

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly
FORTY-FOURTH SESSION
Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE
23rd meeting
held on
Monday, 30 October 1989
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 23rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KABORE (Burkina Faso)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 100: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 105: 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)
- AGENDA ITEM 94: INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 103: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 104: FORWARD-LOOKING STRATEGIES FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN TO THE YEAR 2000 (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 corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/44/SR.23
7 November 1989

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

89-56720 1785S (E)

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

AGENDA ITEM 100: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
(A/C.3/44/L.7 and L.11)

AGENDA ITEM 105: 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.3/44/L.8, L.9 and L.10)

AGENDA ITEM 94: INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN (continued) (A/44/409 and Corr.1 and 2-S/20743; A/44/416)

AGENDA ITEM 103: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (continued) (A/44/38, A/44/238 and Corr.1, A/44/342, A/44/409-S/20743 and A/44/411 and A/44/457)

AGENDA ITEM 104: FORWARD-LOOKING STRATEGIES FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN TO THE YEAR 2000 (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.11

1. The CHAIRMAN invited those delegations that wished to do so to speak in explanation of vote now that draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.1 had been adopted under agenda item 100.
2. Mr. KRENKL (Austria) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because his country was not a party to the Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, specific articles of which were mentioned in paragraphs 6 and 10. Austria also rejected the reference to State terrorism in the fifth preambular paragraph.
3. Mr. BURCUOGLU (Turkey) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on purely legal grounds since Turkey was not a party to the Convention. Turkey would, however, fully support international efforts to combat apartheid.
4. Mr. METSO (Finland), speaking on behalf of Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Finland, said that those States were not parties to the Convention and had therefore abstained both in the separate votes and in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. That did not in itself reflect their positions on the substance of the paragraphs voted on separately or on the resolution as adopted. In view of the unclear but potentially far-reaching international legal implications of the resolution, they considered it necessary to have an explanation of their vote put on record.

/...

5. Mr. ITO (Japan) said that Japan was strongly opposed to apartheid and would work to eradicate it, but that his delegation had abstained in the vote because it had reservations about the reference to State terrorism in the fifth preambular paragraph and because operative paragraphs 6, 7 and 10 contained references that it could not support.

6. Mr. RALEBITSO (Lesotho) said that Lesotho, the only State on the African continent completely surrounded by South Africa, suffered directly from the effects of apartheid, which it steadfastly opposed as a matter of principle. It wanted the international community to hasten the end of apartheid, but could not be party to sanctions against South Africa because it lacked the means to implement them.

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.8

7. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution L.8 contained no programme budget implications.

8. Miss KAMAL (Secretary of the Committee) said that paragraph 16 of draft resolution L.8 had been orally revised to read "Commends the mass democratic movement in South Africa for the tremendous advances scored during the recent campaign of defiance of unjust apartheid laws in the ongoing struggle against apartheid". In the English version, "Secretary-General" should be replaced by "Security Council" in the twenty-seventh preambular paragraph.

9. The CHAIRMAN invited those delegations that wished to do so to explain their vote before the vote on the draft resolution.

10. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation was a firm supporter of self-determination but that it could not agree with the references to Israel in the draft resolution. Costa Rica also preferred negotiation to armed struggle. Her delegation specifically objected to paragraphs 26 and 27 and wished to point out that it had voted in favour of draft resolution L.9, which also dealt with self-determination.

11. Mr. WALDROP (United States of America) said that his country firmly supported self-determination but that his delegation had objected to the draft resolution because it was polemical in tone and unbalanced in content. Drawing attention to the twenty-eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 44, he noted that the draft resolution made no mention of self-determination for the Afghan, Cambodian or Baltic peoples, and said that his delegation would therefore vote against it.

12. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.8, as orally revised.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, 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, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Chile, El Salvador, Fiji, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Malawi, Malta, New Zealand, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Zaire.

13. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.8, as orally amended, was adopted by 107 votes to 15, with 15 abstentions.

14. The CHAIRMAN invited those delegations that wished to do so to speak in explanation of vote after the vote on draft resolution L.8.

15. Mr. STUART (Australia) said that Australia had firmly supported the principle of self-determination. All three of its Non-Self-Governing Territories had exercised their right to self-determination in accordance with the Charter.

16. Australia was among the States that applied a wide range of sanctions against South Africa to bring about a peaceful end to apartheid. His Government was active in efforts to develop strategies aimed at bringing effective pressure to bear on the apartheid régime and countering South African propaganda and destabilization

(Mr. Stuart, Australia)

efforts. Australia also fully supported Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as demonstrated by its contribution of some 400 soldiers to the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

17. It was a matter of regret, therefore, that Australia had been unable to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.8. In particular, it could not support paragraphs 26 and 27 because of the name-calling and questionable assertions. The effectiveness of the United Nations was not served by draft resolutions that mindlessly repeated the slogans of the past. The General Assembly should avoid exacerbating differences and hindering the peace-making process by provocative resolutions. Rather, it should seek solutions to problems and point to practical ways to make progress. Australia unequivocally supported the right of Israel to exist within secure and internationally recognized borders and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including the right to establish an independent Palestinian State. His delegation, however, could not accept the exaggerated assertions made in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution.

18. Mr. MOLINA ARAMBARRI (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and urged Member States to comply with all United Nations resolutions on self-determination. However, it would have preferred that some paragraphs be worded differently.

19. Mr. BEN YOHANAN (Israel) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it objected to paragraphs 2-7, which encouraged terrorism against Israel's civilian population and against Arabs who opposed violence. Furthermore, the text contained no hint that problems could be solved, and peace achieved, through negotiation. Israel's recent peace initiative had been designed to end the conflict without the terrorism and violence advocated in the draft resolution.

20. Mr. RALEBITSO (Lesotho) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution. Lesotho was a peace-loving State that favoured self-determination and independence but preferred to see those goals pursued through negotiation rather than armed struggle. He hoped that the current relaxation of international tensions would be exploited to promote those principles.

21. Mrs. LISSIDINI (Uruguay) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it endorsed its spirit and because it opposed apartheid, but it would have preferred to eliminate from the text the selective condemnation of specific countries, which was not conducive to dialogue.

22. Miss DIEGUEZ (Mexico) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it agreed with its substance, but that it had reservations concerning the twenty-fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 27.

23. Ms. LAFORTUNE (Canada) said that her delegation had been compelled to vote against the draft resolution although it contained some constructive elements because Canada was against the use of violence and against name-calling and

(Ms. Lafortune, Canada)

references to irrelevant situations. It particularly regretted the language on Namibia. The General Assembly should suspend its discussion of Namibia for the time being because the Security Council was currently considering a draft resolution on that subject.

24. Mr. BOUTET (France) said that the 12 members of the European Community strongly favoured self-determination but that they could not support the draft resolution because they had problems with its excessive length and its failure to take sufficient account of positive developments that could lead to peaceful solutions without armed struggle. They specifically objected to paragraphs 2 and 12. To have relations with a State was not tantamount to approval of that State. The United Nations must remain impartial in respect of Namibia. In the Middle East, the members of the European Community deplored Israeli measures in the occupied territories and considered that all States were entitled to live within secure and recognized borders.

25. Mrs. CHIMELA (Botswana) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but wished to reserve its position on paragraph 24. Botswana was unable to impose sanctions but would not stand in the way of those who could do so.

26. Mr. BURCUOGLU (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution despite certain reservations. It objected to singling out groups of countries for selective condemnation and could not accept paragraph 35 because it referred to a resolution on which Turkey had abstained.

27. Mr. NELENDEZ (El Salvador) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote despite its firm support for self-determination because certain paragraphs of the draft resolution should be worded more constructively. His country did not support armed struggle for self-determination because it was contrary to the provisions of the Charter.

28. Mrs. NORIEGA (Panama) said that her delegation was absent during the vote but that had it been present, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

29. Mr. ZIADA (Iraq) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because of its strong commitment to self-determination and opposition to racial discrimination. The negative vote on the draft resolution by some delegations exposed their true positions on those issues. Israel's co-operation with South Africa, particularly with respect to weapons, had already been widely exposed in the press.

30. Mr. NDIAYE (Senegal) said that his delegation was absent during the vote but that had it been present, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.9

31. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

32. Mr. ZIADA (Iraq) said that his delegation wished to be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

33. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.9 was adopted.

34. Ms. MEHTA (India) said that her delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution. However, its favourable vote did not prejudice the position of her Government with respect to article 1 of the International Covenants on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the relevant resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights.

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.10

35. The CHAIRMAN said he had been informed that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications and that Bolivia, Ecuador, Maldives, Niger, Panama and the Syrian Arab Republic had joined the list of sponsors.

36. Ms. GARUBA (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that after extensive informal consultations, and in an effort to accommodate the concerns and constructive suggestions of certain delegations, they had introduced the following amendment to the text: in operative paragraph 3, the words "punishable in accordance with existing international law" should be replaced by the words "of grave concern to all States and violate the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations".

37. In drafting the resolution, the sponsors had acknowledged the work of the Ad Hoc Committee charged with preparing an international convention on the use of mercenaries and were prepared to postpone a decision on the draft resolution, pending the outcome of deliberations in the Sixth Committee. In that connection, she wished to reiterate that the work of the Third Committee on mercenary activities dealt only with the humanitarian aspects of the question: it relied on the Sixth Committee to deal with the legal aspects. Finally, the sponsors wished to be as flexible as possible and were confident that all delegations would support the draft resolution.

38. Mr. VAN WULFFTEN PALTHE (Netherlands) said that his delegation welcomed the amendment introduced by the sponsors and their efforts to take into consideration the relevant work being carried out in the Sixth Committee. That Committee would soon be taking up a resolution dealing with mercenary activities, which, he understood, would be adopted by consensus. Therefore, it was only logical that the Third Committee should await the developments in the Sixth Committee. In the interest of achieving a consensus he wondered if the sponsors would be prepared to postpone action on the draft resolution until a later stage.

39. Ms. ATOUAZE (Algeria) said that the representative of the Netherlands had not benefited from the explanations provided by the representative of Nigeria with respect to the differences in purpose of the two Committees that were currently considering the subject of mercenaries. There was no conflict between Algeria's

(Ms. Atouaze, Algeria)

interests in the Third Committee and its contributions to the work of the Sixth Committee. The sponsors had not requested a vote on the draft resolution and would welcome its immediate adoption by consensus.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the United States of America had requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution.

41. Mr. WALDROP (United States of America) said that his Government had consistently opposed the recruitment, financing, training and use of mercenaries. However, in comparison with the grave problems currently being addressed by the General Assembly, in particular extra-judicial killings, torture, disappearances, and the detention of thousands of political prisoners, the scale of mercenary activity was quite limited. In any event, the draft resolution addressed issues which were wholly extraneous to the purposes and competence of the Third Committee and partially duplicated the efforts of the Sixth Committee, contrary to the recommendations of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly. It was clear that the main focus of the draft resolution was not humanitarian concerns but rather political issues unrelated to the Third Committee's work. His delegation strongly opposed any attempt to extend the generally understood definition of "mercenary" to achieve political ends. The term "mercenary" had been defined in article 47 (2) of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and a similar definition was being used in the draft convention. For all those reasons, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

42. Mr. BOUTET (France), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that while the Twelve unreservedly condemned the recruitment, training and use of mercenaries and understood the concerns motivating the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.10, they could not support either its substance or its wording. In view of the current financial crisis of the United Nations, it was particularly regrettable that the sponsors, instead of trying to rationalize the work of the General Assembly, were duplicating the efforts of another Committee. Furthermore, the appointment of a Special Rapporteur by the Commission on Human Rights was inappropriate - the issue of mercenary activities had more to do with relations between States than with human rights.

43. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.10, as orally amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya,

Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Paraguay, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

44. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.10, as amended, was adopted by 111 votes to 10, with 20 abstentions.

45. Ms. MIGNOTT (Jamaica) said that for technical reasons, her vote had not been registered. Her delegation wished to go on record as having voted in favour of the draft resolution.

46. Mr. WHITAKER SALLES (Brazil), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that as in the past, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. The wording of the third and fifth preambular paragraphs were too general. The Charter of the United Nations stipulated clearly under what conditions a situation might be deemed to present a threat to international peace and security and what authority was mandated to identify such threats. In the circumstances, the third preambular paragraph was open to misinterpretation and might even be potentially harmful. Moreover, while the connection between mercenary activities and drug traffickers was known, the fifth preambular paragraph should cite concrete examples of collusion with a view to proposing effective countermeasures.

47. Mr. STUART (Australia) said that although Australia was strongly opposed to the activities of mercenaries, it had been against the decision to appoint a Special Rapporteur on the question of the use of mercenaries on the grounds that it would lead to duplication of effort and waste scarce United Nations resources. Unfortunately, the draft resolution failed to take into account the recent encouraging developments in the Sixth Committee relating to the drafting of an international convention on the subject. Australia was mindful of the need for all Member States to co-operate in following United Nations procedures in the field of human rights, even if they had reservations about those procedures. Accordingly, his delegation had decided to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

48. Mr. VELLA (Malta) said that because of its opposition to the use of mercenaries his delegation was convinced that a legal instrument on the matter should be completed as soon as possible. Since the Ad Hoc Committee had been established specifically for that purpose, the Third Committee's work represented a duplication of effort and might conflict with that of the Sixth Committee. His delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.
49. Ms. MERCHANT (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that the Nordic countries had also abstained in the vote. While they condemned the use of mercenaries, they regretted that the resolution had not taken into account the relevant work of the Ad Hoc Committee and the Special Rapporteur. Furthermore, it was unfortunate that the decision on the draft resolution could not have been postponed pending the formal adoption of the draft convention in the Sixth Committee. Finally, the language of the draft resolution was not consistent with the language agreed upon in the Sixth Committee.
50. Mrs. NOSE (Japan) said that while it welcomed the amendment to operative paragraph 3, her delegation was concerned that the draft resolution did not give sufficient weight to the draft convention on mercenaries and hoped that the adoption of A/C.3/44/L.10 would not prejudice the final outcome of the Sixth Committee's work. For those reasons, her delegation had voted against the draft resolution.
51. Mr. KRENKL (Austria) said that the efforts to achieve consensus on the draft resolution had been too limited. Furthermore, the draft resolution had not adequately reflected the work on the draft convention in the Sixth Committee and the report of the Special Rapporteur. Lastly, the language of the draft resolution should be similar to that of the draft convention. His delegation had therefore abstained in the vote.
52. Mr. BURCUOGLU (Turkey) said that Turkish citizens were prohibited from serving in foreign forces and the recruitment, financing and training of mercenaries as well as their transit through Turkey were punishable under the Turkish legislation. As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, his country endorsed the speedy adoption of a legal instrument governing mercenary activity. The draft resolution should have acknowledged the enormous strides made recently in the Sixth Committee towards that end. For those reasons, his delegation had abstained in the vote.
53. Mr. AL RAWAS (Oman) said that in view of the current financial crisis of the United Nations and the fact that other bodies were dealing with the same subject-matter, his delegation had abstained in the vote.
54. Mr. MELENDEZ (El Salvador) said that his delegation supported the basic principles contained in the draft resolution. However, as in past years, it still felt that the reference to Central America in the context of colonial struggles was not appropriate. As it stood, the wording of operative paragraph 2 might lead to misinterpretations which departed from the spirit of the United Nations Charter. For those reasons, his delegation had abstained in the vote.

55. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that while her Government accepted the principles on which the draft resolution had been based, her delegation abstained in the vote because it found the references to Central America in the fourth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 2 inappropriate. On the other hand, her delegation endorsed the content of the third, fifth and eighth preambular paragraphs. The fifth, which linked mercenary activities and drug trafficking, should have included a list of specific regions and countries where such activities were taking place.

56. Ms. VASSILIOU (Greece) said that her country wished to reiterate its position concerning the need to hold seminars or expert group meetings, such as the meeting held in Vienna in September, on the priority themes to be discussed at the 1990 session of the Commission on the Status of Women. With respect to the first priority theme, equality in political participation and decision-making, Greece believed that affirmative action programmes were necessary to overcome de facto discrimination and requested that the report to be submitted to the Commission include examples of the successful implementation of such measures in various countries. With respect to the second theme, the negative effects of the world economic situation on the improvement of the status of women, the report should contain more information. Greece also attached particular importance to the follow-up of priority themes. The report contained in document A/44/516 and the seminar held in Vienna in May 1989 were examples of the type of follow-up that it hoped to see given to the other priority themes.

57. The improvement of the situation of women in rural areas was of particular concern to Greece, where 30 per cent of the total population lived in rural areas and 74 per cent of the economically active women worked in the agricultural sector. It therefore commended the Division for the Advancement of Women for arranging, beginning in 1990, for the interregional adviser on women to provide assistance to national machineries in developing programmes sensitive to the needs and potentialities of rural women.

58. Despite commendable efforts, the number of women in professional and decision-making positions in the Secretariat was far from satisfactory. She requested that the report on progress in that area to be submitted to the Commission under General Assembly resolution 43/104 be made available to the Committee for discussion under agenda item 104.

59. Greece did not share the pessimism expressed by many speakers with regard to progress to date in implementing the Forward-looking Strategies. Given the centuries of discrimination against women, the process would necessarily be a slow one, but optimism, not pessimism, would make improvements possible. With respect to the review and appraisal of the Strategies, her delegation wished to reiterate its position that the next world conference should take place in 1995, at the end of the five-year cycle.

(Ms. Vassiliou, Greece)

60. With regard to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, a seminar, intended mainly for third-world countries, had been organized in Athens in January 1989 for the purpose of drafting the reports needed to meet the reporting obligations of States parties and of encouraging States that had not yet ratified the Convention to do so.

61. Mrs. MOLINA DE VILLAGRAN (Guatemala), commenting on the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women, said that the international community needed to focus on women's advancement in designing political, social and development policies. She endorsed the emphasis given at the International Seminar on Women and Rural Development to the need to give priority to policies favouring rural women, as well as to rural development strategies in general. The capability of Governments to design and implement those policies and strategies must be enhanced through international co-operation.

62. The 1980s had been a lost decade for development, especially in Central America, where political violence and natural disasters had created a new need for aid to refugee, repatriated or displaced women. In that connection, the support of the international community was indispensable in the implementation of the special plan of economic co-operation for Central America, adopted in resolution 42/231 of the General Assembly and of the Declaration and Plan of Action adopted at the May 1989 International Conference on Central American Refugees.

63. Guatemala had participated and would continue to participate in the discussions of the Commission on the Status of Women. It also fully supported the work of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women.

64. Mrs. GJIKA (Albania) said that her Government considered women's struggle for emancipation and the general issues of social development and advancement to be intrinsically linked. In the 45 years since the proclamation of the Republic, significant qualitative and quantitative progress had been made in the active participation of women in economic and political activity and professional achievements.

65. Mrs. NOSE (Japan) urged all States that had not done so to accede to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. In its 1988 report to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), her Government had expressed its renewed determination to make further efforts to attain both de jure and de facto equality between men and women. For CEDAW to be effective States parties to the Convention must be present and make presentations when their reports were considered. She stressed that efforts to strengthen its role should take full account of the need to allocate increased resources for that purpose and to discuss that prospect in the Fifth Committee.

(Mrs. Nose, Japan)

66. The Commission on the Status of Women in carrying out its first comprehensive review and appraisal of progress made in the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies, should focus attention on identifying areas where progress had been made and the obstacles to be overcome. A comprehensive reporting system to obtain information on the review and appraisal of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies was necessary to ensure that Member States submitted their replies in a timely fashion.

67. In the report submitted by Japan, her Government had acknowledged that, while de jure equality between the sexes had almost been attained, much still remained to be done to achieve de facto equality. In recent elections, 22 more women had been elected to the Diet. Two women ministers were currently serving in the cabinet. Women's non-governmental organizations in Japan were playing an increasingly important role in efforts to promote the advancement of women.

68. Aware of the importance of ensuring maximum participation by women in the process of development, Japan would continue its contributions to the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) and hoped that those two organizations would continue their important work in enhancing the status of women in developing countries.

69. Mrs. SKOWRON-OLSZOWSKA (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies served as a constant source of guidance for UNESCO in improving the situation of women in its fields of competence. The third Medium-Term Plan (1990-1995) would continue the twofold strategy based on specific activities for the benefit of women and the integration of women in all areas of UNESCO activities. Emphasis on the interdependence of men and women as the key to full equality and on the importance of women's positive contribution to a better world were crucial elements in the Plan.

70. Education of women and girls, which had always been a top priority of UNESCO, was widely accepted as the pivotal factor in achieving full and equal participation by women in all aspects of social, cultural and economic life. Efforts to increase literacy among women and girls would be intensified, especially in countries where less than 20 per cent of the women were literate. Additional measures would focus on post-literacy follow-up programmes to enhance the civic awareness of women and their opportunities for employment. A number of activities associated with the international literacy year would deal specifically with women. Greater attention was also being given to increasing women's participation in higher education.

71. UNESCO would give priority to promoting awareness of women's role in the management of national resources and other environmental issues. Activities would also focus on increasing the participation of women in cultural development. In view of the different needs and interests of men and women, it was necessary to undertake studies of their socio-cultural perspectives with respect to development activities. In the field of communication, priority would be given to various

(Mrs. Skowron-Olszowska, UNESCO)

professional fields, especially those from which women had traditionally been excluded. UNESCO programmes for women would promote the production of endogenous materials and alternative media produced by and for women. Finally, UNESCO's draft programme and budget for 1990-1991 provided for a number of activities specifically related to the implementation of the Declaration on the Participation of Women in Promoting International Peace and Co-operation.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.