

1988th meeting

Friday, 5 October 1973, at 3.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Yahya MAHMASSANI (Lebanon).

A/C.3/SR.1998

AGENDA ITEM 53

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (continued) (A/9003 and Corr.1, chaps. XXIII, sect. A.1 and A.2 and XXX, sect. B; A/9094 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/9095, A/9139, A/9177, A/C.3/L.1995, A/C.3/L.1996):

(a) **Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (continued)** (A/9003 and Corr.1, chaps. XXIII, sect. A.1 and XXX, sect. B; A/9094 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/9177, A/C.3/L.1995, A/C.3/L.1996)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENTS (A/C.3/L.1996)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that various amendments had been submitted to the draft programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (A/9094 and Corr.1, annex I). The amendments were sponsored by the delegations of Brazil (A/C.3/L.1996), Trinidad and Tobago (A/C.3/L.1997), Egypt (A/C.3/L.1998), Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic (A/C.3/L.1999) and Afghanistan and the Syrian Arab Republic (A/C.3/L.2000). All except the Brazilian amendments had been circulated as provisional documents. Working papers A/C.3/L.2001 and A/C.3/L.2002 had also been circulated as provisional documents.

2. Mr. COSTA COUTO (Brazil) said that his delegation had submitted its amendments (A/C.3/L.1996) not with the idea of stirring up controversy but with a clear intention in mind, which went no further than the contents of the document. First of all, it proposed that paragraph 1 of the draft programme should be amended to accord better with the first part of the Preamble of the Charter of the United Nations, on which it was based. Secondly, its intention was to bring the wording of the draft programme into line with that of existing conventions on the subject, as it believed that the best definition of racial discrimination was that contained in article 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. His delegation also proposed the deletion of various references to "other status" as a ground for discrimination, feeling that it led to confusion without improving the text. The same change should be made in paragraph 12 (a), to conform to the wording of the International Convention.

3. With regard to the provisional version of the amendments submitted by Trinidad and Tobago (A/C.3/L.1997), he felt, without underestimating the importance of the role of women in that particular sphere, that the proposals should be considered by other bodies.

4. Mrs. GEORGE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that the provisional version of the amendments proposed by her delegation (A/C.3/L.1997) were designed to emphasize

the importance of the role of women in the implementation of the programme for the Decade at all levels. Although the amendments might appear to be repetitious, they were necessary in order to re-emphasize new approaches that would include women in all efforts to eliminate racial discrimination. It might appear, too, that there was an over-projection of women into the programme, but it was necessary to counteract the traditional practice of relegating women to an inferior position, thus denying society their vital contribution with regard to the needs of the world.

5. The inclusion of the equal participatory role of women in the programme was highly relevant to the theme of the Decade, which was the elimination of racism and racial discrimination. Its pertinence had been ably validated in the valuable study entitled *Racial Discrimination*¹ prepared by the Special Rapporteur, Mr. Hernán Santa Cruz, in connexion with the observance of the International Year to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination in 1971. Paragraphs 643 to 646 of that study, while making special reference to the rigid and legalized situation in South Africa, were none the less indicative of universal attitudes. They demonstrated the effect of the artificial mobilization of women in inferior roles—reflected in the right to marriage and choice of spouse, in educational development and in family life—while giving additional support to the concept of racism, racial superiority and racial discrimination. All of those areas were expected to be attacked during the Decade.

6. With regard to the Brazilian amendments (A/C.3/L.1996), she noted that the Brazilian delegation had been especially concerned with impact, whereas the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago was concerned with both input and impact. The draft programme dealt with a complex issue which required diversity in methods of application and opinion.

7. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) said that the provisional version of his delegation's amendment (A/C.3/L.1998), which consisted in replacing paragraph 13 (a) by a new text, was the outcome of consultations between delegations and had been approved unanimously in the working group. The working papers (A/C.3/L.2001 and A/C.3/L.2002) had been discussed in informal consultations among members of the Committee and there was a general consensus that the co-ordination and review and appraisal of the activities of the Decade should be entrusted to a particular body.

8. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of documents A/C.3/L.1999 and A/C.3/L.2000, said that all the amendments contained in those documents referred to activities for the Decade at the regional and international levels, as provided for in paragraph 13 of the draft programme. The amendments, which were self-explanatory, were in keeping with the spirit and letter of

¹ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.71.XIV.2.

the world campaign against racism and racial discrimination and with the spirit of the United Nations.

9. Mr. LÜTEM (Secretary of the Committee) recapitulated the amendments submitted to the draft programme for the Decade, as they appeared in document A/C.3/L.1996 and in the provisional versions of documents A/C.3/L.1997 to 2002, and read them out, indicating the passages which they affected.

10. Mr. LEHTIHET (Algeria) said he wished to make a slight change in the provisional version of document A/C.3/L.1999. In the French text, the last phrase of the second amendment should read "*un colonialisme de peuplement*" instead of "*un colonialisme de colons*".

11. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) appealed to the representative of Brazil to withdraw the first amendment in document A/C.3/L.1996. He also asked the representative of Trinidad and Tobago not to insist on the first or the fourth to twenty-fourth amendments in the provisional version of document A/C.3/L.1997. As a compromise solution, the first and third amendments submitted by Trinidad and Tobago could be retained on the understanding that Brazil would withdraw its first amendment.

12. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that her delegation supported the amendments submitted by Afghanistan and the Syrian Arab Republic and contained in the provisional version of document A/C.3/L.2000, but suggested that the two changes should be submitted as a single amendment. Her delegation also agreed with the purpose underlying the amendments appearing in the provisional version of document A/C.3/L.1999 and would give them its full support.

13. Moreover, she wished to thank the representative of Brazil for having submitted most of the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.1996, because otherwise the delegation of Morocco would have had to submit them. She fully agreed with the second to seventh amendments in that document, but not with the first amendment, since the words to be deleted had been taken from the Preamble to the Charter.

14. With regard to the provisional version of the amendments submitted by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago (A/C.3/L.1997), she understood their aim and felt that the reasons for their submission were entirely valid. However, she thought that the document might carry less weight if every paragraph mentioned the question of sex. In particular, she was uncertain as to where the first amendment could be included in the draft. Her delegation could accept the second amendment if it was worded to read: "The full utilization of the desire and readiness of men and women throughout the world. . .". However she could not agree to the fourth to fourteenth amendments. As for the fifteenth amendment, she felt that the text would be less unwieldy and that the objectives of the other amendments would be covered if paragraph 15 (c) contained an additional passage reading: "Activities undertaken in connexion with International Women's Year should take into account the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination so as to enable women to make their effective contribution to that struggle". Lastly, she could fully support and co-sponsor the seventeenth amendment.

15. Mr. PETHERBRIDGE (Australia) observed that the special committee responsible for co-ordinating

programmes and evaluating activities under the Decade would be made up of representatives of Member States, and if it was felt that it should be composed of an equal number of men and women there would be the problem of deciding which Member States should send men, and which women, to maintain the balance between the sexes.

16. Mr. COSTA COUTO (Brazil) said that, after having heard the comments made by the representative of Morocco and holding informal consultations with the representative of Trinidad and Tobago, he had decided, in a spirit of compromise, to withdraw the first amendment in document A/C.3/L.1996.

17. Mr. NASSER-ZIAYEE (Afghanistan) said that the draft programme had introduced a new terminology, although it would surely be preferable to retain the language of the Charter, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Covenants on Human Rights.

18. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled the observations made by the delegation of the Soviet Union (1981st meeting) during the general debate on the draft programme, and submitted some oral amendments arising from those observations. First of all, he proposed that the phrase "as a crime against humanity" should be inserted in paragraph 2 after the words "the policy of *apartheid*". Next, he would like paragraph 5 to be replaced by the following wording: "The United Nations is convinced more than ever of the need for constant national, regional and international efforts to eliminate racism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination." The following paragraph should be added after paragraph 12 (a): "The granting of assistance on a bilateral basis to peoples which are victims of racial discrimination". A comma should be placed at the end of paragraph 13 (d), after which the following should be added: "and ways and means for ensuring the international and regional isolation of racist régimes should be examined". Paragraph 13 (f) should be reworded to read: "The implementation of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, as well as United Nations resolutions on this question, is imperative." Finally, in paragraph 13 (g), the words "the crime of *apartheid*" should be replaced by "the suppression of the crime of *apartheid*".

19. Mr. MACRAE (United Kingdom) inquired whether there had been a time-limit for the submission of amendments, and, if so, whether the Committee had decided to extend it. If the submission of new amendments were allowed, he considered that they should be circulated in writing before they were discussed.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that there was a time-limit for the submission of amendments, and that it had already expired. The Committee therefore had to decide whether further amendments were admissible, and its practice had been to accept those which involved only minor changes.

21. Mr. VAN WALSUM (Netherlands) said that his delegation had no objection to the submission of new amendments, but wondered how that would affect the calendar of meetings.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that in accordance with rule 122 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly he would suggest that, if there were no objec-

tions, the time-limit for the submission of amendments might be extended until 6 p.m. that day.

It was so decided.

23. Mr. COSTA COUTO (Brazil) requested that the delegation of the Soviet Union should submit its amendments in writing in order to save time.

24. Mrs. GEORGE (Trinidad and Tobago) thanked the representative of Brazil for withdrawing his first amendment, and said that she was holding consultations with the representative of Morocco concerning her own proposals.

25. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq) said that, as a result of the withdrawal of the first Brazilian amendment, the language of the draft programme remained unchanged, and that raised a problem of a juridical nature. He took it that the draft aimed at faithfully reproducing the Preamble of the Charter; but on close reading, it did not appear to be a faithful reflection of the latter. Paragraph 1 seemed to imply that the Preamble only proclaimed a belief in goals, and that a decision was now being taken to translate them into reality. That did not reflect the true meaning of the Preamble. Where the Charter was involved, any change required careful reflection.

26. Mr. GRAEFRATH (German Democratic Republic) proposed that in paragraph 12 (a) (ii) the words "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" should be followed by "the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination".

27. Mr. MACRAE (United Kingdom) suggested informally that in view of the large number of proposed amendments which required closer examination, the Committee should move on to the next item on the agenda, postponing consideration of item 53 (a) until a later stage, so that further consultations could be held in the interim.

28. Mr. CATO (Ghana) said that if the United Kingdom made a formal proposal to that effect, he would oppose it, since he considered it preferable first to conclude consideration of item 53 (a).

29. The CHAIRMAN recalled that there would be no morning meeting on Monday, 8 October, and urged the delegations to meet informally with a view to reaching an agreement, so that the amendments might be put to the vote on Monday afternoon.

30. Mr. BOOTHE (Jamaica) suggested that the meeting should be adjourned so that consultations could be held that afternoon.

31. Mr. VONKYAW (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he could not understand how it could be confidently expected that the amendments would be put to the vote on Monday afternoon. The Committee had held a general debate for two weeks and was now beginning a new one, thereby running the risk of departing from the planned schedule of meetings. His delegation could not prevent new proposals from being formulated, but wished to stress that it would find it difficult to endorse amendments which had not been carefully examined.

32. The CHAIRMAN urged delegations to make comments and observations on the amendments, since the discussion in progress was not a procedural one.

33. Mrs. KOROMA (Sierra Leone) associated her delegation with the Jamaican proposal to adjourn the meeting so that consultations could be held.

34. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to rule 120 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which stated that a representative could move the suspension or the adjournment of the meeting. Such motions should immediately be put to the vote, without debate.

35. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq) thought that if an amendment related to a fundamental point in the draft, no time-limits could be set for its submission. The working group had not examined the draft programme from the point of view of linguistic purity, and he considered that that needed to be done.

36. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) agreed with the representatives of Jamaica and Sierra Leone that the meeting should be adjourned, since changes were going to be made in the amendments and it was pointless to examine them if they were to be modified or withdrawn. She therefore proposed, in accordance with rule 120 of the rules of procedure, that the meeting should be adjourned.

37. She also requested the Secretary to issue a document presenting the amendments in the usual form, that is, arranged according to the paragraphs to which they referred, as it would be most useful for the purpose of voting.

38. The CHAIRMAN read out rule 120 of the rules of procedure and put the proposal to adjourn the meeting to the vote.

The proposal was adopted by 76 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.