic, social, cultural and political life of their country, in order to eliminate marginal groups. The new paragraph 11 proposed by Chile suggested certain means of ensuring that participation. He felt that a fully integrated national community was the primary condition for integration at the international level.

3. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) said that the amendment submitted by her delegation in document A/C.3/L.1708 duplicated to some extent the ideas contained in a new paragraph adopted by the Committee at its last meeting, on the proposal of Romania (A/C.3/L.1710, para. 1). She therefore proposed a revised amendment to the effect that, in paragraph 11, the words "and in the creation of methods of work in that field and the improvement of those methods" should be added after the words "social and economic development".

4. Mrs. DAES (Greece) congratulated the representative of Chile on his proposal which would complement the principles set forth in article 5 of part I of the draft. However, she proposed that at the beginning of the Chilean amendment (A/C.3/L.1715), the words "The incorporation and increasing participation of all sectors of the population" should be replaced by the words "The adoption of measures for the implementation, at an increasing rate, of popular participation". She also proposed that the words "their respective" before the word "countries" should be deleted, and that the words "national community" should be replaced by "national society".

5. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Chile) accepted the Greek proposals.

6. Mr. BOURGOIN (France) noted that the Chilean amendment partly duplicated the idea expressed in the new paragraph submitted by Romania and adopted by the Committee at its previous meeting. It was a pity that the French suggestion for considering the Romanian amendment as an amendment to paragraph 11, and not as a separate paragraph, had not been accepted. He hoped that the Chilean representative would agree to revise the text of his amendment to avoid further repetition.

7. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he could not support the Chilean amendment, since the meaning of the last phrase, "with a view to achieving a fully integrated national community, accelerating the process of social mobility and consolidating the democratic system", was not clear. He preferred the Economic and Social Council text (see A/7648, annex II), which was clear and well drafted.

8. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) supported the amendments to paragraph 11 contained in documents A/C.3/L.1708 and A/C.3/L.1715 in their revised form, since the participation of peoples in the life of their respective countries seemed to him to be a fundamental prerequisite for economic and social development. In Yugoslavia, development was based on the direct participation of all citizens in economic and social life.

9. Mr. JHA (India) said he also thought that the last part of the text submitted by Chile was open to several different interpretations. He preferred the Economic and Social Council text which was shorter and clearer.

10. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said he also preferred the original text of paragraph 11, as the meaning of the Chilean text was not clear. In particular, he had some reservations about the expressions “sectors of the population”, “national community”, and “social mobility” which seemed to be ambiguous. He therefore asked the representatives of Chile and Mongolia to withdraw their amendments to paragraph 11.

11. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) withdrew her amendment to paragraph 11 in favour of the original text, in order to facilitate the Committee’s work.

12. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Chile) pointed out to the representative of the Ukrainian SSR that the text of his amendment no longer included the expression “all sectors of the population” or the expression “national community” which had been replaced by the term “national society”, at the request of Greece. The acceleration of the process of social mobility was, in his view, essential for integrating the population and eliminating marginal groups; and he was therefore unable to agree that that idea should be omitted.

13. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) supported the Chilean amendment, as revised on the proposal of Greece. He also approved the proposal to replace the word “community” by the word “society”, but would like the representative of the Secretary-General to provide a definition of the word “community”.

14. Mr. JANSSON (Secretariat) said that the word “community” in the context of community development—in other words, in the sense in which it was used in the Economic and Social Council text, and also in the amendment submitted by Chile—referred to any group of people living in the same locality who were willing to work together to improve their living conditions. The word had no ethnic, cultural or religious connotation.

15. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) agreed with the definition given by the representative of the Secretary-General.

16. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) said that he had some difficulty in supporting the last part of the Chilean amendment, and he preferred the Council text. He therefore hoped that the representative of Chile would agree to withdraw his amendment.

17. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said she thought that the new paragraph which had been adopted at the previous meeting on the proposal of Romania should have been

combined with paragraph 11. She hoped the Committee would consider combining the two texts—which dealt with the same subject—when it came to discuss the rearrangement of part III. Unlike the text adopted at the previous meeting, which dealt only with the preparation and execution of national plans, the Chilean amendment to paragraph 11 referred to what could be described as the everyday life of society, namely, economic, social, cultural and political life. Her delegation attached great importance to the concepts of national integration and social mobility, which were also mentioned in the Chilean text. The phrase “the increasing participation of all sectors of the population”, which appeared in the Chilean amendment (A/C.3/L.1715), was preferable to the expression “popular participation”, which was used in the original text (see A/7648, annex II). However, she hoped that the Chilean delegation would shorten the proposed text by replacing the list of types of non-governmental organization by the single word “associations”. She would vote for the Chilean amendment or, if it were withdrawn, for the original text.

18. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Chile) explained to representatives who favoured the original text that his delegation had included almost the whole of that text in its amendment, and had tried also to incorporate some new elements in the original text and bring it more into line with the spirit of part III of the draft Declaration. Replying to the representative of Uganda, he recalled that the words “national community” had been replaced by “national society” in response to a proposal by the Greek representative. With regard to the Italian representative’s proposal for shortening the text, he felt that the list of non-governmental organizations should be retained.

19. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) said that the text proposed by the Chilean delegation was ambiguous, and even self-contradictory, since the concepts of an integrated national society and social mobility seemed to be irreconcilable. His delegation preferred the original text, which was more precise and more acceptable to the Committee as a whole. He would be unable to vote for the Chilean amendment, and he appealed to the Chilean representative to withdraw his proposal.

20. Mrs. KVASHNINA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the Chilean amendment introduced into the draft certain concepts which were obscure even for members of the Third Committee, and she therefore appealed to the Chilean representative to withdraw it. Her delegation would vote against the Chilean amendment if it were not withdrawn and would vote for the original text.

21. Mr. BASCON (Bolivia) said he would vote for the Chilean amendment. If that amendment was not put to the vote, he would vote for the original text, although he did not particularly like the expression “popular participation”.

22. Mr. MOUSSA (United Arab Republic) thought that the text proposed by the Chilean delegation would duplicate one of the new paragraphs to be inserted after paragraph 10. While he agreed with the ideas expressed in the two amendments, he felt that repetition should be avoided, and he hoped that the Chilean representative would withdraw his proposal. He himself favoured the original text.

23. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) appealed to the representative of Chile to withdraw his amendment.

24. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Chile) said that the purpose of his amendment was to incorporate some new elements in the original text. He did not think that the amendment duplicated the text adopted at the previous meeting which referred only to the participation of society in national plans, whereas the Chilean amendment dealt with the participation of all sectors of the population in the preparation, execution and particularly, the results of development. As that was a basic issue, he could not agree to withdraw his amendment.

25. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) moved the closure of the debate.

26. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) opposed the motion for the closure of the debate since he wished to submit a sub-amendment.

*The motion for the closure of the debate was adopted by 30 votes to 26, with 27 abstentions.*

27. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said he wished to submit a sub-amendment.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that the submission of a sub-amendment was out of order after the closure of the debate.

29. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) asked for a separate vote on the words “the implementation, at” in the English text of the Chilean amendment (A/C.3/L.1715), as orally revised (see para. 5 above).

*The words were deleted by 39 votes to 11, with 33 abstentions.*

30. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan) asked for a separate vote on the words “with a view to achieving a fully integrated national society, accelerating the process of social mobility and consolidating the democratic system” in the Chilean amendment, as orally revised.

*The words were retained by 24 votes to 20, with 38 abstentions.*

*The text for paragraph 11 proposed in the Chilean amendment (A/C.3/L.1715), as orally revised and as amended, was adopted by 39 votes to 13, with 35 abstentions.*

#### *Paragraph 12*

31. Mr. TEPAVICHAROV (Bulgaria) said that the Bulgarian and Romanian delegations had, in view of the similarity of their amendments which appeared respectively in documents A/C.3/L.1702 and A/C.3/L.1710, decided to submit a joint amendment to the effect that the following words: “and on the need to accelerate the development of backward areas and regions or those which lag behind the rest of the country” should be added at the end of paragraph 12. That paragraph in the original draft (see A/7648, annex II) dealt with two questions: first, the

elaboration at the national level of social programmes with a view to the development of the entire country, and, secondly, the importance of regional development. These two ideas were closely linked, since the development of each region was an essential condition for the harmonious development of the entire country; and it was therefore important, in the context of national development, to concentrate especially on the most backward regions. That was the pupport of the amendment submitted by Bulgaria and Romania.

32. The Bulgarian delegation would vote for the amendment to paragraph 12 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, which clarified the meaning of the original text.

33. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of document A/C.3/L.1723, stressed that, at all stages of development planning, planners had to take into account the specific conditions and needs of their own countries and regions. That was why the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 proposed that the words “based on” should be replaced by the words “taking into account”.

34. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) thought that the content of the Bulgarian amendment was exactly the same as that of the original text, with the possible exception that it was a little more specific. All countries had backward regions; the words “differing regional conditions and needs” covered backward regions and the Bulgarian amendment was, therefore, unnecessary.

35. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) also thought that the Bulgarian and Romanian delegations should withdraw their amendment, but not because it was similar to the original text as the representative of the Upper Volta seemed to think. This objection was rather that while it was perfectly possible to recommend the developed countries—whose backward areas were fairly small—to give priority to those areas, planners in the developing countries were obliged to abide by Government-established priorities. He therefore preferred the original wording, which seemed more flexible.

36. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the amendment submitted by the Bulgarian and Romanian delegations, which seemed to improve the original text.

37. Mr. TEPAVICHAROV (Bulgaria) replying to the representative of the Upper Volta said that the Bulgarian-Romanian amendment added a new element to the text of paragraph 12. He fully appreciated the argument advanced by the representative of Iran, but pointed out that the two qualifying expressions (“where necessary” and “the countries concerned”) meant that States would be expected to comply with the recommendations of paragraph 12 only to the extent that they were able to do so.

38. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) also asked the Bulgarian and Romanian delegations to withdraw their amendment. The idea contained in it could well be added at the beginning of paragraph 15.

39. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) observed that, while the diversity of the needs of the different regions of each

country was mentioned in article 8 of part I, part II of the Declaration made no specific reference to backward regions. Her delegation therefore supported the amendment submitted by Bulgaria and Romania, and only wished to know whether it related to the whole of paragraph 12 or only to the last part.

40. Mr. TEPAVICHAROV (Bulgaria) said that the Bulgarian and Romanian amendment was designed to clarify the second part of the paragraph.

41. Mrs. AMONOO-NEIZER (Ghana) supported the amendment to paragraph 12 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723, which made the text clearer. She also supported the idea contained in the Bulgarian-Romanian amendment, but thought that it should rather be included in paragraph 15.

42. Mrs. FRANCK (Central African Republic) could not understand what the Bulgarian-Romanian amendment was seeking to achieve, as no country would wilfully neglect any part of its territory. In any case, the point at issue was a purely national matter. Her delegation preferred the original wording of paragraph 12, which was sufficiently clear and precise; and it appealed to the Bulgarian and Romanian delegations to withdraw their amendment.

43. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) pointed out that the Declaration was intended to give guidance not only to international organizations, but also to Governments.

44. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) supported the idea contained in the Bulgarian-Romanian amendment but agreed with the representative of Pakistan that in its present form, the amendment was out of place in paragraph 12. It would be more appropriate if the sponsors agreed to redraft their text as follows: "particularly the development of regions which are less favoured or under-developed by comparison with the rest of the country".

45. Mr. TEPAVICHAROV (Bulgaria) accepted, on behalf of the sponsors, the new wording proposed by the representative of Iraq.

*The amendment to paragraph 12 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 was adopted by 78 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*The oral amendment submitted by Bulgaria and Romania, as revised, was adopted by 62 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 12 (see A/7648, annex II), as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*