



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 48th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 80: UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN: EQUALITY, DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE
(continued)

- (a) WORLD CONFERENCE ON THE UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN
- (b) VOLUNTARY FUND FOR THE UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (c) INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING UNIT FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 83: STATUS OF THE CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month 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.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 80: UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN: EQUALITY, DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE (continued)

- (a) WORLD CONFERENCE ON THE UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN (A/C.3/35/L.17, L.21/Rev.1, L.25, L.36, L.37)
- (b) VOLUNTARY FUND FOR THE UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/C.3/35/L.24)
- (c) INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING UNIT FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/C.3/35/L.24)

AGENDA ITEM 83: STATUS OF THE CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/35/L.16)

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.17

1. Mr. ABDUL AZIZ (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.17 had agreed to submit an amendment to the title of the draft declaration; the amendment consisted of replacing the words "Racism, Racial discrimination" by the words "Apartheid, All Forms of Racism and Racial Discrimination". Moreover, following consultations with other delegations, they had decided to delete the last preambular paragraph announcing the declaration and replace it by two operative paragraphs, with the object of presenting the document as a draft resolution to which the declaration would be an annex. The two operative paragraphs proposed were as follows:

"1. Requests the Secretary-General to solicit the opinions of the Governments of Member States concerning the draft declaration annexed to the present resolution;

2. Decides to consider the draft declaration entitled: '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', together with the observations thereon of Member States, with a view to adopting it at its thirty-sixth session."

2. Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland) said that it would be easier to achieve a consensus on a draft decision than on a draft resolution, since the draft resolution contained eleven preambular paragraphs which many delegations might think would tend to prejudge the content of the draft declaration. He thought that a working group should be formed to study the draft declaration at the next session. Since there was already one revision of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.17, he thought that it would be best to take up the draft resolution without further delay and vote on it.

/...

3. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) referred to the amendment submitted by Morocco in document A/C.3/35/L.36 to the third and fourth lines of the title of the draft resolution and said that since the sponsors had already approved the inclusion of the words "apartheid, All Forms of Racial Discrimination", it only remained to vote on the rest of the amendment which had not been accepted by the sponsors, namely, the words "Foreign Military Intervention against Peoples and Sovereign Nations, the Increased Use of Mercenaries", which would be inserted between the words "All Forms of Racial Discrimination" and "Foreign Aggression".
4. Since the sponsors had dropped the twelfth paragraph of the preamble and replaced it by two operative paragraphs, the corresponding amendment submitted by Morocco would refer to operative paragraph 2 read out by the representative of Libya. The substance of the amendment was to insert the words "Foreign Military Intervention against Peoples and Sovereign Nations, the Increased Use of Mercenaries" between the words "All Forms of Racial Discrimination" and "Foreign Aggression".
5. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) proposed the addition, in the fourth preambular paragraph of document A/C.3/35/L.36, of the words "the policy of territorial expansion practised by certain States to the detriment of the right of peoples under colonial and foreign domination to self-determination and independence" after the words "sovereign nations". The same amendment would apply to the sixth preambular paragraph, article 3, the third subparagraph of part II, and part III, of document A/C.3/35/L.36.
6. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) proposed a slight change in the Moroccan amendments to the title of the draft declaration and in the fourth and sixth preambular paragraphs. The amendment would consist of replacing the words "foreign military intervention" by the words "foreign military or other intervention".
7. Mr. ABDUL AZIZ (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation proposed that operative paragraph 2, which he had previously amended, be further amended to read "Decides to consider the draft declaration entitled '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' together with any comments and amendments which had been submitted with a view to adopting it at its thirty-sixth session". Those amendments, like the amendments submitted by other delegations, were an effort to ensure that the draft declaration would be adopted at the thirty-sixth session. His delegation hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would make a positive contribution to terminating the discussion.
8. The CHAIRMAN praised the valuable contribution of the delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the Committee's work and said that since the Irish delegation had withdrawn its draft resolution, the Committee should proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.17 as revised by the sponsors, it being understood that the amendments suggested by various delegations would, as stated in operative paragraph 2, also be submitted to Member States.

/...

9. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that since the Algerian delegation considered it appropriate to add to the amendments submitted by Morocco, the Moroccan delegation proposed that the words "or hegemonism" be added after the words "the policy of territorial expansion" in the Moroccan subamendment.
10. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should try to tackle the problem raised by draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.17 as revised by its sponsors, in an ordered and constructive manner. The sponsors had shown a great spirit of co-operation and had submitted a draft which was a common denominator of general agreement; therefore, the draft would be put to the vote after the Secretariat had read out the amendments submitted by the sponsors.
11. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) said that in view of the profusion of amendments and subamendments which had been submitted, his delegation formally requested that given the importance of the question on which a vote was to be taken, all the amendments and subamendments which had been submitted or were said to have been submitted should be submitted in writing so that delegations could have before them the exact text of what they were to vote upon, as provided by rule 120 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly. His delegation formally proposed the suspension of the meeting for 15 minutes, to give the Secretariat time to distribute the written text.
12. Following a brief discussion in which Mr. GAGLIARDI (Brazil), Miss SABATIER (Niger), Mr. DE PINIES (Spain), Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) and Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) took part, the CHAIRMAN suggested that voting on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.17 as revised by the sponsors be postponed until the following day, so that delegations would have before them in writing the various amendments and subamendments which had been submitted. He suggested further that the Committee should continue its work by taking up the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 83, beginning with document A/C.3/35/L.20.
13. It was so decided.
14. Following a procedural debate in which Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria), Mr. GLAIEI (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. GAGLIARDI (Brazil), Mr. DERFESSA (Ethiopia), Miss SABATIER (Niger), Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland), Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco), and Mr. ABDUL AZIZ (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) took part, the Committee took up another draft resolution.
- Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.20
15. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) said that Norway had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.20.
16. Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation also wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.20 and also the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.3/35/L.16, A/C.3/35/L.21 and A/C.3/35/L.24. She proposed that draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.25 should be adopted by acclamation.

17. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) proposed that draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.20 be adopted without a vote.
18. The CHAIRMAN suggested that draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.20 be adopted without a vote.
19. It was so decided.
20. Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.20 was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.21/Rev.1

21. Mrs. DEVAUD (France) asked one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution to explain the meaning of the words "droits juridiques" in operative paragraph 1 of the French text of the draft resolution.
22. Ms. WELLS (Australia) said that it might be a matter of translation. In English the term "legal rights" presented no problems. It was possible that in French there might be a better way of expressing the same concept.
23. Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) suggested that the words "and displaced" be inserted after the word "refugee" at the end of the second line of paragraph 5.
24. Ms. WELLS (Australia), referring to the difficulty raised by the delegate for France, suggested that in paragraph 1 of the English text the word "fundamental" be substituted for the word "legal". In the third paragraph of the preamble she suggested that the indefinite article "a" be inserted before the words "heavy social ...". She requested the representative of Syria to withdraw his proposal inasmuch as the co-sponsors of the draft resolution had intended it to refer only to refugee women and not to displaced women.
25. Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) asked why they were unwilling to include the word "displaced" in paragraph 5 since it appeared in other parts of the draft resolution, including the title.
26. Ms. WELLS (Australia) replied that at the Copenhagen Conference only refugee women had been considered, but that, in the light of the subsequent discussions, it had been seen that displaced women often shared the same problems as refugees and so it had been decided to include them in certain parts of the draft resolution. But they had wished to maintain the differentiation, specifically in paragraph 5.
27. Miss SABATIER (Niger), supported by Mr. CASCAIS (Portugal), said that paragraph 3 of document A/C.3/35/L.21/Rev.1 was not identical with the text in document A/C.3/35/L.35 which was the version which they had decided to add to document A/C.3/35/L.21. She asked at what point the decision had been taken to make the changes.
28. Ms. WELLS (Australia) said that the decision had been taken during the discussions on the previous day to include paragraph 3 as it appeared in document A/C.3/35/L.21/Rev.1.

29. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia) supported the suggestion to incorporate the words "and displaced" in paragraph 5; he also felt that it would be advisable to delete the final sentence of the first paragraph of the preamble starting from the words "of concern ...". He was not submitting those amendments officially; he merely wished to make his views known to the members of the Committee.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that a vote would be taken on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.21/Rev.1.

31. Mr. MORENO SALCEDO (Philippines) suggested that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus.

32. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia) suggested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote, but not by consensus.

33. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) said that his delegation was in favour of the draft resolution and had no objections to it being adopted by consensus or being voted on or not. He pointed out that in any case Somalia was extremely sensitive on the subject of displaced persons but that in future, when it was intended only to refer to the problem of refugees, it would be better to avoid linking it for political reasons with the problem of displaced persons.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.21/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

35. It was so agreed.

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1

36. Mrs. SIPILA (Assistant Secretary-General for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs) introduced document A/C.3/35/L.37 concerning the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1. Inasmuch as in draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 the regional commissions were requested to undertake effective measures to implement the Programme of Action, the Secretary-General was of the opinion that one additional P-5 post would be necessary in each of the four regional commissions. Bearing in mind the shortage of staff in the Advancement of Women Branch of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs, the Branch would have to be reinforced by appointing a Chief at the D-2 level. In addition, a new post would be required at the P-4 level to tackle the research and data-gathering work required, especially for preparing the world-wide studies of the role of women in development. The Branch would also need strengthening by adding a new P-5 post at United Nations Headquarters in New York as liaison officer and co-ordinator of the activities of the units located in New York, including, inter alia, the Centre Against Apartheid and UNDP. Bearing in mind the need for ensuring that the best possible use was made of the resources available, only the barest minimal new additions had been requested in document A/C.3/35/L.37 and every possible effort had been made to meet those new requirements through redeployment of existing resources.

37. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) said that she understood that the substance of the question would be given due consideration in the Fifth Committee and she would like to know whether Mrs. Sipila's reference to UNDP would set a precedent for helping UNDP through the regular budget of the United Nations. She would like to know whether a new financial procedure was being established in connexion with UNDP.

38. Mrs. SIPILA (Assistant Secretary-General of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs) replied that document A/C.3/35/L.37/Corr.1 referred to paragraph 4, line 1 of document A/C.3/35/L.37, making it clear that the posts involved were at the P-5 and not the P-4 level. Note should also be taken of the correction to paragraph 20, line 2 of the same document; the amended paragraph would thus read: "In order to carry out the task of co-ordination of activities at United Nations Headquarters described in paragraph 17 above, one P-5 and one General Service ...".

39. The reference to UNDP merely meant that the person assigned to the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs at the P-5 level should act as liaison officer, but did not mean assigning any specific post or function to UNDP as such.

40. Mr. GAGLIARDI (Brazil) said that, with regard to document A/C.3/35/L.37 concerning the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1, the Brazilian delegation wished to point out that paragraph 2 of the first of those documents read "Operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution would have the General Assembly request ..."; yet that document contained no provision whatever along those lines. It should further be pointed out that operative paragraph 13 of the draft resolution was summarized in paragraph 6 of document A/C.3/35/L.37, where no reference was made to a request for additional members of the Centre. All that it requested was action "to strengthen the Centre". Moreover, paragraphs 20 and 21 of document A/C.3/35/L.37 reflected a desire to increase the number of staff, but the Brazilian delegation certainly did not consider it was necessary to make additional appointments to the Centre at the present stage.

41. Mr. DYRLUND (Denmark) said that his delegation would welcome a clarification of paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 which called upon all Governments "to intensify, at regional level, dissemination of information". The fact that throughout the entire draft resolution only one mention was made of such dissemination raised doubts as to whether paragraph 8 could be interpreted restrictively, as though the dissemination of information should be restricted to the regional level. His delegation therefore felt that the paragraph called for an amendment to include "dissemination at international level" in general. But before submitting such an amendment his delegation would like the sponsors to clarify whether that other aspect of the dissemination of information was mentioned in any other part of the draft. In that case, the amendment might not be necessary.

42. Miss ANGORA (Ivory Coast) said that her delegation would like to participate in the discussion but her country was French-speaking and it had no French text of document A/C.3/35/L.37; she would like to ask the Secretary whether a French version of the document could be made available to them.

43. Mr. ROM (Israel) said that the reference to the controversial Declaration of Mexico in paragraph 4 of the preamble and to the Programme of Action of Copenhagen in operative paragraph 2 made draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 unacceptable to his Government in spite of the inclusion of the words "as adopted".

44. Miss RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) said that, while the Group of 77 thought it very important to include the words "at the international level" in paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1, they were implicit in the whole Programme of Action referred to in the draft resolution. What should be stressed was the need to intensify, at the regional level, dissemination of information and the exchange of experiences on the participation of women in all relevant programmes and information activities.

45. Ms. WELLS (Australia) suggested to the sponsors of the draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 that, in the ninth preambular paragraph, the words "their integration" be replaced by "women's integration", and that the words "into the development process" be added at the end of paragraph 11.

46. Miss RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) said that the Group of 77, in drawing up draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1, had considered its text to be sufficiently clear, and could not therefore accept the Australian proposals.

47. Mrs. SIIPILA (Assistant Secretary-General for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs) said that, in paragraph 20 of the statement of the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1, the words "paragraph 17" should be replaced by "paragraph 13". As to whether the proposed posts would be found by redeploying existing posts or by establishing new ones, she said that the Budget Division had not been able to contact the regional commissions, but would submit a definitive reply to the Fifth Committee.

48. Mr. BERGTHUN (Norway) said that, in view of the position taken by Norway during the voting on the final documents of the Mexico and Copenhagen Conferences, he would prefer a separate vote on the fourth preambular paragraph and on paragraph 2.

49. Mr. MÜNCHEN (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the nine member States of the European Economic Community, said that those States maintained the position they had expressed at the Copenhagen Conference on the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women. They had reservations on certain preambular paragraphs.

50. The countries of the European Economic Community reiterated that the aim was to abolish all kinds of discrimination against women, to achieve total equality between men and women and to integrate women fully into every sphere of society. It was regrettable that political considerations were affecting the achievement of the Decade's objectives.

51. At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Canada, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania.

52. The fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 was adopted by 110 votes to 4, with 22 abstentions.

53. At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal,

/...

Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Canada, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

54. Paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 was adopted by 111 votes to 4, with 20 abstentions.

55. At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey⁵, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

56. Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 was adopted by 128 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.

57. Mrs. SUTHERLAND (Canada) observed that the Programme of Action approved at the Copenhagen Conference was a valuable document containing practical measures designed to improve the status of women. However, the Programme's good intentions had been seriously and unnecessarily impaired by the inclusion of certain political references, in particular the appeal for the elimination of zionism, which the Canadian delegation had regarded and continued to regard as unacceptable. It could not support a resolution which "endorsed" the Programme of Action of Copenhagen, and regretted that the sponsors of the draft resolution had been unable to draft a text which could have been adopted by consensus. Accordingly, Canada, in keeping with its position at Copenhagen, had voted against the draft resolution. Nevertheless, that would not affect the vigour and the effort that Canada would exert in applying the practical measures contained in the Copenhagen Programme of Action.

58. Mr. DOMINGUEZ PASIER (Spain) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 in accordance with the efforts that Spain had been making on behalf of the objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women. However, in connexion with operative paragraph 2, the Spanish delegation wished to restate the reservations it had expressed on a number of the paragraphs of the Copenhagen Programme of Action.

59. Ms. ATKINS (United States of America) said that the negative vote of the United States delegation on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 was a reiteration of the concern, disappointment and objections of her Government as expressed at the Copenhagen Conference. The United States could not agree to zionism's being grouped with other terms of opprobrium such as racism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. Also, it could not agree that assistance to the Palestinian people should be provided in consultation with the Palestine Liberation Organization.

60. Nevertheless, her delegation wished to assure the international community of women that the United States would continue to support and participate in national and international endeavours to fulfil the solemn promises enshrined in the objectives of the World Plan of Action adopted by consensus at the Mexico Conference in 1975.

61. Similarly, the United States would continue to co-operate at the international level, as it had shown by its signing of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, would continue to support the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women, and would continue to contribute to the success of the Voluntary Fund for the Decade.

62. As her delegation had stated, it would continue to take full part in the

/...

(Ms. Atkins, United States)

struggle of women to achieve full equality, and would continue to feel as identified with the welfare of women as it did with the welfare of all the inhabitants of the United States itself.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that several delegations had asked to explain their votes in connexion with the draft resolution just approved. When those were completed, the Committee would take a decision on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.17, on which general agreement appeared to have been achieved.

64. Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium) said that Belgium had voted in favour of the draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Fev.1 as an expression of its deep dedication to the purposes of the United Nations Decade for Women and the results of the Copenhagen Conference, despite its serious reservations on some paragraphs of the resolution. The Belgian delegation shared the view expressed previously by the delegation of Luxembourg on behalf of the nine members of the European Economic Community. It also considered that the core of the World Plan of Action was the specific recommendations, for application at the national level, which had been approved by consensus at Copenhagen.

65. Mr. ESCOBAR SIERRA (Colombia) said that Colombia was glad that draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Fev.1 had been approved, although it noted that there had been no change in the views expressed by Colombia at the Copenhagen Conference.

66. Mr. VANACHINDA (Thailand) said that Thailand had certain reservations regarding the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Fev.1, but had voted notwithstanding in favour of the resolution as a whole.

67. Mrs. MBAPILA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the Tanzanian delegation wished it to be placed on record that its vote in favour of maintaining the fourth preambular paragraph had been due to an error, and it had in fact wished to abstain.

68. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands delegation had abstained from voting on the fourth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 2 because it wished to dissociate itself completely from those paragraphs. It had also abstained from voting on the resolution as a whole because of the unacceptable political elements it contained, although the Netherlands would continue to defend the emancipation of women and to co-operate with the activities of the United Nations in that field.

69. Ms. WELLS (Australia) said that Australia had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 because it had voted against the Programme of Action as a whole at the Copenhagen Conference owing to the unacceptable political references it contained, including the criticism of zionism. The Australian delegation was firmly opposed to such references, as it had demonstrated by voting against the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2, but it would continue to participate fully in regional and international endeavours to improve the status of women, particularly in the developing countries.

/...

70. Mr. ERRAZURIZ (Chile) said that the Chilean delegation wished to place on record the reservations it had formulated both at Copenhagen and in the discussions in the Third Committee regarding the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women. At the same time, it was pleased that the draft resolution submitted with a constructive aim by the Group of 77 had received such a large majority.

71. Mrs. GUELMAN (Uruguay) said that the Uruguayan delegation had voted in favour of the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 in keeping with the position that Uruguay had adopted when the World Plan of Action was approved at the Mexico Conference and because it had voted in favour of the Programme of Action adopted at Copenhagen. Nevertheless, it wished to reiterate its reservations regarding the political elements in both documents, in particular the fifth preambular paragraph of the Copenhagen Programme of Action.

72. Mr. CASCAIS (Portugal) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1, since it had already approved the Copenhagen Programme of Action. However, it wished to reiterate its objections to the Programme, as set forth in paragraph 408 of the Final Document of the Copenhagen Conference.

73. Mrs. AKAMATSU (Japan) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1, since it had already approved the Copenhagen Programme of Action. However, it wished to reiterate the objections it had already placed on record in that connexion at the Copenhagen Conference, and noted that Japan's position remained unaltered in that respect.

74. Ms. FAWTHORPE (New Zealand) said that her delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because it had been unable to approve the equation of zionism with racism made in the Programme of Action approved at Copenhagen. It supported the remainder of the Programme of Action and would endeavour to implement its provisions.

75. Mr. DYRLUND (Denmark), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 in order to emphasize the importance it attached to measures intended to promote the full equality of men and women. However, it had abstained in the separate vote on the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 because it could not accept the equation of zionism with racism.

76. Mr. ALMOSLECHNER (Austria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but had abstained in the separate vote on the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2, on the ground that the references in those paragraphs were unacceptable.

77. Mr. MÜNCHEN (Luxembourg) said that his delegation's vote had been due to an error; it had intended to abstain.

/...

78. Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 because of the importance it attached to the objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women. It had abstained from voting on the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 because of its objections to the Copenhagen Programme of Action, although it recognized the usefulness of many of the Programme's recommendations.

79. Miss de OLIVEIRA (Bolivia) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 notwithstanding the reservations it had concerning the Programme of Action adopted at Copenhagen.

80. Mr. LIGAIRI (Fiji) said that, although he supported the general tenor of the draft resolution, he had abstained on the two paragraphs which had been voted on separately because he had reservations on their wording.

81. Mr. OZADOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it contained elements that would help to solve the problems raised in the framework of the Decade. The draft resolution supported measures for the second half of the Decade and approved those which had been taken during the first half. The text indicated that the Copenhagen Conference had been a positive contribution and had made great progress towards overcoming the difficulties raised during the Decade.

82. Referring to the financial implications of the draft resolution, his delegation considered that, in order to carry out the activities referred to, existing staff resources should be utilized to maximum advantage even if that meant discontinuing obsolete programmes.

82a. Miss KEKEDO (Papua New Guinea) and Mr. KAMBAUWA (Malawi) said that, although they supported the thrust of the draft resolution, they had abstained on the two paragraphs which had been voted on separately because they had reservations concerning the wording of those paragraphs.

83. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) endorsed the explanation given by the representative of Luxembourg on behalf of the countries of the European Economic Community before the vote, adding that, with regard to the financial implications, his delegation's position was very similar to that of the Ukrainian SSR. Optimum use should be made of existing resources. His delegation would revert to that point in the Fifth Committee.

84. Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole and of the paragraphs which had been put to the vote separately because it fully supported the objectives of the Decade. Nevertheless, she reiterated the reservations her delegation had expressed at Copenhagen with regard to the fifth preambular paragraph of document A/CONF.9/35. The final words of paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1 "as adopted at Copenhagen" had enabled Costa Rica to overcome its reservations and vote in favour of the draft resolution.

85. Mr. RAHMAN (Observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization) said that he had asked for the floor in order to answer the comments made by some delegations, including, in particular, that of the United States, which had expressed opposition to the channelling of assistance to Palestinian women through the PLO. The PLO was the chosen representative of the Palestinian people and had been recognized as such by the international community.

86. With regard to the reference to zionism in the Programme of Action, he pointed out that, for the PLO, zionism was not an abstract concept but the cause of the tragic situation of the Palestinian people; it was the exact equivalent of the apartheid, racism and racial discrimination practised against the South African people. For that reason, the equation of zionism with racism and racial discrimination constituted a victory for the international community, since zionism was a threat not only to the Palestinian people but to the international community as a whole. He was pleased to see that the resolution had been adopted by an overwhelming majority with only a few delegations voting against it and he said that it was a victory for Palestinian women, South African women and all women who suffered because of foreign occupation and domination.

87. Mrs. FERNANDO (Sri Lanka) said that she wished to place on record that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.23/Rev.1.

88. The CHAIRMAN, referring to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.17, said that the main sponsor had indicated that a draft decision on the matter had been prepared. He would ask the Committee to vote on the draft decision once it had been introduced but to postpone explanations of vote until the next meeting because otherwise the time set aside for the working group would be used up.

89. Mr. ABDUL AZIZ (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) thanked all delegations, both those which had supported draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.17 and those which, though opposing it, believed that it nevertheless dealt with an important matter. He read out the following draft decision, which was the product of extensive consultations:

"The General Assembly decides,

"1. To request the Secretary-General to canvass Governments of Member States for their opinions on the draft declaration contained in document A/C.3/35/L.17;

"2. To consider, at its thirty-sixth session, the draft declaration entitled 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, together with the observations of Member States and the amendments submitted, with a view to adopting it;

"3. To postpone consideration of document A/C.3/35/L.17 until its thirty-sixth session."

/...

(Mr. Abdul Aziz, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

90. He repeated that the agreement was the outcome of lengthy negotiations and urged the members of the Committee to adopt the draft decision by consensus.

91. Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland) said he hoped that the draft decision would serve as a basis for a consensus in the Committee although, as was clear from his previous statements, his delegation had some reservations concerning the text. He proposed that the following words: "and to submit a report at the thirty-sixth session" should be added at the end of paragraph 1 of the draft decision just introduced by the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

92. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that, in the spirit of compromise which had always characterized her delegation, she was prepared to withdraw her earlier proposal in favour of the draft decision introduced by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

93. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft decision proposed by the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, as orally amended by the representative of Ireland, without a vote.

94. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.