



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 71st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 88: UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN: EQUALITY, DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE  
(continued)

- (c) DRAFT DECLARATION ON THE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE STRUGGLE FOR THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY AND AGAINST COLONIALISM, APARTHEID, ALL FORMS OF RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, FOREIGN AGGRESSION, OCCUPATION AND ALL FORMS OF FOREIGN DOMINATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

UN LIBRARY  
10 DEC 1981  
UN/36/SR.71

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

**Distr. GENERAL**

A/C.3/36/SR.71  
10 December 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 88: UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN: EQUALITY, DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE (continued)

- (c) DRAFT DECLARATION ON THE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE STRUGGLE FOR THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY AND AGAINST COLONIALISM, APARTHEID, ALL FORMS OF RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, FOREIGN AGGRESSION, OCCUPIATION AND ALL FORMS OF FOREIGN DOMINATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2, A/C.3/36/L.85 and A/C.3/36/L.86)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would continue its consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2 and the amendments contained in documents A/C.3/36/L.85 and A/C.3/36/L.86, as well as the oral amendments presented by Pakistan at a previous meeting.

2. Ms. SLATTERY (Ireland) said her delegation had already indicated that it was not convinced of the need for a declaration such as the one contained in draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2. There were already two conventions and a declaration aimed at promoting the rights and improving the status of women and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women had only recently entered into force and should be given time to have effect. The ideas in the draft declaration had been put forward and given full consideration by the Committee when the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women had been elaborated and adopted, and again in the course of the consideration of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women. It should also be noted that political considerations and goals applied equally to men and women. Several articles in part I of the draft might more appropriately read "men and women equally" or "women as well as men". Furthermore, women's rights, concerns and activities were not limited to those outlined in the draft, even if all the amendments proposed were included. It was therefore inappropriate to use language which implied that participation of women in such activities should be in any way mandatory. It was important to remember that there were other fields of human endeavour that were worthy of women's - and men's - attention. Members should guard against placing further burdens on women; for example, in part II of the resolution the word "ensure" in paragraph 3 and the word "enhance" in paragraph 4 seemed out of place, and expressions such as "permit" or "facilitate" would be more in keeping with the aims of the Decade. The object of such a declaration should be to broaden the possibilities open to women and enlarge their field of choice. Her delegation believed that the broad aim of greater participation by women in political movements and parties should be achieved by creating the conditions which would permit women to be more active politically; women themselves could be depended upon to do the rest.

/...

(Ms. Slattery, Ireland)

3. Her delegation would prefer further detailed consideration of the question in some suitable forum before the Committee was called upon to adopt a text. It had therefore been reluctant to engage in amending the text in the Committee. However, a number of substantive amendments had been proposed in addition to the revisions which the sponsors had incorporated into document A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2. Now that they were being considered, her delegation wished to put forward some additional suggestions.

4. With regard to article 2 of the draft declaration, she suggested that the words "without hindrance" should be replaced by the words "on an equal footing with men, without distinction as to race, colour, language, religious or other belief, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status". The words "of women" at the end of article 3 should be replaced by the words "of individuals and peoples". In article 4 the word "women" in the first sentence should be replaced by the words "individuals, whether men, women or young people". Similarly, the words "to those women" in the second sentence of that article should be replaced by the words "to women as well as men", there being no apparent reason why solidarity should be limited to solidarity among women. Article 5 might also be changed to take account of the importance of reducing disparities within countries, between developed countries and between developing countries. That could be done by replacing the words "developed and developing countries" in the last sentence with the words "development within and between countries".

5. With regard to part II of the draft declaration, she felt that the reference to the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women was inappropriate. Normally a declaration, which was something permanent, had no need to refer to a specific five-year programme of action; she therefore suggested that that reference should be deleted. With regard to the third paragraph of part II, she suggested that the word "ensure" should be replaced by the word "permit" and that the words "with men" should be inserted after the word "women". Similarly, in paragraph 4 the word "enhancing" should be replaced by the word "facilitating". Last, she felt that the last phrase of the fifth paragraph, "and to promote the dissemination of such information by the mass communications media at the national and international levels", was redundant and could be deleted.

6. In conclusion, she stressed that her amendments were not intended to conflict with the amendments previously proposed but were rather supplementary suggestions.

7. Mr. TARASYUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that there was nothing constructive about the amendments proposed by the United States in document A/C.3/36/L.86 or about the manner in which they had been submitted. Those amendments were no more than an attempt to change the original idea and purpose of the draft declaration and were intended to prevent the Committee from adopting that draft. The reason for those amendments lay not in any wish to improve the text but rather in the fundamental approach of the United States

/...

(Mr. Tarasyuk, Ukrainian SSR)

to contemporary world problems, as demonstrated by the way it had voted on such issues as self-determination, apartheid and racism. He stressed that the sponsors of the draft declaration had paid careful attention to all proposed amendments which had been made in a spirit of co-operation and mutual respect. The United States amendments had not, however, been submitted in such a spirit and indeed, showed a fundamental lack of respect for the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2. His delegation hoped that the Committee would treat them accordingly.

8. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia) recalled that General Assembly decision 35/429 clearly stated that the draft declaration was to be considered at the thirty-sixth session with a view to adopting it in 1981. That decision had been unanimously supported, and there had already been extensive discussion on the draft declaration and the proposed amendments. The discussion at the current session and the preceding session of the General Assembly had shown the interest in and the desirability of such a draft declaration, and his delegation felt that the Committee should adopt it. The intrinsic quality and timeliness of the declaration had not been questioned. The problem was the desire of some delegations to transform the text into a catalogue of evils, a task that was beyond the scope and competence of the Committee. In document A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2, the sponsors had accommodated all points of view in so far as that was possible. To ask for more was contrary to the spirit of compromise and understanding. He appealed to all delegations to resist the temptation to overcrowd what was already a cumbersome text. He stressed that he was not attempting to detract from the points raised by certain delegations but simply pointing out that only so much could be done with one document.

9. His delegation felt that sufficient consideration had been given to the draft. There had been no secrecy involved in the negotiations, in which the 30 sponsors and all interested delegations had participated. It had not been the intention of the sponsors to avoid consultations, and the views of other delegations had been duly accommodated. After thorough consideration, oral and written amendments had been incorporated into the text in so far as possible, and the draft had been improved. His delegation could not, however, take seriously amendments that were aimed not at improving the text but simply at showing that certain delegations had apprehensions about the text. It was simply not true that the sponsors had acted contrary to existing practice, and he urged all delegations of good faith to help reach an agreement on the document under consideration and to adopt it at the current session.

10. Mr. VONGSALY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that the amendments proposed by the United States (A/C.3/36/L.86) contained three main ideas, of which the first had already been included in the title of the declaration, the second was beyond the subject-matter of the declaration and the third touched on matters which were still highly controversial. In general, amendments should be made to improve a text and ought to be constructive and positive. The United States proposals, however, were aimed at changing the original sense of the declaration. He pointed out that annex V, paragraph 95, of the rules

/...

(Mr. Vongsaly, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

of procedure of the General Assembly stated that resolutions should be as clear and succinct as possible. Furthermore, it was international practice that declarations, like conventions and treaties, should be drafted in general and abstract terms. An excess of detail would mean that the text before the Committee would no longer be a declaration. The United States amendments were simply a manoeuvre to prevent the early adoption of the text and were quite unacceptable to his delegation.

10a. In conclusion, he stressed that the sponsors had shown a spirit of compromise when amendments had been presented and that the text in document A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2 contained much that had not been present in the original draft.

11. Mrs. AKAMATSU (Japan) said that her delegation appreciated the efforts of the German Democratic Republic and the other sponsors to make the draft declaration acceptable to all delegations. However, she was disappointed that the discussion was dragging on with no end in sight; the Committee might perhaps have made better use of its time. In its reply to the Secretary-General, contained in document A/36/476, her country had expressed its doubts with regard to how much such a declaration could do to enhance the status of women and realize world peace. It had felt that the declaration would lead to a political debate which was not relevant to the problems facing women. The recent discussion in the Committee had shown that her Government's apprehensions had been fully justified.

12. She had found it noteworthy in the course of the debate that many delegations were represented only by men and that the participation of women in the substantive discussions had been very limited. She doubted that the draft declaration fully reflected the views of women and believed that it should do so more clearly. Her Government had found it very difficult to obtain the views of Japanese women on the amendments and on the revisions which had only recently been submitted to the Committee. If, however, the role of women in the draft declaration was purely nominal and the main emphasis was on the struggle for international peace, her delegation believed that the subject should be considered in some other forum.

13. The fact that only 25 Governments had responded to the Secretary-General's request showed a lack of interest and suggested that the draft declaration was not urgent. In her delegation's view, the substance of the matter should be discussed elsewhere before it was considered in the Third Committee; accordingly, her delegation felt that it would be inappropriate to adopt the proposed declaration at the current session.

14. Mr. DYRLUND (Denmark) said that his delegation considered all the amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2 to be important and did not agree with the sponsors that some amendments were contrary to the rules of procedure. In view of the large number of amendments submitted, his delegation did not

/...

(Mr. Dyrlund, Denmark)

think that there was enough time to finalize that document, particularly since it would have the status of an international declaration. In addition, the current discussion had cast doubt on the advisability of taking a decision on a declaration that included important political issues which were dealt with by other United Nations organs. For those reasons, in his delegation's opinion, the adoption of the draft resolution should be postponed and the sponsors should re-examine that text, placing emphasis on women's participation in decision-making processes.

15. Mr. FONT (Spain) said that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2 created difficulties for his delegation because it dealt selectively with one particular group of human beings, namely, women. The Committee's work should be aimed at protecting men and women alike from discrimination, in accordance with existing international instruments on human rights. In addition, the draft declaration referred to selected aspects of the international situation, and not to the practical problems women faced, for example in the areas of health, education and employment. Lastly, his delegation questioned the procedure that had been followed in the submission and discussion of the draft declaration, which was better suited to the submission and discussion of a draft resolution. For example, contrary to normal practice, neither the Commission on the Status of Women nor the Economic and Social Council had recommended that the General Assembly should consider the draft declaration.

16. In view of the large number of amendments submitted and the sponsors' emphasis on immediate adoption, many delegations were not even certain just what document was under consideration. Accordingly, his delegation appealed to the sponsors not to press for the adoption of the draft declaration with such urgency. All delegations should recognize that any declaration adopted in that manner would not have the necessary moral authority that was expected of international instruments.

17. Mrs. LORANGER (Canada), referring to the comments made by the representative of Japan, confirmed that women were truly interested in world peace and in promoting their own role in attaining it. She thanked the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2 for their efforts to include the many amendments submitted but pointed out that her delegation had not even had enough time to read some of the amendments. It was therefore difficult to ask delegations to express a firm opinion on the draft declaration; in her delegation's view, further consideration was needed.

18. As her delegation had indicated previously, the draft declaration was not essential and did not further the cause of women. Moreover, while her delegation was willing to discuss that matter, the Committee was not the appropriate forum in which to do so. The draft declaration was being discussed as if it were a draft resolution, and in her delegation's opinion, that was not the best way to elaborate an international instrument. Therefore

/...

(Mrs. Loranger, Canada)

her delegation endorsed the comments made by the representative of Denmark to the effect that the consideration of the draft declaration should be continued in another forum. Moreover, her delegation might wish to submit its own amendments, or, in any case, to consider the existing amendments at greater length.

19. If the declaration was indeed warranted, the text must be one that could withstand the passage of time and must truly benefit the women of the world. The competent Canadian authorities had been unable to respond to the Secretary-General's request for comments on the original draft declaration because they had been involved in questions concerning the ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. However, they could now focus their attention more fully on the draft declaration and would endeavour to respond to any further request received from the Secretary-General in that connexion.

20. In conclusion, she stressed that it would be unfortunate if the draft declaration in its present formulation was pushed to a vote.

21. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America) said that some particularly relevant comments had been made during the current discussion, for example by the representative of Japan, who had drawn attention to the fact that women had played only a small role in the elaboration and discussion of the draft declaration. In addition, his delegation felt that many of the amendments submitted, for example those submitted by the representative of Ireland, were useful and offered a fresh approach to the discussion of the draft declaration. Those amendments also revealed the shortcomings of the existing text, as well as the fact that it was impossible for the Committee to conduct negotiations on it.

22. Referring to the comments made previously by the representative of the German Democratic Republic and other sponsors, who seemed to respond only to some of the points raised and not to others, he observed that the discussion of the draft declaration was not an East-West dispute and that the United States was not opposing the sponsors; the basic issue concerned the Committee's integrity and its way of conducting business, particularly in connexion with the adoption of an international instrument of a legal nature.

23. The main problem for his delegation concerned procedure. Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2 was the result of a closed process in which the delegation of the German Democratic Republic had held bilateral negotiations with other delegations. However, that type of international instrument being proposed should be the result of formal negotiations involving all the nations represented; all members of the Committee, including the sponsors, realized that the text of the draft declaration could not be negotiated in the Committee in a professional manner. The impropriety of seeking to negotiate an international instrument in the corridors was surely clear to everyone. Although

/...

(Mr. Johnson, United States)

the representative of the Ukrainian SSR had observed that many delegations were satisfied with that procedure, he drew attention to the fact that no other human-rights instrument had been dealt with in that way.

24. Some of the sponsors had accused his delegation of engaging in delaying tactics by submitting the amendments contained in document A/C.3/36/L.86; in so doing, they had ignored his delegation's previous statement indicating that the purpose of the amendments was to make delegations aware of the problems surrounding the existing text. Referring to the comments made by the representative of Ethiopia, he explained that the United States amendments were designed to improve the text as much as possible in the event of a vote. However, he hoped that the sponsors would not press that issue.

25. He drew attention to the fact that after a draft resolution had been submitted, it ceased to be the property of the sponsors and was open to comment by all members of the Committee. Therefore no delegation should need to obtain approval for the amendments it submitted, nor was it within the province of the sponsors to pass judgement on amendments.

26. The representative of the German Democratic Republic had complained that the United States had followed an unfair procedure in submitting document A/C.3/36/L.86. However, in his delegation's opinion, the procedure followed by the sponsors, in trying to oblige Committee members to vote on the draft declaration long before they were prepared to do so and before the many ideas expressed in that connexion had been considered by the appropriate body, left much to be desired. The representative of the German Democratic Republic and others had also claimed that document A/C.3/36/L.86 did not contain real amendments. His delegation, however, felt that the argument was not supported by the rules of procedure, and he asked what distinction could be made between the amendments contained in document A/C.3/36/L.86 and those contained in documents A/C.3/36/L.84 and A/C.3/36/L.85, which the sponsors had accepted.

27. The representative of the German Democratic Republic and other sponsors had also attempted to portray his delegation as the only obstacle to the adoption of the draft declaration. In so doing, they had ignored the statements made by a large number of other delegations. In that connexion, he drew attention to the amendments submitted by Australia and New Zealand, which suggested the addition of references to discrimination against women. Surprisingly, the sponsors had drafted the entire text of the proposed declaration without making any mention of discrimination against women.

28. The representative of the Ukrainian SSR had also asserted that document A/C.3/36/L.86 did not contain amendments to the draft declaration and that that document had been submitted at the last minute. However, since the scope of the draft declaration had been considerably expanded through the revision of its title, it was clear that all those amendments were relevant. In addition, document A/C.3/36/L.86 had been issued almost a full week earlier. Indeed, it seemed that it was not his delegation but the sponsors that were trying to confuse the Committee.

/...



(Mr. Johnson, United States)

29. It had been alleged that his country's amendments did not respect the spirit of co-operation displayed by the sponsors; the truth was the contrary: the sponsors' attempt to press the Committee to a vote on an international legal instrument revealed a lack of respect for the Committee and for its traditions.

30. The representative of Ethiopia had referred to General Assembly decision 35/429 concerning the consideration of the draft declaration, with a view to its adoption during the current session. In actuality, the same wording was always used to refer to pending draft declarations in the hope that they would be adopted at the subsequent session. However, that wording did not oblige the General Assembly to adopt such instruments at the session referred to. He drew attention to the fact that it had taken 20 years to consider thoroughly and to adopt the draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief, which was approximately as long as the draft declaration under consideration. The main problem lay in the fact that the draft declaration had not been considered in the appropriate forum. His delegation agreed with the representative of Ethiopia that additional amendments would make the draft more cumbersome. Therefore, the draft should be subjected to further consideration in order to make it clearer and more concise.

31. The only purpose of his country's amendments was to establish a rational procedure for the discussion of the draft declaration. His delegation had a very serious attitude towards international instruments and actively participated in working groups and subsidiary bodies which elaborated them. However, the draft declaration had never been subjected to an exchange of views in a multilateral negotiating forum. Once the draft declaration had received such consideration, his delegation could see no reason why a decision on it should be delayed.

32. Mr. ERDÖS (Hungary) said that his delegation and the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2 had contacted other delegations and had explained the importance they attached to the participation of women in national public life with a view to solving national and international problems. There had been differences of view, but the delegations contacted had shared the main concern on which the draft declaration was based. He also drew attention to the spirit of co-operation the sponsors had displayed in incorporating amendments submitted by other delegations. In that context, the attitude of the United States was particularly surprising. While the comments made by many delegations reflected their willingness to take into account the intentions and views of others, the amendments submitted by the United States merely showed its intention to bury the draft declaration in unconstructive debate. In short, those amendments were deliberately designed to create confusion. Accordingly, his delegation refused to be associated with them, despite the United States representative's assertion that after documents had been submitted, they became the property of the Committee. While his delegation did not question the right

/...

(Mr. Erdős, Hungary)

of other delegations to express their views, he asked how the amendments submitted by one delegation could further the consideration of the draft declaration at the present stage. Surely the United States delegation had had sufficient time to study the draft declaration during the past year and to adopt a more constructive, serious approach to the current discussion.

33. In any case, it was urgently necessary to include women in national, social, political, economic and cultural processes, an effort which document A/C.3/36/L.86 was clearly designed to frustrate. That document did not contain amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2; it changed the basic spirit of the draft resolution and undermined efforts to find acceptable language.

34. He therefore proposed that, in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure, the Committee should formally decide that document A/C.3/36/L.86 represented a separate proposal and did not contain amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2. Moreover, he requested that a recorded vote should be taken on that decision.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that he had consulted the Office of Legal Affairs in connexion with the point of order raised by the representative of Hungary and had been informed that the amendments contained in document A/C.3/36/L.86 were in order. He accepted that view.

36. Mr. BROWERS (Netherlands) said that during the general debate on agenda item 88, his delegation had questioned the need for a draft declaration. The Copenhagen Conference had emphasized the need for a practical and action-oriented approach and had agreed that so long as the basic needs of women in many countries had not been met, no high priority should be given to any new international instrument. In any event, the Programme of Action that had resulted from the Copenhagen Conference already covered many of the provisions in the draft declaration, which, as it stood, had several drawbacks, as had been pointed out by some of the previous speakers. Moreover, his delegation believed that the normal practice within the United Nations for dealing with international declarations should be followed and further efforts at consultations and negotiations should be pursued. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2 had shown a willingness to adapt the text to accommodate other delegations, and for that his delegation was most grateful. The most significant amendment accepted by the sponsors concerned the title, the scope of which had been broadened. In any event, there had not been sufficient time to study all the proposed amendments, and for that reason his delegation believed that consideration of the item should be postponed.

37. Mr. ABAWI (Afghanistan) said that sponsors of the draft declaration had demonstrated their readiness to accept constructive amendments, and accordingly, the text had been revised twice. However, other delegations, such as the sponsor of document A/C.3/36/L.86, had attempted to introduce confusion. He appealed to the sponsor of that document not to pursue it and hoped that the draft declaration would be adopted at the current session.

38. Miss FRANCO (Portugal) said that her delegation was surprised to see the time of the Third Committee being used as if it were a working group. Her delegation did not doubt the importance of the draft declaration; however, it believed that the way to proceed was through an open-ended debate with a view to obtaining a consensus. It did not agree that the amendments proposed in document A/C.3/36/L.86 were in effect separate proposals. In any event, the number of amendments submitted showed the need to accommodate the views of other delegations, and for that reason her delegation believed that the draft declaration might best be studied in another forum.

39. Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium) said that the reason for so many amendments was twofold. First, there was the procedural reason. The Committee had been dealing with the draft declaration as if it were a draft resolution. The procedure used for draft resolutions was not the procedure normally applied to draft declarations, which required wider-ranging discussions. Secondly, there was the substantive reason, which called into question the thrust and the general structure of the draft. For example, the draft attempted to tell women what they ought to do; in his delegation's view, that was a backward step. Moreover, the section dealing with national and international action had nothing to do with women in particular. It could be applied to any group of people regardless of sex or social status. In addition, the draft was replete with technical mistakes. All of those facts indicated that the draft was not yet ripe for adoption, and his delegation therefore associated itself with those favouring postponement of the discussion.

40. Mr. TARASYUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in his delegation's view, the discussion reaffirmed the fact that the draft was in keeping with the goals of the United Nations Decade for Women and was a substantive contribution towards achieving those goals. The struggle for peace, against colonialism and for the development of women required the involvement of women in all aspects of life, and the need for that involvement was obvious from the current international situation. The delegations opposing the draft declaration had also been those that had voted against the recommendations of the Mexico City and Copenhagen Conferences. In its present form, and especially since the sponsors had taken into account all rational amendments made, the draft declaration was indeed ripe for adoption. Any objective look at the situation would confirm that. The representative of the United States had indicated in an earlier statement that his delegation would vote against the very idea of the draft. Contrary to what that representative had stated, there had been broad discussion of the draft both in the Commission on the Status of Women and in the Third Committee, and due account had been taken of all the views expressed. It should be remembered that the United States delegation had also attempted to torpedo the Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women. That attitude was also obvious in the so-called amendments submitted in document A/C.3/36/L.86, the concepts of which were radically different from the concepts of the two Conferences and the relevant General Assembly resolutions. Accordingly, his delegation believed that under rule 130 of the rules of procedure, the proposals in that document should be regarded as a separate and distinct from the draft resolution under consideration.

/...

(Mr. Tarasyuk, USSR)

41. No one could deny the importance of the draft declaration, and his delegation was therefore surprised to hear certain Western delegations, which had taken part in the consultations and whose amendments had been accommodated, state that the draft was not ready for adoption. His delegation believed that the best that the United Nations could do for women at the present moment was to adopt the draft as it stood.

42. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia) said that contrary to what the representative of the United States had stated, he had never said that the amendments proposed by the United States delegation should be rejected. What he had said was that they should be accorded the attention which they deserved. In any event, he wished to assure all delegations that as a sponsor of the draft declaration, he had given full attention to all proposals, and his delegation believed that the essence of the task of diplomats working in the Third Committee was co-operation. Accordingly, under rule 118 of the rules of procedure, he proposed suspending the meeting, so that the sponsors of the draft declaration could determine what steps should be taken.

43. The meeting was suspended at 12.55 p.m. and resumed at 1.05 p.m.

44. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia) said that after consultations, the sponsors of the draft declaration had agreed on the following draft decision, which they hoped that the Committee would adopt by consensus:

"Appreciating the interest shown in the draft Declaration on the Participation of Women in the Struggle for the Strengthening of International Peace and for the Solution of Other Vital National and International Problems by a large number of Member States and the extensive discussions held on the subject in the Third Committee during the thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth sessions of the General Assembly,

"Realizing that in view of lack of time, the Committee was unable to conclude these discussions, and examine fully all the proposals before it,

"Decides to request the Secretary-General to seek further comments from Member States and to present a report based on their comments, as well as on the proposals submitted so far, with a view to ensuring the early adoption of the draft declaration during the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly."

45. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to adopt the draft decision without a vote.

46. It was so decided.

47. Mr. SCHLEGEL (German Democratic Republic) said that while his delegation respected the decision of the Committee, it did not feel that the proper

/...

(Mr. Schlegel, German  
Democratic Republic)

procedure had been followed with respect to the important initiative taken by the sponsors of the draft declaration. His delegation would be happy to submit the draft declaration at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly because it was a goal worth fighting for. He thanked the sponsors of the draft and those delegations that fully understood the initiative and had supported it.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.