



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HAMER (Netherlands)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 83: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE SECOND DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 84: ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES FOR THE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS OF POLITICAL, MILITARY, ECONOMIC AND OTHER FORMS OF ASSISTANCE GIVEN TO THE RACIST AND COLONIALIST REGIME OF SOUTH AFRICA: RETORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 88: IMPORTANCE OF THE UNIVERSAL REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND OF THE SPEEDY GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES FOR THE EFFECTIVE GUARANTEE AND OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 89: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

- (a) **REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION**
(continued)
- (b) **STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL** (continued)
- (c) **STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE SUPPRESSION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF APARTHEID: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL** (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 92: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN
(continued)

- (a) **REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN** (continued)

/...

*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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.3/41/SR.25
29 October 1986

CONTENTS (continued)

- (b) STATUS OF THE CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 93: FORWARD-LOOKING STRATEGIES FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN TO THE YEAR 2000 (continued)

- (a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND CO-OPERATION (continued)
- (b) UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (c) INCORPORATION OF THE INTERESTS OF WOMEN IN THE WORK PROGRAMME OF THE REGIONAL COMMISSIONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (d) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NAIROBI FORWARD-LOOKING STRATEGIES FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COUNCIL (continued)
- (b) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (c) REPORTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 83: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE SECOND DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/41/L.11, A/C.3/41/L.22)

AGENDA ITEM 84: ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES FOR THE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS OF POLITICAL, MILITARY, ECONOMIC AND OTHER FORMS OF ASSISTANCE GIVEN TO THE RACIST AND COLONIALIST REGIME OF SOUTH AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/41/L.12, A/C.3/41/L.23)

AGENDA ITEM 88: IMPORTANCE OF THE UNIVERSAL REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND OF THE SPEEDY GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES FOR THE EFFECTIVE GUARANTEE AND OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/41/L.7, A/C.3/41/L.13)

AGENDA ITEM 89: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/C.3/41/L.8, A/C.3/41/L.24)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
- (b) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (c) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE SUPPRESSION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF APARTHEID: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.11 as orally amended at a previous meeting.
2. Draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.11, as orally amended, was adopted without a vote.
3. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.7 and announced that Gambia had become a sponsor.
4. Draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.7 was adopted without a vote.
5. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolutions A/C.3/41/L.12 and L.13.
6. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon) said that while his delegation fully supported the substance of the draft resolutions, it had serious reservations concerning those paragraphs in both of them which made selective mention of certain countries.

7. A separate vote was taken on the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12.

8. The tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12 were adopted by 76 votes to 24, with 25 abstentions.

9. Draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12 was adopted by 108 votes to 9, with 16 abstentions.

10. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that her delegation still had reservations concerning paragraph 26 of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.13 but would not request a separate vote.

11. Mr. MINTSA ZOE ONDO (Gabon) said that his delegation had intended to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12 rather than abstain.

12. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.11 had it been present during the vote. It also would have abstained in the vote on the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12, but would have voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

13. Miss LA FORTUNE (Canada) said that her delegation had intended to vote against preambular paragraph 10 and operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12 but in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

14. Mr. SOBREDO (Spain), speaking in explanation of the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.13, said that his delegation would abstain in the vote because it could not accept the implication in paragraph 2 that armed force was a legitimate means of resolving international conflicts. It had reservations concerning paragraph 22, which implied that encouragement was being given to the South African régime, and paragraph 26, which referred to regional organizations to which his country did not belong and to resolutions which it had not supported.

15. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.13.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal,

Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Fiji, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Portugal, Spain.

16. Draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.13 was adopted by 110 votes to 17, with 9 abstentions.

17. Mr. BASHIR (Pakistan) said that his delegation had intended to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.13.

18. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.14 as orally amended at a previous meeting and announced that Benin, Burkina Faso, Democratic Yemen, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Uganda and Zimbabwe had become sponsors.

19. Mr. BASHIR (Pakistan) said that helping the victims of mercenaries was just as important as prohibiting their use and he objected to the denigration of the concept of humanitarian aid in paragraph 1. He therefore suggested that the words "including so-called humanitarian aid" should be deleted from that paragraph and that the word "all" should be added before the words "other forms of support". He further proposed that the following new operative paragraph should be inserted between paragraphs 4 and 5: "Calls upon all States to extend humanitarian assistance to victims of situations resulting from the use of mercenaries as well as from colonial domination or foreign occupation".

20. Miss AYORINDE (Nigeria) said that the sponsors had not been consulted promptly concerning the possibility of amendments. Also, the concept of humanitarian aid should not become a pretext for violating the sovereignty of independent States; hence the wording of paragraph 1. The draft resolution should therefore be considered as it stood.

21. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that she favoured the proposed amendment and felt that the new paragraph was very clear. The sponsors should request a postponement and give serious consideration to the amendment.

/...

22. Mr. MEZA (El Salvador) said that the proposal by the representative of Pakistan was an intelligent one and his delegation was prepared to support it because it clarified the text. It was difficult to understand the mention of Central America in a draft resolution intended to promote independence. Central America had gained its independence in 1821 and there were no dependent people there. The situation in Central America was completely different from that in other parts of the world and so the reference to national liberation movements could be misunderstood. His delegation therefore believed that a separate vote should be taken on paragraph 1.

23. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) and Mr. DAMM (Chile) supported the statement made by the representative of El Salvador.

24. Miss AYORINDE (Nigeria) said that, while the sponsors would have preferred to take action immediately on the draft resolution, in view of the statements just made, they were prepared to postpone a decision with a view to studying the proposal by the representative of Pakistan.

25. Mr. DOWEK (Israel) said that Israel, as a people that had suffered genocide, could not agree with the comparison of the use of mercenaries to genocide, two entirely different situations.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that he took it that the Committee wished to postpone consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.14, pending further consultations.

27. It was so decided.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would now consider draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.8, which had no programme budget implications, and of which Rwanda had become a sponsor.

29. Miss YOUNG (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Economic Community, said that the vote of the Twelve on the draft resolution had no connection with their views on apartheid itself. The Twelve had repeatedly condemned the system of apartheid which they regarded as a flagrant violation of the most basic human rights and had called for it to be abolished. However, they continued to take the view that the Convention made no contribution to the elimination of apartheid. They supported the aim of the Convention, but had grave reservations about the means envisaged in it which in their view raised serious legal difficulties. The Convention was defective on a number of grounds and their reservations were compounded by the fact that it defined the violations covered by it very imprecisely.

30. They had a number of difficulties with the draft resolution itself. With regard to the fifth preambular paragraph, genocide was clearly defined in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. The Twelve did not accept that a resolution adopted by the General Assembly could purport to extend that definition or the area of application of that Convention. Only the States parties to the Convention or the appropriate international organs were

(Miss Young, United Kingdom)

competent to pronounce on its interpretation. With regard to operative paragraphs 5 and 8, the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, like other international instruments, was applicable only to States that had ratified it and to the citizens of those States. To act otherwise would be contrary to the generally acceptable principle that treaties had no legal effects on States which were not party to them. The Twelve would therefore vote against those three paragraphs.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that separate recorded votes had been requested on the fifth preambular paragraph, operative paragraph 5 and operative paragraph 8.

32. A recorded vote was taken on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.8

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden.

33. The fifth preambular paragraph was adopted by 105 votes to 16, with 15 abstentions.

34. A recorded vote was taken on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.8.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Jamaica, Lesotho, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Sweden, Uruguay.

35. Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 105 votes to 18, with 13 abstentions.

36. A recorded vote was taken on operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.8.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia,

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Japan, Lesotho, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Swaziland, Sweden, Uruguay.

37. Operative paragraph 8 was adopted by 106 votes to 16, with 14 abstentions.

38. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.8, as amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

/...

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

39. Draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.8 as amended, was adopted by 116 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions.

40. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.9 and the amendments proposed thereto contained in document A/C.3/41/L.24, neither of which had programme budget implications. In addition, Cuba had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.9 and Iceland had become a sponsor of the amendments in document A/C.3/41/L.24.

41. A recorded vote was taken on the amendments contained in document A/C.3/41/L.24.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Equatorial Guinea, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

42. The amendments were adopted by 80 votes to none, with 45 abstentions.

43. Draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.9, as amended, was adopted without a vote.

44. The CHAIRMAN said that at the request of a number of delegations, he had agreed to defer consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.10 which had been submitted under agenda item 89.

45. The Committee had thus concluded consideration of the draft proposals submitted under the first cluster of items, with the exception of draft resolutions A/C.3/41/L.10 and A/C.3/41/L.14. He then gave the floor to delegations wishing to explain their votes, after the vote, on the various draft resolutions.

46. Mrs. MUKHERJEE (India) said that although her delegation had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.7, that was without prejudice to its position on article 1 of the International Covenant and various resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights.

47. Miss BYRNE (United States of America) said that her delegation had not participated in the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.11. The United States had supported the launching of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination in 1973. However, since the adoption in 1975 of General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) containing the false and odious statement equating zionism with racism, the United States had not participated in the activities of the First or Second Decades.

48. With regard to the decision to authorize a global consultation on racial discrimination, contained in paragraph 13 of the resolution, the programme budget implications statement in document A/C.3/41/L.22 presented the full cost estimates of conference servicing for that activity. Her delegation's decision not to participate in the adoption of the resolution, apart from substantive grounds, was predicated upon its understanding, indeed its full expectation, that the Secretary-General would fully absorb the conference servicing cost of that activity when presenting his consolidated statement of conference servicing towards the close of the forty-second session.

49. Her delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.8. The United States Government had long held the position that the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid purported to extend the international criminal jurisdiction in a broad and ill-defined manner and sought to rely upon present powers of domestic jurisdiction for its enforcement. Any country that wished to take international action against apartheid could do so, and many States had passed laws against various aspects of racial discrimination. Under United States civil legislation, for example, the United States had adopted numerous laws prohibiting and punishing certain practices of racial discrimination.

50. The Convention, in article III, appeared to extend international criminal responsibility to the private acts of individuals, wherever committed. The broad extension of international jurisdiction under the Convention, even in cases where there were no significant contacts between the offence and the forum State and where the offender was not a national of the forum State, was impossible for the United States to accept as consistent with basic norms of fairness and due process essential in criminal law. For example, her country could not accept that a

(Miss Byrne, United States)

United States citizen vacationing in a foreign country could be extradited to another foreign country and tried there for something that had been said in the territory of the United States. That was fundamentally incompatible with what the United States regarded as the basic and inalienable rights of freedom of speech and expression.

51. Deplorable as apartheid was, her delegation could not, from a legal point of view, accept the presumption that apartheid was already generally regarded as a crime against humanity. Crimes against humanity were so grave in nature that they must be meticulously elaborated and strictly construed under existing international law, as set forth in the Nuremburg Charter and applied by the Nuremburg Tribunal. Her delegation rejected the formulation equating apartheid with genocide and with a crime against humanity. It also rejected the condemnation of transnational corporations engaged in legal activities.

52. Her delegation's vote against resolution A/C.3/41/L.12 was based in part on the objectionable language of the resolution, including name-calling, and on its opposition to the fruitless exercise by Mr. Khalifa, the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights.

53. Her delegation had vote against resolution A/C.3/41/L.13. The United States was firmly opposed to racism and racial discrimination and believed that apartheid was evil, abhorrent, reprehensible and must end. It regretted, however, the politicization of United Nations activities in the field of racial discrimination and the extreme language that had prevented her delegation from supporting some of the resolutions under that cluster of agenda items. Such language did not facilitate peaceful change either in South Africa or the Middle East, but only encouraged more polarization and strife.

54. Mr. ABOU-HADID (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on resolution A/C.3/41/L.11 in order to promote efforts to abolish all forms of racism, especially in southern Africa and Palestine. Any reference to racism also meant zionism and he understood the last phrase in operative paragraph 2 to include the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, the West Bank and the Golan Heights. The international and non-governmental organizations referred to in operative paragraph 3 included, in his view, the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

55. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) said that his delegation reserved its position on paragraph 26 of resolution A/C.3/41/L.13. His delegation also had reservations on certain of the other texts because it was against the practice of calling States by names in resolutions and holding them responsible for the crimes of South Africa.

56. Mr. ORTIZ (Uruguay) said that his delegation did not agree with the reference to specific States in the tenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 3 of resolution A/C.3/41/L.12. With respect to resolution A/C.3/41/L.13, paragraph 2, Uruguay

(Mr. Ortiz, Uruguay)

supported the struggle of peoples for independence, territorial integrity and national unity, particularly in the case of Argentina and the Malvinas. However, it had reservations about the reference to armed struggle because it did not believe that force should be used in international relations. With respect to paragraph 33 of that resolution, Uruguay believed that it was for the Palestinian people themselves to determine their sole and legitimate representative and, in that connection, the role of the Palestine Liberation Organization was only provisional.

57. With respect to resolution A/C.3/41/L.8, Uruguay was studying the legal and formal methods of making the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid compatible with its national legislation.

58. Mr. JATIVA (Ecuador) said that his delegation had voted for resolution A/C.3/41/L.13 because as a whole it was consistent with certain aspects of Ecuador's foreign policy. It could not, however, agree with some of the wording in the resolution because it was selective. Accordingly, it had reservations on the tenth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 3 and 15. Ecuador also had reservations on resolution A/C.3/41/L.12 because its objectivity was questionable.

59. Miss YOUNG (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said the Twelve Member States of the European Community welcomed the fact that thanks to the African Group, a consensus had been maintained on the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

60. If the Twelve had not supported draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12 it had not been because of their views on apartheid. Rather, as in the past, the report of the Special Rapporteur had not constituted a useful framework for debate. The lists of companies included in the report were inaccurate, selective, and -- apparently for political reasons -- excluded many States and other corporations which were known to conduct regular trade with South Africa. Companies from over 100 countries were involved in such trade, yet the report referred to little more than 30. The further guidance given to the Special Rapporteur in operative paragraph 9 would not redress the situation, nor would the provision of more resources at a time of financial crisis.

61. The Twelve had voted against the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 because they rejected arbitrary and unjustified attacks, whether by name or implicitly, on Member States of the United Nations. Although they firmly supported the right to self-determination, they could not support draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.13. Several elements in the text raised substantial difficulties or were even unacceptable, and a draft had been put forward without any attempt to consult all the groups represented in the Committee. Overall, the text was negative and unbalanced, referring to certain violations of the right of self-determination, but omitting any reference to the flagrant violations of that right in Afghanistan and Cambodia.

(Miss Young, United Kingdom)

62. The Twelve had repeatedly condemned the system of apartheid in South Africa, but it was their view that the United Nations should encourage peaceful solutions to international problems. Moreover, maintaining relations with a State did not imply encouragement or approval of its policies. The people of Namibia should be able to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination by means of free elections under United Nations supervision, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435.

63. Peace in the Middle East could be guaranteed only if the security and legitimate interests of all of the region's States and peoples were taken into account. Lasting peace in the Middle East would only come with recognition of the right of all States to exist and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination.

64. Mr. SCHWANDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said his Government was deeply committed to the ultimate goals of the Second Decade and welcomed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.11 by consensus. However, it still had reservations concerning the thirteenth preambular paragraph, because migrant worker status, in and of itself, was not necessarily a factor in racial discrimination. His delegation also objected to the wording "by all available means" in operative paragraph 1, as it was an implicit endorsement of the use of force. The Federal Republic of Germany would prefer that South Africa were not singled out in operative paragraph 2, for racial discrimination existed all over the world.

65. Mr. VILLAGRA DELGADO (Argentina) said that Argentina had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.13, because it agreed in essence with the statements on the rights of peoples to self-determination and independence. However, it had some reservations about the wording of certain paragraphs.

66. Mr. HOGUE (Australia) said that he had abstained on draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.8 because Australia was not a party to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. As had been stated earlier, Australia abhorred apartheid and its differences with both the Convention and the resolution under consideration were purely legal in nature.

67. Mr. LINDHOLM (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Finnish and Swedish delegations, said that neither was a party to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. Their abstention on operative paragraphs 5 and 8, and on the resolution as a whole, had been based not on substance, but rather on the potentially far-reaching legal implications of the resolution.

68. Mr. DOWEK (Israel) said that had Israel cast its vote on draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.11, it would not have supported it. The fact was that the Decade had been misused to promote and legitimize anti-Semitism, and to give it a new ideological rationalization.

(Mr. Dowek, Israel)

69. Israel had voted against draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12 because operative paragraph 3 had been retained, in defiance of well-known facts and minimum principles of equity. Out of respect for the struggle against apartheid, he would refrain from providing a detailed explanation of his country's negative vote on draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.13. It could only be lamented that the noble struggle against apartheid was harnessed to the service of those who sought not only to tarnish the image of Israel, but also to obliterate it as a State.

70. The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.8 had neglected many legal aspects, particularly with regard to the definition of genocide. The concept of genocide should not be belittled by trivial and repeated use out of context. Israel abhorred apartheid, and strongly believed that it should be uprooted. However, the way the Committee was leading the struggle did not promise to bring about the desired results.

71. Ms. DIEGUEZ (Mexico) said that although Mexico fully endorsed draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.13, it had the same reservations it had had in previous years concerning operative paragraphs 5 and 21.

72. Mr. ATTEWELL (Canada) said Canada had been a leader in the Commonwealth and the French-speaking community in the struggle against apartheid. His delegation could not support draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12, as it was profoundly disappointed over the gratuitous and extraneous singling out of countries in the tenth preambular paragraph. Furthermore, Canada did not believe that all actions of transnational corporations were detrimental to developing countries. In fact, Canada used its transnational corporations to transfer technology and channel other forms of assistance to them.

73. His delegation objected to operative paragraph 5, and particularly sub-paragraph 5 (c), as it was beyond the General Assembly's mandate to give directions to the Security Council. Canada had reservations about the value of the reports mentioned in operative paragraphs 8 and 9. His country would comment further on the involvement of specific companies in South Africa prior to any future reports by the Special Rapporteur.

74. Canada had reservations about the General Assembly giving directions to the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in operative paragraph 14, as it called their independence into question. Canada would elaborate its position on budget implications of the draft resolution within the Fifth Committee.

75. Mr. BERGTHUN (Norway), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and Norway, said that the Nordic countries had long supported efforts by the international community to eliminate apartheid and racism in South Africa, and agreed in essence with draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12. However, it was regrettable that a number of paragraphs detracted from the original and worthy objectives of the agenda item. The Nordic countries could not accept either unjustified accusations against selected countries or recommendations that did not respect the divisions of competence among the United Nations organs. The

(Mr. Bergthun, Norway)

continuing tendency to include controversial formulations in resolutions was regrettable and had caused Nordic countries to abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12.

76. Mr. IBRAHIM (Oman) said his country's vote on draft resolutions A/C.3/41/L.8 and L.9 had been based on the fact that it was not a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Oman would be studying that Convention carefully and in the mean time, wished to reiterate its condemnation of apartheid.

77. Mr. AL-SUGAIR (Saudi Arabia) said that, in error, his delegation had abstained on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.8. Saudi Arabia supported that paragraph and the resolution as a whole.

78. Mr. CERMAK (Austria) said that Austria had voted against operative paragraph 5 of resolution A/C.3/41/L.8, and had abstained on the resolution as a whole, because it was not a party to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. Austria had repeatedly condemned the system of apartheid, but in several instances, the Convention was incompatible with its constitutional law. Austria had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.13, because it objected to certain portions of the text, particularly the reference to armed struggle in operative paragraph 2.

79. Miss BOUCOUUM (Côte d'Ivoire) said her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.13 because it subscribed to the fundamental principles contained in it. However, had separate votes been taken, Côte d'Ivoire would have abstained on the seventh preambular paragraph and on operative paragraphs 21 and 22 of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.13, as it had on the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12. The subjective selectivity in those paragraphs constituted interference in internal affairs.

80. Mr. MICALLEF (Malta) said that, had his delegation been present, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12, including the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3.

81. Mrs. BARTSH (Costa Rica) said she was pleased with the voting on draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.16, which had been co-sponsored by Costa Rica. Costa Rica had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.8 because it had recently acceded to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. It had abstained on operative paragraph 5 because it disagreed with the wording, and it had supported the fifth preambular paragraph although it did not believe that the crime of apartheid warranted comparison with any other type of crime.

82. Her delegation supported draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.11 on the Second Decade and had demonstrated its total repudiation of apartheid by breaking all ties with South Africa. Had Costa Rica been present for the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.12, it would have abstained on the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3. While it agreed with them in substance, it did not agree with the manner in which they had been worded.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 92: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN
(continued) (A/41/3, chap. III, sect. B, A/41/45 and Corr.1, A/41/216, A/41/607 and A/41/608 and Add.1)

(a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN
(continued)

(b) STATUS OF THE CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION
AGAINST WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 93: FORWARD-LOOKING STRATEGIES FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN TO THE
YEAR 2000 (continued) (A/41/3, chap. V, sect. C, and chap. VI, sect. C, A/41/216,
A/41/600, A/41/623 and A/41/672)

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN PROMOTING
INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND CO-OPERATION (continued)

(b) UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
(continued)

(c) INCORPORATION OF THE INTERESTS OF WOMEN IN THE WORK PROGRAMME OF THE REGIONAL
COMMISSIONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NAIROBI FORWARD-LOOKING STRATEGIES FOR THE ADVANCEMENT
OF WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/41/3,
chap. V, sect. C)

(a) REPORT OF THE COUNCIL (continued)

(b) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

(c) REPORTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES (continued)

83. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume consideration of the third
cluster of items related to issues under agenda items 92, 93 and 12.

84. Ms. DIEGUEZ (Mexico) said that the United Nations had reached a new phase in
its long struggle to achieve equality for women and their integration in
development. The new challenge would be to implement the Forward-looking
Strategies for the Advancement of Women, and to find effective mechanisms for
monitoring and evaluating progress. As much of the work would fall to the
Commission on the Status of Women, it was time to consider measures to strengthen
that Commission, including an increase in membership.

85. Mexico fully supported the decision by the Economic and Social Council that a
special session of the Commission would enable it to proceed with integration of
the Strategies into the medium-term plans, and its programme of work to the year
2000.

(Ms. Diequez, Mexico)

86. Her delegation was pleased that the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean had already submitted its contribution to the first draft of the system-wide medium-term plan on women and development. That important Plan should be reviewed by the Commission on the Status of Women prior to its consideration by the Economic and Social Council in 1987.

87. Referring to the Secretary-General's report on the implementation of the Strategies, she said that Mexico attached particular importance to the question of monitoring, both by the United Nations system and the States themselves. Her delegation was pleased that the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs was surveying national monitoring procedures in order to ensure that Member States would not be overwhelmed by requests for information.

88. Mexico stood behind the principles contained in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and was concerned that it had not yet been ratified by certain countries.

89. In the Latin American and Caribbean countries, drastic adjustment policies to cope with the heavy financial debt had taken their toll on all sectors of the population, particularly women. However, for women, the crisis would have more than merely economic and social consequences. There was the real danger of a regression, in which the woman would again be confined to the role of housewife.

90. The World Survey on the Role of Women in Development rightly stressed the need to study the impact of the economic crisis on women's status. Unfortunately, however, it did not contain enough precise information. More than ever, it was important to possess information that would assist Governments in elaborating adjustment policies which would not seriously affect the social status of their populations. The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean and the International Research and Training Centre for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) were already looking into those prospects.

91. Mexico had taken action in support of women in its National Programme of Action for the Integration of the Woman in Development. Moreover, the programme of its National Commission on Women had been devised in conformity with the Strategies. The programme also defined priority measures to be taken by Government agencies in co-operation with social organizations and academic institutions.

92. Mexico had instituted reforms to promote job training for women and their participation in the labour market. Efforts were under way to change the traditional concept of male and female roles in society and in the nuclear family. Women's activities were underestimated in all sectors of society, and the situation had to be corrected. Appointment of a Co-ordinator for the Improvement of the Status of Women had been an extremely significant step in the United Nations Secretariat. Mexico fully supported the recommendations contained in the report of the Steering Committee and hoped that the current financial crisis would not block access by women to high-level positions in the Organization.

/...

93. Ms. PULIDO (Venezuela) said that, as reflected in the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women, it was no longer possible to keep women isolated. The principle of interdependence was valid for individuals as well as countries. Discussion of the Strategies in the United Nations and the other intergovernmental bodies had pointed to the need to integrate women fully in the activities of those organizations and enable them to contribute to and benefit from the development of their respective programmes. However, it was also essential for women to participate in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the development projects affecting their rights.

94. Venezuela was firmly committed to doing everything within its power to achieve the goals of the advancement of women. The impetus given to that effort by the United Nations Decade for Women and the World Conference held at Nairobi had had an impact at the national level as well as regionally and world wide. At the national level, women's increased participation in decision-making in all areas had been made possible by the democratization of education over the previous 28 years. National programmes had been strengthened in order to incorporate women in the development process and to enhance their status. Policies in that sector were centralized in Venezuela's Women's Office, which was responsible for co-ordinating the activities carried out within the framework of the goals and objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women and the Nairobi Strategies. In addition, systematic studies on the status of women in Venezuela were making it possible to implement measures aimed at correcting situations of inequality and promoting the integration of women as citizens in a democratic system.

95. Her country had also defined a national strategy, in which women had been included as active participants, to cope with the current economic crisis based primarily on the need for a comprehensive restructuring of society.

96. The Decade for Women had been very successful in Venezuela since, among other things, women had achieved legal equality in civil matters, owing to the 1982 reform of the Civil Code, and had increased their participation in development activities. Nevertheless, much remained to be done, including the achievement of legal equality with regard to labour matters.

97. Her delegation supported the programme of work adopted by the Economic and Social Council for the meeting of the Commission on the Status of Women to be held in January 1987 in New York. The Commission had an important role to play in the implementation of the Nairobi Strategies and in their evaluation. As stated by some delegations, it was important to take advantage of the optimism prevailing at the Nairobi Conference at the end of the Decade for Women to give an impetus to the Commission's programmes, but, to do so, the Commission itself would have to be strengthened. It was therefore encouraging to hear that a request had been made in the Third Committee to give preferential treatment to the Commission's work so that it would not be adversely affected by the current financial crisis.

98. Although it was gratifying that 89 Member States had ratified or acceded to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, it was essential to urge all Member States which had not yet done so to ratify or accede to that important instrument. With regard to the reservations expressed by

(Ms. Pulido, Venezuela)

some Member States contained in the Secretary-General's report on the matter, she pointed out that the Third Committee was not empowered to interpret reservations expressed by States or to examine the question of their legality.

99. Ms. ENGMAN (Sweden), speaking on agenda items 92 and 93 on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that those countries were making special efforts in such fields as the situation of women in the labour market, the involvement of men in the promotion of equality and the representation of women in decision-making and advisory assemblies. A Nordic conference and forum on the subject were to be held in Oslo, Norway in 1988.

100. The Secretary-General's report on the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women (A/41/623) showed that encouraging progress had been made, despite the current financial crisis. There was a need, however, to ensure that sectoral economic development policies included strategies to promote the participation of women, both as agents and as beneficiaries. The Nordic countries had noted with satisfaction the efforts of the Secretariat to disseminate the Strategies, as widely as possible.

101. Monitoring of the Strategies was more difficult and would depend upon the decisions to be made at the next session of the Commission on the Status of Women. The Commission would need to improve its efficiency by careful planning and by establishing priorities. In the past, there had been too many items on the Commission's agenda, with the result that each one could only receive superficial attention. The Commission should consider removing some items or discussing them only at alternate sessions. Disciplined discussion, better attendance and well-prepared documentation were also priorities.

102. The Commission might choose to consider a central theme of the Strategies at each ordinary session. A mid-term conference could be held, perhaps in 1993, and another in the year 2000. Such conferences provided an opportunity to bring together the non-governmental organizations, whose input was very valuable. The Commission must devote particular attention to the needs of women in developing countries with a view to increasing their ability to influence the development process.

103. Turning to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, she said that the Nordic countries had carefully examined the views of States Parties on the question of reservations to the Convention that could be considered incompatible with its article 28, paragraph 2. In the opinion of the Nordic countries, some reservations were based on an incorrect interpretation of the Convention and its implementation, but others were truly incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Such reservations would cast doubt on the commitment of States to the Convention and would undermine international treaty law as a whole. The Governments of the Nordic countries hoped, therefore, that States parties which had made such reservations would reconsider them. Another solution might be to amend the Convention. The Nordic countries had noted with interest the proposal to set up a working group of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women to prepare guidelines on the nature and scope of the substantive articles of the Convention.

104. Mrs. ITO (Japan) said that her Government was pleased to note the recent trend towards practical and systematic action at the international level to improve the status of women. Her Government appreciated the efforts of the Secretariat to consolidate the monitoring system for the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women, as outlined in document A/41/623, and welcomed the decision to convene a session of the Commission on the Status of Women in January 1987. The Commission's attempts to integrate the Strategies into all United Nations development programmes would help to maximize women's contribution to the development process. A world conference might be held in 1992 or 1993 to review progress in the implementation of the Strategies.

105. Her delegation supported resolution 40/105 on the incorporation of the interests of women in the work programmes of the regional commissions, and hoped that effective measures would be taken to that end. Her Government had decided to contribute \$235,000 in 1986 and 1987 to the Regional Women's Information and Networks System planned by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP). A regional seminar on the project would be held in Japan in December 1986. The Japanese Government would also contribute \$330,000 to the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and \$80,000 to the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW). In addition, it was expanding technical co-operation in projects to improve the status of women in developing countries and increasing support for the co-operative activities of non-governmental organizations.

106. Japan had ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women without reservations. Her Government had stated (A/41/608, para. 10) that it would not accept reservations which were evidently incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, but that countries which were making a sincere effort to implement the Convention should not be discouraged from becoming parties to it.

107. Miss CHENG (Democratic Kampuchea) said that Kampuchean women actively contributed to the national efforts to restore peace and independence to Kampuchea. Women helped to keep open the supply routes for the guerrilla fighters, transporting weapons, ammunition, medicine and food across enemy minefields. Women also worked as physicians and nurses in field hospitals and transported the wounded back from the front. Away from the fighting, in the inland villages of the central region, women were educators, food producers and health workers. They taught their sons and daughters to love their motherland and value peace, and sought to create an atmosphere of security which would lessen the impact of the war on their children.

108. Although, in liberated areas, Kampuchean women were full and equal contributors to the national resistance efforts, life in the occupied areas was a nightmare. Abduction, rape and torture were almost daily occurrences. Many women and children braved dangerous forest paths and landmines to reach the areas under the control of the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea. They were harassed and tortured for information about their missing husbands and fathers.

(Miss Cheng, Democratic Kampuchea)

109. Kampuchean women resented and resisted the attempt to turn Kampuchea into a province of Viet Nam within the so-called "Indo-China Federation". More than 700,000 Vietnamese settlers had deprived the Kampucheans of their homes and livelihoods, turning them into refugees in their own country. The ill-treatment of the population and the indignities suffered by the women had so outraged the Khmer soldiers of the puppet Heng Samrin régime that many of them had defected to the resistance.

110. The Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea had put forward many peace initiatives, the most recent being the eight-point peace proposal, but all had been rejected outright by the Vietnamese occupiers. For many years, the international community had reaffirmed the right of the Kampuchean people to self-determination. The sole aim of Democratic Kampuchea's military resistance was to force Viet Nam to come to the negotiating table.

111. Under present conditions, there were no prospects of implementing the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies. The Strategies should be seen not only as a means of improving women's status, but also as a means of bringing peace to women. Only a political negotiated settlement in conformity with the eight-point peace proposal could restore Kampuchean women to a liberal and democratic society of their own choosing.

112. Ms. UMANA (Colombia) said that within the United Nations system and in the developing world in particular, the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) served both as a catalyst, ensuring that women's needs, such as training, access to credit and confidence-building, were met by various development programmes and as the executing agency of specific development projects. UNIFEM, in its new capacity as an independent fund with administrative ties with UNDP, had come to represent a good example of technical co-operation among developing countries. It had been quick to perceive the needs identified within the framework of the Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women and to formulate comprehensive policies governing the specific projects aimed at meeting those needs. Since Colombia had the honour of representing Latin America on the Consultative Committee of UNIFEM, it had first-hand experience of the importance of the global programmes, such as the Investment Plan for Africa, which had responded to Africa's problem of hunger by identifying women as the primary agents in food production and making efforts to provide them with credit and appropriate technology even before the General Assembly had launched its urgent appeal for assistance to the African countries. Moreover, UNIFEM had increased its capacity to respond to the needs of the developing world as a result of its contact with UNDP. Her delegation therefore recommended an increase in contributions to the Fund so that it could play a greater role in the promotion of development, thus enabling men and women to develop their full potential.

113. Ms. BOKOVA (Bulgaria) said that one of the most important conditions for the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women was an awareness of the close relationship and interdependence of the three goals of the United Nations Decade for Women and of the Forward-looking

(Ms. Bokova, Bulgaria)

Strategies: equality, development and peace. During the International Year of Peace, Bulgarian women, who had been participating fully in the many events in Bulgaria on behalf of peace, disarmament and international co-operation, were endeavouring to make 1986 not simply a year of peace but the beginning of mankind's deliverance from the nuclear peril.

114. The Thirteenth Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party had recently charted the basic guidelines for the country's socio-economic development in the next five years. The documents adopted by the Congress had paid particular attention to important socio-economic issues bearing directly on the problems of women, such as better working conditions and more public funds for education, health care, social security and aid to families. Social justice, which was the mainstay of the country's social system, meant equal access for all men and women to employment, free education, health care and protection of children and the family.

115. Implementation of the Forward-looking Strategies, which was to be carried out mainly at the national level, required a radical structural reform of society, a comprehensive socio-economic approach, the allocation of the necessary resources and the existence of favourable conditions for the equality of women. The draft report to be presented by her delegation addressed those issues.

116. Of no less importance was how the United Nations would assist Governments in implementing the Strategies. In that connection, many interesting proposals had been put forward at the thirty-first session of the Commission on the Status of Women and at the spring session of the Economic and Social Council concerning the role of world conferences held thus far within the framework of the Decade and the need for convening such conferences in the future. Such conferences generated important programme documents and could be extremely helpful in mobilizing Governments to work on behalf of equality, development and peace. The Commission on the Status of Women had also contributed immensely to elaborating such important instruments as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. Her delegation supported the idea of holding a special session of the Commission in January 1987 to consider all proposals of an organizational and structural nature pertaining to the issues to be addressed in the future.

117. During the Decade and at the World Conference held at Nairobi, attention had been devoted to the need for further research on the problems of women. The International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) had been playing a positive role in that regard. In addition to collecting and exchanging information on women and organizing meetings, it had been co-operating with the specialized agencies of the United Nations system and the regional economic commissions. Its activities would undoubtedly have an even greater impact if it came to grips with the real economic problems of developing countries, such as the inequitable international economic order and external indebtedness, as they related to the situation of women. Her country's voluntary contribution to the Trust Fund for the Institute and the establishment of a focal point in Bulgaria had demonstrated its support for the Institute's activities. Her country had also submitted a proposal at the sixth session of the Board of Trustees of INSTRAW to hold an interregional seminar in Bulgaria on women and development.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.