



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 72nd MEETING

Chairman: Mrs. SHAHANI (Philippines)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 75: DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN  
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 76: NATIONAL EXPERIENCE IN ACHIEVING FAR-REACHING SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC  
CHANGES FOR THE PURPOSE OF SOCIAL PROGRESS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL  
(continued).

AGENDA ITEM 80: IMPORTANCE OF THE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF NATIONAL INCOME FOR  
ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 79: PRESERVATION AND FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURAL VALUES (continued)

OTHER MATTERS

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3508.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 75: DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (continued) (A/C.3/33/L.47 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/33/L.81)

1. Miss DJURIČKOVIĆ (Yugoslavia), speaking as Rapporteur of the Working Group of the Whole on the Drafting of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, said that at its 1st meeting, on 29 September 1978, the Working Group had decided first of all to consider the sections of the draft Convention whose redrafting had not been completed at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, namely, section III, concerning social and economic rights, section IV, on civil and family rights, and section V, containing the final provisions and an additional article on reservations.
2. At the current session, the Working Group had adopted sections III and IV. Consideration of the substantive provisions had thus been concluded. All the articles had been adopted by consensus, and reservations or objections were reflected in the report.
3. Because of lack of time the Working Group had been unable to consider the final provisions or to review the paragraphs on which work had not been completed at the thirty-second session. It had, however, adopted article 1, in the section containing the general provisions, which had been left open at the previous session.
4. The report (A/C.3/33/L.47 and Add.1) contained all the proposals, written or oral, and some of the views on the final wording of the text adopted. It had not, however, been possible to include all the discussions that had taken place.
5. She thanked the many members of the Third Committee who had actively participated in the deliberations of the Working Group in a spirit of co-operation and understanding.
6. The text of the Convention, which the entire Working Group had tried to improve, would help to ensure equality between the sexes. There had been a general feeling that the Convention should promote the status of both men and women, and thus contribute to the over-all development and progress of society. It should, therefore, be drafted in such a way as to permit universal application.
7. The Working Group would like work on the draft Convention to be continued at the next session of the General Assembly, and it hoped that the members of the Third Committee would draw their Governments' attention to its work.
8. The CHAIRMAN thanked the Chairman of the Working Group, the Rapporteur and the secretariat.

9. Mr. PEDERSEN (Denmark) said that his delegation wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.81.
10. Mrs. ZOURABICHVILI (France) said that her delegation had consistently played an active part in the drafting of the text of the Convention, both in the Commission on the Status of Women and in the Working Group, and it hoped that the drafting would be completed before the World Conference in 1980. She thanked the Chairman of the Working Group, whose industry had facilitated the adoption of six basic articles.
11. Her delegation was co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.81.
12. Mr. MAKKI (Oman) pointed out that some essential substantive arguments, which had been advanced at the previous meeting of the Working Group on Saturday, 2 December, were not reflected in the report.
13. Mr. CABRERA (Spain) said that in present-day, democratic Spain women occupied just as important a place as men. Women's associations had been established throughout the country and were trying to eliminate any inequalities which might still remain.
14. His Government had established the post of Under-Secretary-General for the Status of Women and had, of course, appointed a woman to that post. Women were working in all professional fields and also participated in political life, in particular as members of parliament. The new legislation conformed to the draft Convention in all respects, and consequently his delegation had proposed no amendments to the draft.
15. Although differences between countries, in terms of legislation, culture, religion and other matters, were sometimes considerable, it had none the less been possible to achieve at least a provisional consensus on all the articles discussed by the Working Group. In that respect, his delegation wished to commend the efforts of certain delegations which had made it possible to achieve a satisfactory solution to certain problems connected with article 16.
16. His delegation was co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.81, and hoped that the Committee would adopt it by consensus.
17. Hrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) unreservedly supported draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.81, which her delegation wished to co-sponsor.
18. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.79, concerning the venue for the 1980 World Conference, her delegation welcomed both the cordial and fruitful talks held with the representative of Denmark and the solution which had been found.

19. The CHAIRMAN declared the general debate on agenda item 75 closed.
20. Mr. HERKEL (Federal Republic of Germany) asked when the document on the Seminar held in Geneva on national human rights machinery would be available.
21. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Secretary of the Committee) said that the document would be issued very shortly.
22. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the draft resolutions on the various agenda items should be considered, in the course of the next few meetings, in the following order: items 78 and 80; items 79 and 83; item 84; items 88 and 75. The draft resolutions on item 12 would be considered last.
23. Mrs. MATTESON (United States of America) requested that a recorded vote should be taken on each draft resolution.
24. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, she would take it that the proposal of the United States representative was accepted.
25. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 78: NATIONAL EXPERIENCE IN ACHIEVING FAR-REACHING SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGES FOR THE PURPOSE OF SOCIAL PROGRESS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/33/L.3, L.18, L.36 and L.65/Rev.1)

AGENDA ITEM 80: IMPORTANCE OF THE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF NATIONAL INCOME FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/33/L.23, L.25 and L.65/Rev.1)

26. Mrs. CHATER (Tunisia) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1, entitled "World social development", on behalf of the Group of 77. Section A of the draft resolution dealt with the social situation in general, with national experience in implementing large-scale social and economic change, and with the elaboration of the new development strategy. Section B was specifically concerned with the equitable distribution of national income. The sponsors of the draft resolution had sought to lay down guidelines to facilitate the preparatory work for the strategy. The world socio-economic situation was characterized by deteriorating economic conditions in the developing countries and the ever-increasing gap between developed and developing countries. It was impossible to bring about a real improvement in the living conditions of people in the developing countries without establishing a more equitable economic order. The draft resolution had been drawn up with those considerations in mind.

27. In its original form, draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65 had mentioned the "Preparatory Committee" for the new strategy, which had not yet been officially established; therefore in paragraphs 8 and 9 of section A of the revised text those words had been replaced by the phrase "the body entrusted with the preparation" of the strategy.

(Mrs. Chater, Tunisia)

28. She described the main provisions of the draft resolution. The resolution, which dealt in a balanced manner with agenda items 78 and 80, was supported by a very large number of delegations. She believed that the Committee's recommendations would receive more attention if they appeared in a single resolution. She therefore wished to appeal to the sponsors of documents A/C.3/33/L.23, L.25 and L.36 to withdraw them, and she hoped that draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1 would be adopted by consensus.

29. Mrs. GEREB (Hungary) said that in a spirit of co-operation the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.23 would not press for a vote on their resolution if draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.25 was withdrawn as well.

30. Her delegation was pleased to see that some ideas embodied in document A/C.3/33/L.23 had been incorporated in draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1, but regretted that other points had not been accepted. It was particularly unfortunate that it was precisely the provisions designed to strengthen the social aspect of the question of the just and equitable distribution of national income which had been rejected.

31. Her delegation was, however, sure that those aspects and provisions could be considered again in the near future, either by the Commission for Social Development or by the General Assembly.

32. Mr. MERKEL (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation regretted the fact that for want of time and because of the complexity of the decision-taking machinery in the Group of 77, it was very difficult to arrive at a consensus on a draft. Since the Second Committee had been unable to reach agreement on related issues, it was hard for the Third Committee to do so.

33. For reasons that were well known, his delegation had expressed reservations concerning section A of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1, and it felt that section B also did not serve the objectives sought.

34. Since there would be an opportunity to submit the ideas contained in draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.25 to the Commission for Social Development in February, the sponsors would not press for a vote on their resolution, provided that the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.3/33/L.23 and A/C.3/33/L.36 did likewise. Since certain questions had not been settled to his delegation's satisfaction, however, his delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1.

35. Mr. KEILAU (German Democratic Republic) introduced his delegation's draft amendment (A/C.3/33/L.18) to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/33/L.3. The amendment had been proposed because a great many delegations felt that the item it dealt with should be included in the agenda for the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. Document E/1978/15 also reflected that point of view.

(Mr. Keilau, German Democratic Republic)

36. He said that a slight change should be made in document A/C.3/33/L.18: in the first line of paragraph 10, the words "thirty-fifth" should be replaced by "thirty-sixth". It should be possible to adopt his delegation's draft amendment by consensus.

37. Mr. HARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) wished to express the appreciation of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.36 to the Tunisian delegation and to the members of the Group of 77 for the constructive consultations that had been held. He noted with satisfaction that several important provisions of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.36 had been reflected in draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1. In a spirit of co-operation the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.36 would not press for a vote on their text.

38. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom), referring to draft amendment A/C.3/33/L.18 and to draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1, suggested that, in order to facilitate the proceedings, the item for inclusion in the agenda should be reworded so as to cover both questions.

39. The CHAIRMAN took note of the suggestion made by the representative of the United Kingdom and said that it was for the Bureau to take a decision on the matter.

40. Mrs. GEREB (Hungary) said she was afraid that, if the United Kingdom suggestion was adopted, the social aspect of the question would receive less emphasis and she appealed to the United Kingdom delegation to withdraw the proposal.

41. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) proposed that the title of draft amendment A/C.3/33/L.18 should be replaced by the following title: "Social development questions".

42. Mr. HARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) supported draft amendment A/C.3/33/L.18 as it stood. His delegation agreed with the Hungarian delegation's view that the wording proposed by the United Kingdom delegation might make the title of the item very vague.

43. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) said that he had made his suggestion because draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1 covered both questions, which showed that they were closely related. However, since the Committee was on the verge of completing its work, his delegation would not insist that its suggestion become a formal amendment. As the Chairman had pointed out, the Bureau could make a ruling on the subject.

44. Mrs. BEAGLE (New Zealand) said that her delegation welcomed the initiative taken by the Group of 77 in submitting a draft resolution on world social development, because it believed that the Third Committee should contribute to the preparation of the new International Development Strategy. Indeed, each country must define an appropriate social development policy within the context of its development plans and priorities.



(Ms. Beagle, New Zealand)

45. Her delegation none the less regretted the fact that the shortage of time had made it impossible to continue the consultations on draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1 and that some delegations might therefore be forced to abstain. For its part, her delegation had submitted an amendment to the Group of 77 which had not been accommodated. So that it could vote for the draft resolution, her delegation would like at that stage to propose an amendment to the third line of paragraph 7 of section A, whereby the words "an appropriate social development policy" would be replaced by the words "an appropriate policy for the promotion of social development". The amendment conveyed the idea that each country was free to define its own policy within the context of its development plans and priorities.
46. Mr. KEILAU (German Democratic Republic) said he was surprised that, at that late stage in the proceedings, the United States delegation should introduce an amendment to draft amendment A/C.3/33/L.18, which had been issued on 1 November 1978.
47. He therefore appealed to the United States representative to withdraw his amendment.
48. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) withdrew his amendment but observed that he had confined his comments to draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.3.
49. Mrs. CHATER (Tunisia) requested a brief suspension of the meeting so that the Group of 77 could be consulted about the amendment proposed by the New Zealand delegation to draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1.
50. Mr. SOBHY (Egypt), supported by Mr. ELHOFARI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), thought that it would be impossible to hold consultations with the Group of 77, which included over 100 members, at such short notice. He therefore requested the New Zealand delegation to withdraw its amendment so as to facilitate the Committee's work.
51. Ms. BEAGLE (New Zealand) repeated that she had submitted a written amendment to the Group of 77 before its last meeting and regretted that it had not been taken into consideration. However, her delegation, wishing to show a spirit of conciliation, agreed to withdraw its amendment, whose purpose had been to improve the text of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1.
52. The CHAIRMAN put the amendment contained in document A/C.3/33/L.18 to the vote.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau,

Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

53. Amendment A/C.3/33/L.18 to draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.3 was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.

54. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) said that his delegation was prepared to join in a consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.3.

55. Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.3, as amended, was adopted by consensus.

56. The CHAIRMAN put draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1 to the vote.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique,



Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

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

57. The draft resolution was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

58. Miss GELBER (Canada) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1 in order to express its agreement in principle with the provisions of that draft. Her delegation, however, regretted the fact that the text dealt with problems on which negotiations were still being held and therefore wished to specify that its vote did not pre-empt the position Canada might take on those very important problems.

59. Ms. BEAGLE (New Zealand) said that in voting in favour of the draft resolution, her delegation had wished to express its support for social development policies and for the initiative of the Group of 77. It considered, however, that the draft resolution was not well balanced.

60. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) said that draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1 contained provisions formulated in wording which was unacceptable to the United States Government, particularly the wording concerning the right of States to sovereignty over their natural resources. The United States certainly recognized that right, but it believed that it should be exercised in accordance with the principles of international law. Furthermore, the references to the resolutions adopted at the sixth special session of the General Assembly on the new international economic order obliged the United States to reiterate its reservations concerning the resolutions adopted at that session. His delegation would have liked the sixth preambular paragraph to be worded in such a way as to express the idea that the objective of increasing the real national income of the developing countries and their social progress necessitated considerable development of the existing world economic system with a view to instituting a new international economic order. For those reasons, his delegation had decided to abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

61. Mr. LAVETT (Australia) said that his delegation had been in favour of the draft resolution, but would have liked to see the New Zealand amendment adopted. Australia's vote in favour of the draft resolution did not prejudge its position on related questions in the Second Committee.
62. Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that if her delegation had been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1 and would have joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.3, as amended.
63. Mrs. TAKAHASHI (Japan) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.65/Rev.1 because it believed that its adoption would help to promote the continued economic and social development of all countries. The Japanese Government understood the developing countries' wish to achieve constant social and economic progress with a view to improving the well-being of their people. Her delegation, however, was obliged to express reservations concerning paragraph 7 of the text because while it approved of the principles underlying the paragraph, it thought that it tended to prejudge the Second Committee's decisions on the new International Development Strategy.
64. Mr. MARASLI (Turkey) said that although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and endorsed certain points in the text, it regretted the lack of precision in some of its provisions, particularly in paragraph 7. In his delegation's view the new International Development Strategy should not only stress the need to define an appropriate social development policy but should go further, and link economic development with social development. Furthermore, the new strategy should formulate some guidelines for social development with a view to promoting the participation of the entire population in the production process.
- AGENDA ITEM 79: PRESERVATION AND FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURAL VALUES  
(continued) (A/C.3/33/L.24, A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1)
65. The CHAIRMAN announced that Mexico and the Sudan had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1.
66. Mr. RIOS (Panama) said that his country also wished to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1.
67. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) said that draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.24 had been slightly revised. The words "and of peoples" should be inserted after the words "of living conditions and the well being of nations" in the last preambular paragraph. Furthermore, Ecuador, Cameroon, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Guyana and Sweden had expressed a wish to co-sponsor the draft resolution.
68. Mr. SOBHY (Egypt) read out the complete list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1. He then called attention to the French version of that document which mentioned the Intergovernmental Committee established the previous week in UNESCO. The official title of that Committee was "Comité intergouvernemental pour la promotion du retour de biens culturels à leur pays d'origine ou de leur restitution en cas d'appropriation illégale". He accordingly invited the Secretariat to make the necessary change in the wording of that paragraph.

(Mr. Sobhy, Egypt)

69. His delegation hoped that draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1, whose sponsors represented all regions of the world, would be adopted by consensus.
70. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would make the necessary correction and announced that Bulgaria had asked to be included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.24.
71. Miss CARRION (Bolivia) said that her delegation wished to co-sponsor draft resolutions A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1 and A/C.3/33/L.24.
72. Mrs. HUDA (Bangladesh) said that her delegation wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1.
73. Mr. RAKOTOMAIVO (Madagascar) said that his delegation wished to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.24 and he stressed his country's interest in cultural development. The Malagasy Government had undertaken many measures for the preservation and further development of cultural values. It had, inter alia, established a Ministry of Revolutionary Art and Culture. It had enacted legislation to regulate the export of cultural property and had decided to make an index of cultural property and to include such property in the inventory of national assets. With a view to ensuring the further development of cultural values, his Government had taken the following measures: compilation of oral traditions, census of historical sites and monuments, establishment of museums, radio broadcasts on national customs, reorganization of folk groups, gradual establishment of libraries, studies on handicrafts and publications, in the national language, on basic features of the national culture. At the international level, Madagascar welcomed the efforts made by UNESCO and supported the report on cultural development. His delegation had no objections to draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1.
74. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) said that his delegation was co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1. However, he wished to call attention to a typographical error in the English text of the draft. He thought that the phrase "preservation and future development", which appeared in the subtitle of the resolution, should read "preservation and further development".
75. Mr. NTAKIBIRORA (Burundi) said that his delegation attached the utmost importance to cultural values and had launched a campaign to promote appreciation of the national heritage. His delegation was accordingly a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1.
76. Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his Government was making intensive efforts to preserve and develop Byelorussia's cultural values. For that reason, his delegation was co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.24.
77. Mr. SOBHY (Egypt), replying to a question from the Chairman, said that the representative of the Philippines had been quite correct in pointing out that the wording of the subtitle of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1 should be amended. In the English version, the word "future" in the second line of the subtitle should be replaced by the word "further".

78. Mr. MERKEL (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, in the opinion of the nine members of the European Economic Community, the subject dealt with in draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1 came within the purview of UNFSCO. At the twentieth session of the UNESCO General Conference, the members of the Community had joined in the consensus reached on the resolution approving the statutes of the Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation. They had hoped that the draft resolution to be adopted by the Third Committee would reflect the terms of the UNESCO Agreement. Such was not the case, however. The Nine had proposed some amendments to the draft resolution, but those amendments had not been accepted by all the sponsors. In the circumstances there could be no consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1, and his delegation would abstain in the vote on that document.

79. He also wished to state that his delegation had difficulty in acceding to the Convention mentioned in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution and, in addition, he pointed out that some of the sponsors had not ratified that Convention themselves.

80. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco), referring to the amendment to draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.24 proposed by the representative of Poland, calling for the insertion of the words "and of peoples" after the words "of living conditions and the well-being of nations" in the third line of the sixth preambular paragraph, pointed out that any mention of living conditions must necessarily refer to people. It would therefore be preferable to use the words "of living conditions and the well-being of peoples". If the representative of Poland was anxious to include the word "nations", it could come after the word "peoples".

81. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) said that he preferred the wording that he had proposed.

82. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that a question of priorities was involved. She wished the summary record to show that her delegation accorded priority to peoples, for it was peoples that made up nations, and not the reverse.

83. Miss BOA (Ivory Coast) associated herself with the remarks of the representative of Morocco.

84. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Secretary of the Committee) read out the list of countries now sponsoring draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.24. Those countries were: Bangladesh, Barbados, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Guatemala, Madagascar, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Republic of Cameroon, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago and Zaire.

85. The CHAIRMAN said she took it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.24 by consensus. If she heard no objection, she would consider that it was so decided.

86. Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.24 was adopted by consensus.

87. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America), explaining his delegation's position regarding draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.24, referred to the second preambular paragraph, in which the Assembly noted resolution 4.12 on preservation and presentation of the cultural heritage of mankind, adopted by the nineteenth UNESCO General Conference. His Government had disassociated itself from resolution 4.129, one of the resolutions included under that heading, because it dealt with Jerusalem and called for sanctions against another Member State. His country had consistently and vigorously opposed that resolution, and would continue to do so. With regard to the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.24, which referred to the new international economic order as envisaged in the Declaration and Programme of Action adopted during the sixth special session of the General Assembly and in the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, his delegation's position on those documents remained unchanged.

88. With regard to the report of the Director-General of UNESCO, referred to in the fourth preambular paragraph, his delegation gave high priority to activities that promoted appreciation of and respect for the cultural identity of individuals and peoples, and to projects that enabled the developing countries to develop and preserve their cultural heritage. His country had been one of the first to ratify the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, establishing the World Heritage Fund to help the signatory countries preserve and protect those cultural monuments and natural sites which were of unique significance for all mankind.

89. With regard to UNESCO's other activities, his delegation considered that, while they might have intrinsic merit, their implementation should be left to Member States or non-governmental organizations. UNESCO's energies and resources were better directed towards those cultural projects which it alone was capable of fulfilling.

90. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the following were co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1: Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Burundi, Ethiopia, Guyana, Honduras, Jordan, Mexico, Panama, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Sudan and Yemen.

91. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand,

/...



Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

92. Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1 was adopted by 116 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

93. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America), explaining his delegation's vote on the draft resolution just adopted, said that while his country supported the principle of the return of cultural property, it was opposed to any governmental obligation for restitution beyond the terms of the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. That Convention did not require Governments to take restituting action with respect to works of art entering a country prior to the effective date of the Convention for that country. The Convention should be the main vehicle for protecting cultural property and for facilitating its return. The United States judicial system offered redress to individuals or nations alleging that their property had been stolen and was located within the United States.

94. Mrs. BEN-AMI (Israel) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote because it had reservations of a legal nature about the draft resolution. Besides, the subject of the draft resolution had already been discussed by UNESCO at its twentieth session.

95. Mr. BEMPU (Zaire) said that he welcomed the adoption of draft resolutions A/C.3/33/L.24 and A/C.3/33/L.60/Rev.1. His delegation attached great importance to cultural values, and fully supported the restitution of cultural property to the countries familiar with the history of such property. Zaire had therefore co-sponsored the two draft resolutions and hoped that the measures they provided for would bear fruit.

96. The CHAIRMAN announced the closure of the debate on agenda item 79.



## OTHER MATTERS

97. The CHAIRMAN announced that United Kingdom had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.51, that Japan, Ireland and Ethiopia had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.81, that Ireland had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.59 and that Trinidad and Tobago had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.75.

98. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Secretary of the Committee) said that the President of the General Assembly had asked him to request all delegations wishing to transmit written statements from their Heads of State on agenda item 33 to submit them to the Assembly secretariat as soon as possible so that they could be published in the records of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.