



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 23rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 94: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN
- AGENDA ITEM 95: FORWARD-LOOKING STRATEGIES FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN TO THE YEAR 2000
- AGENDA ITEM 87: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE SECOND DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 88: 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 (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 91: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 96: 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 (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.3/43/SR.23
31 October 1988

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 94: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (A/43/3, A/43/38, A/43/273-S/19720, A/43/354 and Corr.1, A/43/370, A/43/393-S/19930, A/43/605)

AGENDA ITEM 95: FORWARD-LOOKING STRATEGIES FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN TO THE YEAR 2000 (A/43/3, A/43/370, A/43/638, A/43/643)

1. Ms. SELLAMI-MESLEM (Director, Branch for the Advancement of Women, Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs) introducing agenda item 95, said that the Secretary-General's report (A/43/638), while not exhaustive, reflected contributions from the entire United Nations system. She drew attention to chapters I and II and said that the research which had gone into the report had brought to light certain facts that were cause for concern. For example, in 1985 for every 100 men employed there were only 50 women, and that did not take into account the informal sector, in which women were numerous but often disadvantaged in terms of working conditions, salary, etc. In early education, the encouraging improvements of the 1970s had given way since 1985 to stagnation, and in some countries even regression. New efforts were required to prevent those developments from having a multiplier effect and to avoid undoing the progress achieved in the 1970s. The expansion of the informal sector was disturbing because it was hard to protect its women workers, and the regression in education was of even greater concern because girls who did not attend school faced a future of illiteracy and unemployment.

2. It was also disturbing to note that more than 60 States had not ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and that no ratifications had been announced since September 1987.

3. She drew attention to chapter II B of the Secretary-General's report and referred in particular to the need to strengthen the support structure for the division of family responsibilities. The crisis of the 1980s and the austerity policies of the debtor countries had affected women far more severely than men. Those policies had placed a heavier work burden on women, increased the number of women heads of households and increased poverty, thereby forcing women to work in order to augment family income. In November 1988 a seminar of experts would be held in Vienna to discuss the problem. It would consider parental and domestic responsibilities and social infrastructures that assisted the family and encouraged and facilitated the distribution of tasks within the family and vis-à-vis society. There had to be an equitable redistribution of family responsibilities between men and women who nowadays had the same roles both outside the home and in the home, in order to preserve the family.

4. Turning to chapter II C, she said that the full and equal participation of women was not only a means for promoting the advancement of women but was a fundamental individual right. The participation of women in political decision-making in particular was still very limited, as the report showed.

(Ms. Sellami-Maslem)

Various groups in society rejected the methods applied or proposed to develop women's participation and women were often still treated as second class citizens. The Secretary-General's report showed that they were under represented at decision-making levels even in the Secretariat, particularly in P-5 posts and above.

5. Sustained effort was required to overcome the inequalities in the treatment of women. They had been exacerbated in the 1980s by the problems of the world economy, which had been especially tragic for the developing countries, but culture and attitudes remained the major obstacles to full equality between men and women.

6. Ms. SNYDER (Fund Director, United Nations Development Fund for Women), introducing the Secretary-General's note on the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) (A/43/643), said that UNIFEM's years of growth, the 1980s, had been marked by a world-wide economic crisis that had heightened awareness of the interdependence of nations and of how important women were to the survival and development of economies and societies. The evidence pointed to a very high input by women in the productive sector, where national and family livelihood was determined. At the same time, the economic crisis had led to a reduction in the per capita expenditure by Governments in areas essential to development such as health and education, and unemployment and malnutrition had increased in many countries. At last, however, planners and bankers were becoming aware of the fact that many economic adjustments, including cutbacks in support sectors, had proved harmful and created inordinate burdens on already overburdened women, particularly poor women in developing countries. Hence the emphasis was now on people centred, participatory and local development, on a smaller scale than before and backed, of course, by the necessary government policies and investments.

7. UNIFEM's goal was to involve women in development on an equal footing with men by giving them equal access to the society's available resources and to decision-making. UNIFEM sought to promote such access through the investment priorities established in its mandate and by treating the integration of women into mainstream development activities and the support of women's groups as equally necessary and complementary approaches. UNIFEM had acted as a catalyst in mobilising funds for women from various sources, and its regional plans had sharpened its focus on top priority development issues. The Fund's financial and administrative management systems were nearly all in place and just a few, but important, additional appointments remained to be made.

8. Several characteristics made UNIFEM unique and should be nurtured. The first was a flexibility that enabled it to respond to special and urgent needs and adjust to changes in development priorities. It could, for example, provide \$2,000 at one moment and \$200,000 at another, and do so promptly and with a minimum of bureaucratic constraints. It was also flexible in its capacity to work on projects at the national, regional and international levels. She welcomed in that connection the Consultative Committee's request that policy questions should be moved up on its agenda (A/43/643, para. 72 (b)) so that the Fund's expertise could be concentrated on the implementation of policy and on technical support for the

(Mrs. Snyder)

project cycle. To ensure its flexibility, the Fund's autonomy must be preserved and nourished and control over its resources must remain with the Director, with due accountability to Member States.

9. The second characteristic of the Fund was innovation: it had pioneered in such areas as providing credit rather than handouts.

10. Its third characteristic was sustainability. It recognized the fact that it could take 7 to 10 years for groups to become cohesive and develop management skills and that long-term assistance was therefore imperative. Development and technical co-operation programmes had often been disastrous because their effects would disappear a few years after external financing ended. UNIFEM, on the contrary, could cite examples of success in projects where external support had been terminated three years ago.

11. She placed special emphasis on the need to reduce the apparent imbalance in work-loads between men and women in the low income rural areas and poor sections of towns. Men should be encouraged to assume a greater share.

12. It was imperative for the Fund to continue to grow. It was still inadequate given the needs of development and women's role in development. The resources available to UNIFEM would never cover even a reasonable portion of the most obvious needs of women. It should be borne in mind that the countries that must be considered least developed as far as the involvement of women and the flow of resources to them was concerned required higher IPFs than other least developed countries, that a flexible fund with a special focus had a strong catalytic impact, that the right steps had to be taken now so that no one in the future could say that attempts to involve women in development assistance activities were pointless because they had failed. UNIFEM's sole purpose was to involve women in development. It was not hampered by competing priorities that affected other funds and pulled them in different directions every year. It treated women as producers, rather than just victims, and understood that progress for women meant progress for everyone.

13. Ms. VASSILIOU-ZACHAROPOULOS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the Twelve States Members of the European Community, said that the adoption of the Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women at the Nairobi Conference in 1985 had provided valuable guidelines for the advancement of women. Although the methods and strategies for improving the status of women differed in accordance with the cultural, economic and political situation of every country, the Conference had stressed common interests and priorities.

14. Since the Conference, implementation of the Strategies had been entrusted to the Commission on the Status of Women, which had revived the spirit of Nairobi at its special session in January 1987. It had successfully dealt with substantial matters relating to the strengthening of its central role in monitoring implementation of the Strategies. The Commission now met annually. It had restructured its agenda and adopted priority themes, thereby making it more

(Ms. Vassiliou-Zacharopoulos, Greece)

effective. It had also proved its competence by providing guidance on the integration of strategies into the United Nations system-wide medium-term plan.

15. The Twelve welcomed the new method of work of the Commission on the Status of Women, established at its thirty-second session, and the constructive discussions, in which the Group had actively participated, on the priority themes of equality, development and peace. They supported the Commission's proposals concerning the strengthening of national machinery. As problems of rural women had always been of particular concern, she hoped that the proposed seminar on women and rural development would produce action-oriented recommendations. In addition, the issue of violence against women remained a very serious problem which could not be effectively attacked without establishing a broad-based international network for co-operation. Finally, the Commission on the Status of Women must follow up and evaluate the progress achieved under each priority theme.

16. The Group of Twelve was looking forward to constructive and comprehensive discussion of the priority themes at the Commission's 1989 session. That session could be adequately prepared in two ways: by convening expert group meetings and seminars on priority themes to be discussed and by transmitting to the Commission the views of delegations. The report of the Secretary-General (A/43/638) was a useful and comprehensive document, and should be carefully studied with a view to offering comments based on national experience.

17. With respect to the first priority theme, equality in economic and social participation, the Twelve agreed that emphasis should be placed on the growing gap between progress in achieving equality, as reflected in legal instruments, and the pace of achieving de facto equality. The Secretary-General's report suggested that temporary measures could improve the situation. Furthermore, there was a need for more accuracy in methods used to determine the contribution of women to the informal economic sector. That contribution was inadequately reflected in official statistics and, in consequence, was often ignored by planners and policy-makers.

18. She agreed that emphasis should be given to providing social support measures to enable women to contribute to and benefit from socio-economic development. She hoped that the seminar on that theme, scheduled to be held in Vienna in November 1988, would provide specific recommendations for action-oriented policies. With respect to the priority theme of participation, emphasis should be given to women's ability to participate in the political process. Special attention should be placed on finding methods to develop women's skills for political participation and on examining ways in which women might more effectively influence public policy-making.

19. She stressed the importance of the 1990 extended session of the Committee on the Status of Women, which would include a review and appraisal of the progress in the implementation of the Forward-looking Strategies and a recommendation to the General Assembly on the convening of a world conference. To facilitate the work, States should provide timely and thorough responses to the questionnaire on which the review and appraisal would be based.

(Ms. Vassiliou-Zacharopoulos, Greece)

20. With respect to the expiration of the mandate of the Co-ordinator for the Improvement of the Status of Women, recent information indicated that the intention of the Secretary-General was to transfer the functions of the Office of the Co-ordinator to the Office of Human Resources Management as of July 1988. The Twelve asked the Secretariat to inform the Third Committee regarding any steps that had been taken on that matter.

21. Mrs. SAELZLER (German Democratic Republic) expressed her thanks to the Director of the Branch for the Advancement of Women of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs and the Director of the United Nations Development Fund for Women for their excellent and comprehensive introductions of the items before the Committee. The progress made in implementing women's rights was a visible expression of the fruitful and result-oriented co-operation between all the Member States. The Forward-looking Strategies, in particular, had given fresh and decisive impetus to efforts to improve the situation of women. At the same time, a great deal remained to be done and it was important that future work should be based on the concept of the equivalence and interdependence of the principle objectives of the Forward-looking Strategies: equality, development and peace.

22. There was a growing awareness that social progress, material security, equality, happiness and well-being could be achieved only under peaceful conditions. Situations of war, aggression and occupation had an overall negative impact on the condition of women and the thirty-second session of the Commission on the Status of Women had been fully justified in drawing the attention of the international community to the fate of women in areas of conflict. The trend toward the settling of regional conflicts by peaceful means would have major benefits for women and she hoped that it would continue.

23. In connection with the issue of equal rights for men and women and the integration of women into economic development, she wished to commend the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) for its valuable work. She hoped that in the future CEDAW would find the administrative and technical support it needed to be able to continue working effectively.

24. The practical application of the initiatives, commitment and action-oriented approaches necessary to translate the Forward-looking Strategies into reality was more urgent than ever. In that context, her country attached particular importance to the full implementation of the Declaration on the Participation of Women in Promoting International Peace and Co-operation. It appealed to the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs and other relevant institutions to establish the theoretical groundwork which would enable women to play a greater role in efforts to strengthen peace, security and international co-operation.

25. Her country shared the view that it was time for an in-depth evaluation of progress made on implementation of the Forward-looking Strategies. Therefore, she accepted the proposal to hold an extended session of the Commission on the Status of Women in 1990 for that purpose.

26. Mrs. LAURENT (Observer, European Communities) said that, under its Medium Term Community Programme on Equal Opportunities for Women 1986/1990, the European Community had identified its own priority themes for future action. The first theme - improved application of existing legal provisions - involved an examination of the application of European Community law dealing with equal pay, employment equality and equal treatment in matters of social security. Protective legislation was also being reviewed with the intention of eliminating any negative effect on women's employment. In addition, the Commission of the European Communities had recently introduced a draft Directive intended to shift the burden of proof to the respondent in cases of discrimination, to define the concept of indirect discrimination and to reinforce the powers of courts to obtain and provide evidence.

27. In the area of education and training, a specific action programme on equality of opportunity for girls and boys in schools had been in operation since 1985. Other initiatives in that area included a research project on the impact of new technology subjects in schools; initial and in-service training of teachers and school counselors on the theme of equality; a Recommendation on Vocational Training for Women, adopted by the European Commission at the end of 1987; and establishment of a network of demonstration projects on vocational training for women.

28. Specific initiatives were being taken to promote women's employment in several sectors of activity. Positive action to improve the relative position of women in the labour force was being promoted and, to that end, a guide on Positive Actions had been published recently in all nine European Community languages. Particular attention was being devoted to the employment and training needs of disadvantaged women and, in that connection, the European Commission was preparing a Communication on the social situation and employment of migrant and ethnic minority women. A study was also being conducted on trends in atypical forms of employment of women in the Member States.

29. New technologies were giving rise to increased segregation in the labour market to the detriment of women. In consequence, the European Commission was supporting training programmes in non-traditional occupations and occupations of the future. In 1989, it would also begin to draft specific guidelines on the impact of new technologies on women's employment.

30. Another priority theme - the sharing of family and occupational responsibilities - was being implemented through a study of maternity leave and child-care provisions in the Member States and the publication of a report on available child care throughout the European Community. In the area of social protection, the Community had adopted one Directive and was considering others with a view to achieving equal treatment for men and women in matters of social security.

31. The Medium Term Programme recognized that systematic action to increase awareness and change attitudes was vital to the implementation of legal provisions concerning equal opportunities and the European Commission was sponsoring seminars, exhibitions and round tables to deal with that question.

(Mrs. Laurent)

32. The European Community had adopted a series of resolutions on the issue of women in development, with the most recent giving priority to the implementation of the Forward-looking Strategies. The European Commission was financing a study aimed at gathering training materials to aid development and planning personnel in recognising and dealing with the centrality of women's role in development. Seminars had been organised for Africa and the Caribbean region to help establish policies on women in development. Reflecting the Community's relations with its partners in other areas of the world, the third Lomé Convention between the European Economic Community and the African, Caribbean and Pacific States contained provisions aimed at expanding the role of women and enhancing their status.

33. During its November 1987 meeting, the Council of Development Ministers had stressed the need for the women in development issue to be fully integrated into all Co-operation Agreements between the European Community and its development partners. The Council had also noted the intention of the European Commission to carry out an evaluation of the extent of women's involvement in several mainstream development programmes in different countries and sectors. That evaluation would contribute to the preparation of new conventions, co-operation agreements and financial proposals and would serve as useful material for staff training. The April 1989 Council would be considering an Action Plan on Women in Development Projects encompassing practical measures to ensure that policies with regard to women in development were properly implemented.

The meeting was suspended at 4.30 p.m. and resumed at 4.55 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 87: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE SECOND DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/C.3/43/L.7 and L.18)

AGENDA ITEM 88: 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 (continued) (A/C.3/43/L.11/Rev.1 and L.16)

AGENDA ITEM 91: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/C.3/48/L.8 and L.14, L.9 and L.10/Rev.1)

AGENDA ITEM 96: 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 (continued) (A/C.3/43/L.5 and L.6)

Draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.7

34. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.7 contained in document A/C.3/43/L.18.

35. Ms. BYRNE (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the United States remained firmly committed to combating racism. None the less, because draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.7 in effect equated

(Ms. Byrne, United States)

sionism with racism and racial discrimination, the United States could not participate in action on that draft resolution, nor could it participate in the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

36. Draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.7 was adopted without a vote.

37. Mr. TURK (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that, regretfully, his delegation could not participate in action on the draft resolution: General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX), which falsely equated sionism with racism, made it impossible for Israel to join in the consensus. That resolution was a black mark in the history of the United Nations; it represented the triumph of cynical manipulation and political demagoguery over common sense, historical objectivity and the most basic standards of justice and fairness. Zionism was the national liberation movement of the Jewish people. The General Assembly resolution's baseless equation of sionism with racism had grievously hurt the prestige of the United Nations in the eyes of all unbiased people. His delegation hoped that the day was not far off when that resolution would be rescinded.

38. Mr. GROLIG (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the Federal Republic of Germany was deeply committed to the ultimate goals and objectives of the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. His delegation was therefore pleased that draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.7 had been adopted without a vote, as in past years, thus making it possible to proceed along the course prepared by General Assembly resolution 38/14. However, his delegation had continuing difficulties with the references to migrant workers in the thirteenth preambular paragraph, operative paragraphs 6, 13 and, particularly, 19, since his Government was of the opinion that no general link could be established between the status of migrant workers and racism.

Draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.11/Rev.1

39. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the statement on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.11/Rev.1, contained in document A/C.3/43/L.16. He recalled that the representative of Tanzania, in introducing the draft resolution, had orally amended it by inserting a new preambular paragraph after the sixth preambular paragraph. In the revised version, A/C.3/43/L.11/Rev.1, a new operative paragraph 12 had been inserted.

40. Mr. LINDHOLM (Sweden) pointed out that in the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 8, the wording "the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa" should be used.

41. Mr. TURK (Israel) speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.11/Rev.1 unjustly singled out Israel for condemnation. His Government's position against apartheid was categorical and of public record. Israel had taken far-reaching steps to curtail trade between Israeli companies and racist South

(Mr. Turk, Israel)

Africa. It was patently absurd that Israel, whose trade with South Africa was marginal, should be singled out by name, while certain Persian Gulf States that sold billions of dollars worth of vital and strategic oil to South Africa went unmentioned. To his delegation's deep chagrin, the just struggle against apartheid was being cynically exploited by delegations of countries hostile to Israel; in so doing, they did great harm to the united effort against apartheid. His delegation urged all countries of good will to reject that form of manipulation and oppose the draft resolution until the offensive paragraphs singling out Israel were deleted.

42. Ms. BYRNE (United States of America) said that the elimination of all forms of racism and racial discrimination, including the system of apartheid, was of the utmost importance to the United States. However, the United States did not support the unbalanced draft resolution submitted under the item since it did not contribute to the accomplishment of the desired objective. The United States was against the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa and favoured efforts for peaceful change, as opposed to armed conflict, in South Africa. Her delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

43. The CHAIRMAN said that a separate vote had been requested on the eleventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.11/Rev.1.

44. A recorded vote was taken.

45. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

/...

Abstaining: Argentina, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Haiti, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

46. The eleventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.11/Rev.1 was adopted by 80 votes to 35, with 27 abstentions.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that a separate vote had been requested on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.11/Rev.1.

48. A recorded vote was taken.

49. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

Abstaining: Argentina, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Haiti, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela.

50. The operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.11/Rev.1 was adopted by 80 votes to 36, with 26 abstentions.

51. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the United States had requested a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.11/Rev.1 as a whole.

52. A recorded vote was taken.

53. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brasil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, 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, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swasiland, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Zaire.

54. Draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.11/Rev.1, as amended, was adopted by 121 votes to 10, with 15 abstentions.

55. Ms. VASSILIOU-ZACHAROPOULOS (Greece), speaking in explanation of the vote after the vote on behalf of the members of the European Community, said that, notwithstanding their view on apartheid, the Twelve had not been able to support draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.11/Rev.1. The Twelve had repeatedly condemned the abhorrent system of apartheid, which they regarded as a gross violation of basic human rights, and had called for it to be abolished. In 1986, the Twelve had adopted decisions whereby their authorities had taken the necessary measures to

(Ms. Vassiliou-Zacharopoulos, Greece)

prohibit new investments in South Africa as well as imports of iron, steel and gold coins.

56. As they had made clear in their statement in the debate on the item, the Twelve considered that the report of the Special Rapporteur once again did not represent a useful basis for the debate since the list of companies included in the report was inaccurate, selective and, apparently for political reasons, excluded many States and other corporations which were well known to conduct regular trade with South Africa. The Twelve had voted against the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 because they rejected all arbitrary or unjustified attacks, whether by name or implicitly, on Member States of the United Nations, or groups of countries.

57. Ms. CHICHIRAZY (Belize) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole but objected to the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 since they unfairly singled out Israel by name for alleged collaboration with the apartheid régime. Strident name calling did not contribute to progress in the struggle against apartheid.

58. Mr. SIGURDSSON (Iceland), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, said that it was well known that the Governments of the Nordic countries had for a long time strongly and actively supported the efforts of the international community to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination, and had supported action within and outside the United Nations. They therefore supported the main thrust of the draft resolution. However, they could not support unjustified accusations against certain countries or recommendations which did not respect the division of competence between bodies of the United Nations as embodied in the Charter. They noted with great regret the continued tendency to include controversial formulations in the draft resolution and had therefore abstained.

59. Mr. TANLAY (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, despite its reservations, to demonstrate its desire to take part in the efforts of the international community to eliminate the odious régime of South Africa. However, Turkey was, in principle, opposed to the designation of certain countries or groups of countries on the basis of geographical, political or other criteria in order to criticize or condemn them or hold them exclusively responsible for the vile policies of the South African régime. His delegation had therefore abstained in the separate votes on individual paragraphs.

60. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it firmly supported the efforts of the United Nations to eradicate apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa and elsewhere. It had voted against the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 because they made unfair generalizations and singled out certain countries.

61. Mrs. TAVAREZ DE ALVAREZ (Dominican Republic) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. It did not support the idea of singling out individual States and had therefore abstained in the vote on the eleventh preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 3.

62. Mr. GALAL (Egypt) said that Egypt was very proud of the report prepared by the Special Rapporteur Mr. Khalifa, which was very objective and logical. It hoped that certain countries which had dealings with South Africa, or multinational corporations of those countries which had such dealings, would reconsider their position.

Draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.8

63. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.8 contained in document A/C.3/43/L.14. He had been informed that the draft resolution did not contain any programme budget implications. Brazil and Djibouti had joined the sponsors. A recorded vote had been requested on the proposed amendments contained in document A/C.3/43/L.14.

64. A recorded vote was taken.

65. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Brasil, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico,

Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

66. The amendments contained in document A/C.3/43/L.14 were adopted by 80 votes to none with 59 absentions.

67. Draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.8, as amended, was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.9

68. The CHAIRMAN said that he had been informed that draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.9 did not contain any programme budget implications, and that Djibouti and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had joined the sponsors.

69. Draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.9 was adopted.

70. Mr. VAN WULFFTEN PALTHE (Netherlands), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.9 because it did not wish to break the consensus on that important issue. However, it had not been able to sponsor the draft resolution, as in the past. The paragraphs on the financial problems facing the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination should have been more explicit. The draft resolution should distinguish between two aspects of those problems: the fact that a number of States parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination did not meet their financial obligations, and the fact that the United Nations bore special responsibility for the implementation of the different human rights instruments negotiated under its auspices.

71. It was regrettable to see the long list of countries in default, as set out in the report of the Secretary-General (A/43/607). It was very hard to understand why those countries withheld payment of their contributions to CERD. He welcomed the possible administrative and legal measures mentioned in operative paragraph 11 and also suggested that the next meeting of States parties to the Convention could consider suspending the right of States in default to vote at such meetings; that in accordance with article 11 of the Convention, a State party which considered that another State party was not giving effect to the provisions of the Convention should bring the matter to the attention of CERD; and that, in accordance with article 22, disputes with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention should be referred to the International Court of Justice.

72. The United Nations should go beyond expressing its regret that a number of States parties had not paid their contributions. The General Assembly should consider ways of resolving the financial problems in an overall context covering all the human rights supervisory bodies. It should also seek short term ad hoc remedies to the financial problems faced by a number of supervisory bodies, notably CERD. As an emergency measure and on a provisional basis, the possibility of resuming the practice of the United Nations advancing funds to CERD under certain conditions should have been considered.

73. Mr. SKIBSTED (Denmark) said that his delegation welcomed the concern expressed in resolution A/C.3/43/L.9 on CERD's current financial crisis and appreciated the strong appeal to all States parties to fulfil their financial obligations under the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Denmark was concerned that the implementation of various human rights instruments was being weakened by the fact that some Governments did not fulfil their financial obligations under those instruments. If the United Nations was to be more effective in combating human rights violations, all States must adhere to those instruments and meet their financial obligations. In the year of the fortieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it was high time for all Member States to show the necessary political will in that respect.

74. In view of the large number of States parties which had still not paid their assessed contributions to CERD, his delegation would have preferred it if the resolution had indicated alternative ways of allowing CERD to proceed with its heavy work-load on a normal schedule of meetings. The resolution should have endorsed the recommendation made by CERD at its thirty-sixth session that the Secretary-General should be authorised, on a temporary basis, to finance the expenses of the members of CERD from the United Nations regular budget until a more permanent solution was found.

Draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1

75. The CHAIRMAN said that he had been informed that draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1 did not have any implications for the programme budget of the United Nations and that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had become a sponsor.

76. Mr. CHRYSANTHOPOULOS (Greece), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, on behalf of the Twelve Member States of the European Community, said that the votes of the Twelve on the draft resolution had no connection with their views on apartheid: the Twelve had repeatedly condemned that abhorrent system.

77. The Twelve noted with serious concern that the resolution did not in any way take into account the practical and political efforts made by the international community including the European Community, to contribute to the abolition of apartheid. Nor did it reflect the overall political trends in southern Africa which, compared with previous years, had been described by many delegations in less negative terms. The text of the draft resolution contained language which was not only controversial but also counter-productive. Even though the Twelve supported the stated aim of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, they continued to have serious reservations about the means envisaged in the Convention, which raised legal difficulties; furthermore, the Convention defined the violations covered by it in an imprecise way.

78. The Twelve regretted the reference to State terrorism in the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution as, to say the least, a controversial term. As to the sixth preambular paragraph, genocide was clearly defined in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; it was unacceptable that a resolution adopted by the General Assembly should purport to extend that

(Mr. Chrysanthopoulos, Greece)

definition. Concerning operative paragraph 6 and 10, the International Convention, like other international agreements, was applicable only to States which had ratified it and to the citizens of those States. The Twelve also noted the continuing tendency to include new, controversial elements in the resolution, in particular operative paragraph 7, which the Community was not in a position to support.

79. Miss BYRNE (United States of America) said that the draft resolution defined apartheid as a "crime against humanity" - a term which her country construed strictly, in accordance with usage established by the Nuremberg Charter and at the Nuremberg Trials. The Convention's definition of apartheid as a crime against humanity was broad and ambiguous, and could conceivably apply to almost any legal commerce with South Africa.

80. In addition, the Convention contained generally vague provisions calling upon nations to assert broad extraterritorial jurisdiction over those who purportedly engaged in the crime defined by the draft resolution. For those reasons, her delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

81. At the request of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on the words "State terrorism" in the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1.

82. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, 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, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, 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, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bhutan, Canada, Chile, Fiji, Finland, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, Uruguay.

83. The words "State terrorism" in the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1 were adopted by 110 votes to 18, with 14 abstentions

84. At the request of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1.

85. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, 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, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Chile, Fiji, Finland, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, Zaire.

86. The sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted by 114 votes to 15, with 13 abstentions.

87. At the request of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1.

88. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, 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, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Finland, Gabon, Haiti, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sweden, Turkey.

89. Operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted by 113 votes to 17, with 11 abstentions.

90. At the request of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1.

91. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, 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, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

92. Operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted by 16 votes to 8, with 16 abstentions.

93. At the request of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1.

94. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia,

Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, 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, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Finland, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Turkey.

95. Operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted by 117 votes to 14, with 9 abstentions.

96. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1 as a whole.

97. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, 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, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania,

Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swasiland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, 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: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

98. Draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.10/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 120 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions.

99. Mr. STUART (Australia) said that the Convention continued to raise difficult legal problems for Australia, preventing it from becoming a State party. His delegation had abstained in the vote since it did not wish to take a position on issues not relevant to Australia as a non-party to the Convention.

100. Mr. MIYATA (Japan) said that his delegation had voted against the reference to State terrorism in the fourth preambular paragraph because it did not consider it appropriate to include in a General Assembly resolution terminology on which the international community had not reached agreement.

101. Mr. TANLAY (Turkey) said that his delegation had abstained in the separate votes and in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. Its abstention was motivated by legal considerations, since Turkey was not a party to the Convention. It would, however, continue to play an active part in international efforts to eliminate apartheid, and would vote in favour of all draft resolutions submitted to the plenary session on the question of the apartheid policies of South Africa.

102. Mr. ANDERSEN (Sweden) said that Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden were not parties to the Convention and had therefore abstained in the separate votes on individual paragraphs and in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. The voting did not reflect their positions on the substance of the paragraphs or the draft resolution as a whole which, they felt, had unclear but potentially far-reaching international legal implications.

103. Mr. KRENKEL (Austria) said that Austria was not a party to the Convention. Austria had repeatedly condemned the system of apartheid, but some provisions of the Convention were incompatible with Austrian constitutional law. His delegation had therefore voted against operative paragraphs 6 and 10, in which reference was made to the Convention. Its abstention in the vote on the fourth preambular paragraph was motivated by its rejection of the concept of State terrorism. It had

(Mr. Krenkel, Austria)

abstained in the vote on the sixth preambular paragraph because the term genocide was clearly defined in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

104. Mr. RAVEN (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that his delegation's vote should have been recorded as an abstention.

Draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.5

105. Draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.5 was adopted without a vote.

106. Mrs. MUKHERJEE (India) said that while her delegation had not opposed the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote, that was without prejudice to India's stated position on article 1 of the International Covenants on Human Rights and to the relevant resolutions, as it had been expressed in the Commission on Human Rights.

Draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.6

107. Mrs. BUTIKO (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the final preambular paragraph should be amended to read: "Deeply concerned and alarmed at the deplorable consequences of the continuing Israeli acts of aggression against Lebanon and recalling all the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, in particular resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978". In operative paragraph 27, the word "headed" should be replaced by "mediated".

108. Mr. TURK (Israel) said that operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the draft resolution, with their references to "armed struggle" by the Palestinians against Israel, clearly implied the condoning of acts of terror against Israel's civilian population; the draft also made no mention of peaceful political processes as the means of achieving a peaceful solution to the Palestinian problem. Israel believed that true negotiated peace with all its neighbours was feasible, and that within that framework a solution could be found to the problems and aspirations of the Palestinians. Israel had committed itself, as a signatory to the Camp David Accords, to seek and obtain a resolution to the Palestinian problem in all its aspects and had recognized the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. Terror and violence as advocated in the draft resolution would only cause further suffering and postpone the resolution of the problem. His delegation urged the delegations of all countries that desired a peaceful and just resolution of the Palestinian problem to oppose violence by voting against the draft resolution.

109. Miss BYRNE (United States of America) said that, while her country had always been a firm believer in the principle of self-determination, it had been compelled to vote against the draft resolution, because it was unbalanced in its thrust, and, specifically, made no mention of the right to self-determination of the Afghan and Baltic peoples.

110. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution in document A/C.3/43/L.6, as orally revised.

111. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brasil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, 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, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Fiji, Greece, Ireland, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Zaire.

112. The draft resolution in document A/C.3/43/L.6, as orally revised, was adopted by 116 votes to 16, with 13 abstentions.

113. Mr. STUART (Australia) said that Australia had been a consistent and firm supporter of the principle of self-determination and of the role of the United Nations in asserting that principle. It had played a role in the realization by peoples of that right, as attested by the exercise of the right to self-determination of Australia's Non-Self-Governing Territories. Moreover, Australia was among the States which applied a wide range of sanctions against the apartheid régime and was a regular co-sponsor of General Assembly resolutions on concerted international action against apartheid. The Australian Foreign Minister was, moreover, a member of the Commonwealth Foreign Ministers' Group on Southern Africa which was developing strategies to bring pressure to bear on South Africa to eliminate apartheid.

/...

(Mr. Stuart, Australia)

114. It was a matter of regret, therefore, that Australia was once again unable to vote for the draft resolution under discussion. Operative paragraphs 34 and 35, in particular, failed to take account of announced changes in the approach of the Government of Israel to South Africa, and failed to reflect the change in the thrust of General Assembly resolution 42/23 D concerning measures recently announced by the Government of Israel in that connection. The draft resolution in document A/C.3/43/L.6 referred instead to a conference held five years ago. It did nothing for the reputation of the United Nations and its capacity to influence events when draft resolutions unthinkingly repeated the slogans of the past.

115. Pending further discussion of the Middle East situation under the relevant items yet to be considered by the General Assembly, he stated that Australia supported unequivocally the right of Israel to exist within secure and internationally recognized borders and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including, if they so chose, an independent Palestinian State. His delegation did not accept the exaggerated assertions made in operative paragraph 41 of the draft resolution.

116. Mr. CHRYSSANTHOPOULOUS (Greece), speaking in explanation of his vote on behalf of the Twelve Member States of the European Economic Community, said that the Twelve firmly supported the right of self-determination in accordance with the Charter and the International Covenants on Human Rights, but had been unable to support the draft resolution, parts of which raised substantial difficulties. It was also inordinately long, which sometimes made it difficult to understand. It did not take sufficiently into consideration recent positive developments leading to the peaceful solution of regional problems and lent itself to misrepresentations or misunderstandings. Such a misunderstanding was created by operative paragraphs 25 and 27, which were contradictory. The Twelve considered that the United Nations should above all encourage peaceful solutions to international problems.

117. With regard to South Africa, the Twelve had repeatedly condemned the apartheid system, demanded its abolition and called for the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners. They could not, however, accept the assertion that maintaining relations with a State implied encouragement or approval of that State's policies.

118. With regard to Namibia, the Twelve welcomed the recent progress made, and had individually and collectively declared their support for the efforts being undertaken to secure peace for Angola and independence for Namibia on the basis of General Assembly resolution 435 (1978).

119. With regard to the Middle East, the Twelve had repeatedly deplored Israeli repressive measures in the occupied Territories and maintained that lasting peace could only be achieved if the right of all States in the area, including Israel, to exist within secure, recognized and guaranteed borders was confirmed and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, with all that that implied, was also fully recognized.

(Mr. Chrysanthopoulos, Greece)

120. The Greek Minister for Foreign Affairs had explained the views of the Twelve on the other questions dealt with in the draft in his statement in the general debate on 27 September 1988.

121. The Twelve wished to associate themselves fully with the appeal in operative paragraph 16 for the immediate and unconditional release of Nelson Mandela, Zephania Mothopeng and all other political prisoners.

122. Mr. PALACIOS (Spain) endorsed the views expressed by the representative of Greece. Spain had always supported the right of peoples to self-determination in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and international human rights instruments, but had been compelled to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. It could not accept operative paragraph 2 which approved of armed force as a legitimate means of combating foreign occupation. His country had always rejected racism and racial discrimination and condemned apartheid, but it had reservations concerning operative paragraph 35 because it did not consider that maintaining political relations with South Africa implied support for the policies of its Government. Moreover, the draft resolution did not give sufficient consideration to the important efforts made to enable the peoples of Namibia and southwestern Africa to exercise their right to self-determination.

123. Mr. HERNANDEZ-BASAVE (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it agreed basically with its substance, but had reservations about operative paragraphs 5 and 34.

124. Mr. MOLINA ARAMBARRI (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it agreed with the substance of the text, although it would have preferred a different wording for some paragraphs.

125. Mr. JATIVA (Ecuador) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, with which it agreed in essence, since it was consistent with certain basic principles of Ecuador's policy. It did not, however, fully agree with the wording of some paragraphs which it regarded as selective and which referred to conferences in which Ecuador had not participated.

126. Mrs. TAVAREZ DE ALVAREZ (Dominican Republic) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but did not agree with the singling out of any State for condemnation, since that was a subjective approach and detracted from the force of the draft resolution.

127. Mr. TANLAY (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/43/L.6, but wished to stress that in principle Turkey did not approve of United Nations resolutions mentioning particular countries or groups of countries by name. His delegation also had reservations on paragraph 37, which referred to a resolution that Turkey had not supported.

128. Mrs. LISSIDINI (Uruguay) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, the substance of which reflected Uruguay's convictions and expectations concerning the right to self-determination. It regretted, however, that in the present period of tension, despite the evidence that constructive dialogue was possible, the draft resolution contained no provisions encouraging parties involved in conflicts to work out solutions through diplomatic procedures. Moreover, the inclusion of wording describing in absolute terms the conduct of a Government upset the balance which a draft resolution should strike in order to create a climate conducive to a constructive solution.

129. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that, in view of Costa Rica's firm support for the principles contained in the draft resolution, her delegation would have wished to support the draft. It had, however, been compelled to abstain on account of the wording of operative paragraphs 2, 34 and 35, which unfairly singled out one State and generalized about another. She reaffirmed her country's support for United Nations efforts to secure the independence of Namibia and the remaining colonial countries, and hoped that self-determination of the Palestinian people could be achieved through dialogue.

130. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation supported all the draft resolutions which had been put to the vote. Their provisions were consistent with the goals of the United Nations in the struggle against racism, racial discrimination and apartheid and for the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination. In connection with the draft resolution under consideration, his delegation believed that the sponsors had said what they wanted to say, and was grateful to Tanzania and the African group for their work.

131. Mr. PALMA (Honduras) said that his delegation's vote should have been recorded as an abstention. Explaining his delegation's position, he said that while his Government was committed to the struggle for the self-determination of peoples, it could not countenance the singling out of any individual country.

132. Miss AL-MULLA (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, drew attention to the reference made by one delegate to oil shipments to South Africa. Her delegation would be eagerly awaiting the contribution of that delegation to the forthcoming debate on the oil embargo.

133. Israel's view of self-determination was blurred and distorted. Its policies towards South Africa were well known. They had been reflected in the absence of Israel at the plenary session of the Assembly when 146 States had unanimously voted to condemn the municipal elections in South Africa.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.