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The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 95: PREPARATION AND ORGANIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL LITERACY YEAR (continued) (A/44/409-S/20743 and Corr.1 and 2)


AGENDA ITEM 108: ADOPTION OF A CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD (continued) (A/44/240, A/44/305, A/44/393, A/44/616; A/C.3/44/7)


AGENDA ITEM 115: PREPARATION OF AN INSTRUMENT ON HUMAN RIGHTS BASED ON SOLIDARITY (continued) (A/44/409-S/20743 and Corr.1 and 2, A/44/551, A/44/706)

1. **Miss CASTAÑO** (Colombia), speaking on agenda item 108, said that the draft Convention on the Rights of the Child was ready for adoption. In monitoring the implementation of the Convention, due account should be taken of the differences between developed and developing countries. The latter were undergoing a dynamic development process and experiencing social, economic and political changes. They sought to improve the situation of children who were victims, directly or indirectly, of poverty, economic dependence, an unjust economic order and the consequences of the international traffic in arms and narcotic drugs. In those countries, the problems of children had structural economic and social causes. The Family Welfare Institute of Colombia had drawn up a code on minors, which would be brought into line with the provisions of the Convention when it entered into force.

2. **Mr. TANASA** (Romania), speaking on agenda item 107, said that in an era when science and technology influenced all aspects of human existence, his delegation was deeply concerned about the danger posed by the arms race and the accumulation of huge stockpiles of weapons. Romanian scientists, conscious of their
responsibility for the future of mankind, had always vigorously supported the use of science and technology to improve the human condition. Science and technology must be used to eliminate the gap between rich and poor countries, solve the problems of underdevelopment, halt the spread of disease and protect the environment. Scientists must focus their efforts on discovering new sources of energy and raw materials and solve problems relating to food, health and water supply, which were of major importance for the observance of fundamental human rights. They must help people to replenish the universal treasury of knowledge and advance the cause of peace, progress and friendship. A national committee had been established in Romania to promote the use of science and technology for the welfare of the whole population.

3. Mr. DE AZAMBUJA (Brazil), referring to agenda item 112, said that Brazil had recently ratified the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, demonstrating its respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Under the Brazilian Constitution, no one could be subjected to torture or inhuman treatment. Torture was among the crimes which were not subject to amnesty. In view of the autonomous budget of the Committee against Torture, the States parties to the Convention had to bear a financial burden which was particularly onerous for developing countries. A session of that Committee had already been postponed owing to lack of funds. It would be unfortunate if reluctance to assume that burden delayed universal accession to the Convention.

4. Mr. SZELEI (Hungary), speaking on agenda items 98 and 106, said that the United Nations had achieved important results in promoting respect for human rights. Hungary was a party to the International Covenants on Human Rights and supported universal accession to those instruments. Hungarian society was in the midst of a profound democratic renewal driven by major reforms in his country's political, social and economic life. The Government had taken steps to bring national laws fully into line with its international obligations. Hungary had taken a number of far-reaching measures to establish a parliamentary democracy in a pluralist society, where human rights and fundamental freedoms were respected in accordance with universally accepted standards.

5. In its foreign policy, Hungary recognized that human rights were based on universal values and were essential for international security. The international community had the right and duty to call upon States to fulfil the obligations they had voluntarily undertaken in that regard. The observance of human rights in an interdependent world could not be considered an exclusively internal affair since violations might directly affect international security.

6. Hungary had recently joined those countries which recognized all United Nations human rights bodies competent to receive communications from States and individuals under the established monitoring system. It stood ready to be judged and rightfully expected others to do likewise.
7. His Government was seriously concerned about the persistence of discrimination on grounds of religion or belief in many parts of the world. Under such instruments as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, States had the obligation to eliminate all forms of intolerance and discrimination based on religion. There had been a number of cases where religious leaders had been threatened as a matter of official government policy. International action should be taken to put an end to those violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

8. Churches were a major factor in efforts to promote universal human values and democracy. In a joint undertaking with church representatives, the Hungarian Government was drafting a law on freedom of conscience and religion. Hungary was also about to undertake formal negotiations to re-establish diplomatic relations with the Holy See. It welcomed the proposal made at the current session of the General Assembly for a review of earlier United Nations resolutions on religious intolerance with a view to rectifying missions or strengthening assertions of the need to promote freedom of belief and worship.

9. Mr. STOLTENBERG (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries on agenda item 108, said that the draft Convention on the Rights of the Child covered the basic rights of the child and recognized the need for special protection for certain categories of children.

10. The international community was united in supporting measures to protect children in view of their special needs. Furthermore, human rights provisions relating specifically to children were scattered over a range of treaties and international instruments. The draft Convention consolidated those provisions in a single document establishing new standards for child protection and recognizing that children had inalienable rights.

11. One of the most important features of the draft Convention was that it recognized the child as an independent individual. The Nordic countries noted with satisfaction that it contained undertakings to prevent abuses such as economic and sexual exploitation, and sale of and traffic in children. They also welcomed the provisions aimed at ensuring enjoyment of the highest attainable standards of health and facilities for the treatment of illness and were pleased to note the improvement in the provisions concerning protection of children in penal matters.

12. The Nordic countries attached special importance to the protection of children in armed conflict and were disturbed at reports of children being killed in armed conflicts or disabled physically and mentally. It was regrettable that article 38 of the draft Convention did not deal adequately with those concerns and, in fact, represented no progress at all. The convention should offer children better protection than that offered by existing instruments and should be interpreted as a reinforcement of existing standards. In that connection he referred to the unambiguous provision in article 41 to the effect that nothing in the Convention should affect any provision in national or international law which established higher standards than those defined in the Convention.
13. The Nordic countries were also disturbed by the number of delegations in the Working Group that had made reservations concerning certain articles. They would find a Convention based on the lowest common denominator of national legislation unacceptable. It was essential for the Convention to represent progress and to obligate every State to review its legislation and practices before it could ratify it.

14. The Nordic countries welcomed the provisions concerning implementation of the draft Convention and the role of the Committee on the Rights of the Child in co-ordinating international action. They attached great importance to the role of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and other United Nations organisations, whose technical advice and assistance were essential for States parties having the will but lacking the resources for implementation. The role of non-governmental organisations had also been recognised. In the context of article 42, which provided that States Parties should make the principles and provisions of the Convention widely known, the Convention could be seen as a new and powerful tool for disseminating and promoting the concept and understanding of human rights.

15. It was important that financial considerations should not prevent countries from acceding to the Convention and that lack of financial resources should not hamper the functioning of the Committee on the Rights of the Child. The Nordic countries considered that the costs of the Committee should be borne by the regular budget of the United Nations.

16. Mrs. LIZIN (Belgium) said that Belgium was especially interested in the problem of children with parents of different nationalities, particularly where the parents were separated. Kidnapping, for example, was an act of violence against parent - often the mother - and child. In that connection, the anticipated opening of frontiers in the European Community in 1992 was important. Each member State of the European Community had its own legislation on the right to custody and visitation of children, and with parents in different countries children were often brutally deprived of regular contact with one or the other parent. It was essential, when the frontiers were opened, to maintain the fundamental right of every child to have regular contact with both its parents and with the other members of its family.

17. The subject of child custody was dealt with not only in the draft Convention but also in two existing multilateral instruments: the European Convention of Luxembourg of 20 May 1989 concerning custody of children and the Hague Convention of 25 October 1980 on international kidnapping. She urged speedy ratification of those Conventions.

18. At a time when the European Community was pursuing policies protecting the freedom of movement of persons, it was paradoxical that the children of parents in different countries could not move freely. Belgium therefore proposed the establishment of a body to act as ombudsman in dealing with such problems by negotiating with parents. She welcomed the provisions of article 9 of the draft Convention.
19. Mrs. MARGAZI (Morocco), referring to agenda item 98, said that for a number of years her delegation had refrained from voting against a draft resolution advocating an optional protocol on the abolition of the death penalty, but was now faced with a draft protocol which entailed an implicit decision on the question, even though some delegations insisted that it concerned only countries that had abolished the death penalty. She did not wish to open a debate on a controversial subject, but protection of the lives of the victims of crime was a human right, and any decision that would weaken that protection should be based on their agreement. It was interesting to learn that, according to Canadian television and the Belfast Telegraph, prisoners in Canada and in the United Kingdom had admitted that if they had known that they would be subject to capital punishment they would never have killed.

20. In Morocco capital punishment was limited to exceptionally serious offences, and there was always the possibility of a royal pardon. As Amnesty International had pointed out, although the death penalty was retained in Moroccan law, it had never been carried out.

21. Speaking on agenda item 108, she recalled that in 1946 the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) had been made responsible for children and adolescents who were the victims of aggression, and its mandate and activities had been strengthened when the General Assembly recognized the immensity of children’s sufferings, particularly in the developing countries and in countries ravaged by war and other scourges. It was thanks to UNICEF, the International Labour Organisation and numerous international non-governmental organizations that the world had come to realize the conditions to which millions of young children were subjected - economic exploitation, debt bondage, international traffic in persons, prostitution, torture, violence and delinquency, a life of poverty and abandonment by their parents. The physical and psychological health of millions of girls were threatened by traditional practices which Governments should do everything possible to eliminate.

22. The tragic situation of children had led the international community to adopt a Declaration on the Rights of the Child in 1959. It had taken 10 years of study, negotiation, thought and compromise to produce the draft Convention now before the Committee. The Moroccan delegation in Geneva had played an active part in the Working Group, contributing to the adoption of the draft Convention by consensus in the Commission on Human Rights.

AGENDA ITEM 90: WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.13

23. The CHAIRMAN announced that the draft resolution had no implications for the programme budget and that Costa Rica had joined the sponsors.

24. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.13 was adopted without a vote.
Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.14

25. **The CHAIRMAN** said that the draft resolution had no implications for the programme budget.

26. Mr. **JOHN** (German Democratic Republic) proposed the following amendments after consultation with the other sponsors of the draft resolution: operative paragraph 4 and the word "Also" at the beginning of operative paragraph 5 should be deleted.

27. **Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.14, as amended, was adopted without a vote.**

28. Mr. **WALDROP** (United States of America) said that the United States did not object to the Committee's adoption of the draft resolution without a vote but wished to place on record its reservations about its conceptual limitations and inappropriate focus. In free societies, most scientific and technological developments resulted from the endeavours of private individuals and were not the province of the State. It was not for Governments to channel or restrict them. The major barriers to co-operation in the scientific community were the laws and regulations of many countries which prohibited their citizens from exchanging ideas and information. Respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of individuals was an essential condition for improving international co-operation in the field of science and technology.

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.16

29. **The CHAIRMAN** said that the draft resolution had no implications for the programme budget.

30. **Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.16 was adopted without a vote.**

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.24

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

32. **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.24.**

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's...
Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali,
Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar,
Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea,
Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint
Lucia, Saudi Arabia, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire,
Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France,
Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel,
Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal,
Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland.

33. The draft resolution was adopted by 114 votes to 1 with 22 abstentions.

34. Mr. BRETHES (France), speaking on behalf of the 12 member States of the
European Economic Community, in explanation of their vote, said that they
understood the reasons for the draft resolution and were especially aware of the
links between social and economic problems. They had been unable to support the
draft resolution, however, because some of its provisions, in particular those in
operative paragraphs 9 and 13, would deprive the Centre for Social Development and
Humanitarian Affairs of some of its fundamental prerogatives. They reaffirmed the
importance they attached to maintaining the Centre's social activities intact.
They also considered that the draft resolution called for presentation of the
report at too frequent intervals. For all those reasons, they had abstained in the
vote.

35. Mrs. BANGOURA (Guinea) said that she had supported the draft resolution but
her vote had failed to be recorded.

36. Mrs. SAULLE (Italy) said that her delegation's vote had not been recorded. It
had abstained in the vote.

37. Mrs. ARUNGU-OLENDE (Kenya), Mrs. VARGAS (Nicaragua), Mr. KOUNKOU (Congo),
Mrs. CASTRO de BARSIS (Costa Rica) and Mr. MALAGA (Peru) said that they had been
absent during the vote but that had they been present they would have voted for the
draft resolution.

38. Mr. ITO (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote.
Paragraphs 4 and 5 were extraneous because they introduced, and placed too much
stress on, economic issues, which could result in a duplication of effort in the
Second and Third Committees.
39. Paragraphs 9, 10 and 13 were unacceptable because it was unwise to have the Secretary-General prepare the report after such a short interval. He was also concerned over the lack of co-ordination between the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs and the United Nations Office at Geneva, which he wanted to see strengthened.

40. Ms. COOMBE (New Zealand) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote because although it recognized the strong link between economic and social issues, it felt that a single report could not cover both.

41. Ms. MERCHANT (Norway), speaking for Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway, said that those delegations had abstained in the vote because although they understood the link between economic and social development, they were opposed to establishing a linkage between economic growth and social progress and felt that social problems should not be lumped together in a single report. They therefore felt that the request for additional chapters was inappropriate, and stressed the need to have the report circulated promptly.

42. Miss LA FORTUNE (Canada) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote because the resolution implicitly understated the importance of the social situation. The report should include social indicators, but the method prescribed in Economic and Social Council resolution 1989/72 was the wrong one. It was also essential to take into account the multidimensional nature of the social situation.

AGENDA ITEM 91: TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF THE DECLARATION ON SOCIAL PROGRESS AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.4

43. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.4 had no financial implications.

44. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.4 was adopted without a vote.

45. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the Declaration on Social Progress and Development in document A/44/116/Add.1-E/1989/15/Add.1.

46. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 92: NATIONAL EXPERIENCE IN ACHIEVING FAR-REACHING SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGES FOR THE PURPOSE OF SOCIAL PROGRESS (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.23

47. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.23 had no financial implications.
48. Mr. ERDENECHULJUN (Mongolia) said that paragraph 5 had been amended to read "... The question entitled 'Co-operatives and new trends in socio-economic development' as a sub-item under the item National experience in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for the purpose of social progress" at its forty-seventh session.

49. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.23, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.

50. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly take note of the report of the Secretary-General on national experience in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for the purpose of social progress in document A/44/86-E/1989/14.

51. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 93: POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES INVOLVING YOUTH (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.17

52. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.17 had no financial implications and that paragraph 17 had been amended with the addition, at the end of the sentence, of the words "on the implementation of this resolution".

53. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.17, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.

AGENDA ITEM 97: INTERREGIONAL CONSULTATION ON DEVELOPMENTAL SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.5

54. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.5 had no financial implications.

55. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.5 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.21

56. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.21 had no financial implications and that El Salvador, Malaysia, Thailand and Costa Rica had become co-sponsors.

57. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.21 was adopted without a vote.

58. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly take note of the Secretary-General's note transmitting the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Report on the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia" in document A/44/206-E/1989/69, and his note presenting his
AGENDA ITEM 99: QUESTION OF AGING (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.15/Rev.1

60. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.15/Rev.1 had no financial implications.

61. Mrs. TAVARES DE ALVAREZ (Dominican Republic) said that paragraph 4 had been amended to read "... considered as a priority theme" and that paragraph 14 had been amended to read "... national aging populations".

62. Mr. AL-SABEEH (Kuwait), speaking on behalf of the Arab Group, proposed that paragraph 12 should be amended to include, after "United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees", the words "and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)".

63. Mr. BEN-JOHANAN (Israel) inquired whether the sponsors agreed to the Kuwaiti amendment, which injected irrelevant political considerations into the draft resolution.

64. Mrs. TAVARES DE ALVAREZ (Dominican Republic) said that the sponsors would need time to study that amendment.

65. The CHAIRMAN suggested that consideration of the draft resolution should be deferred to give the sponsors an opportunity to agree on its wording.

66. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 101: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD PROGRAMME OF ACTION CONCERNING DISABLED PERSONS AND THE UNITED NATIONS DECADE OF DISABLED PERSONS (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.20

67. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.20 had no financial implications and that El Salvador, Iceland, the United States and Samoa had become sponsors.

68. Paragraph 13 had been amended to read "... and non-governmental organizations, specially disabled persons' organizations, to assist in a global information and fund-raising campaign, to publicize the Decade through all appropriate means".

69. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.20, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.
AGENDA ITEM 102: CRIME PREVENTION AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.19

70. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.19 had no financial implications and that El Salvador, Denmark, Trinidad and Tobago, Greece, Costa Rica, Turkey and Morocco had become co-sponsors.

71. Paragraph 1 had been amended to add the words "through the Economic and Social Council" after the word "Control".

72. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.19, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.22

73. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.22 had no financial implications and that Samoa had become a co-sponsor.

74. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.22 was adopted without a vote.

AGENDA ITEM 113: FAMILIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.18

75. The CHAIRMAN said that El Salvador, Myanmar and Suriname had become co-sponsors of the draft resolution, which had no programme budget implications.

76. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.18 was adopted without a vote.

77. Ms. BOS (Netherlands), speaking in explanation of vote, said that while it recognized the family as the basic unit of society, her Government also recognized the diversity of family structures within and between societies. As a result, policy in the Netherlands was geared towards strengthening the family and comparable social units. Family structures, traditions and values differed so markedly throughout the world that it seemed unlikely that international meetings could produce measures promoting family life that would be widely applicable. Furthermore, her delegation was concerned that a debate at the international level might become value-laden and might even be used to promote discrimination against non-traditional households. Her Government would therefore like to see co-operation on family issues carried out at the regional level, as was being done currently and it endorsed the recommendation of the Secretary-General that activities connected with the international year of the family should be encouraged primarily at the local and national levels.

78. In industrialized countries, discussions concerning family life centred on issues such as family law, the elderly, equality between the sexes and single-parent households. In contrast, the developing countries were confronted with a very different set of issues concerning the family, such as health, nutrition, and the eradication of poverty. It was unfortunate that those differences had not been recognized in the resolution.
79. Mr. DUHS (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that while they had joined the consensus, the Nordic countries had some doubts about the celebration of an international year of the family. In general, they questioned the value of international years, believing that the effort and costs involved were often greater than the achievements. It was best to avoid proclaiming too many international years and those that were observed should be celebrated within the context of concrete, long-term plans of action. For example, it was vital that the programme of the international year of the family should contain measures aimed at achieving equality between men and women.

80. Mr. STUART (Australia) said that his delegation understood that the international year of the family would be based on tolerance for the diversity of social experience. In that connection, the consensus achieved on the resolution reflected the general view that it would be inappropriate to adopt a restrictive interpretation of the family in relation to the international year. That year would provide an opportunity to build on progress achieved in all areas of social development, in particular the advancement of women.

81. Ms. COOMBES (New Zealand) said that New Zealand would be glad to contribute to preparations for the international year of the family, an occasion that would address the needs of all families, whatever their nature. Although it had not been highlighted in the resolution, one of the basic principles set forth in the Secretary-General's report (A/44/407) was that families assumed diverse forms and functions.

AGENDA ITEM 99: QUESTION OF AGING (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.15/Rev.1

82. The CHAIRMAN said that he had just been informed that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.15/Rev.1 were in the process of working out a compromise text. It had been proposed that the meeting should be suspended for a brief period to allow them to complete their work. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee members agreed to that proposal.

83. It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 12.35 p.m. and resumed at 12.40 p.m.

84. Mrs. TAVARES DE ALVAREZ (Dominican Republic) said that after consultations, agreement had been reached on the following changes in the text: in operative paragraph 12, the words "and all other relevant agencies of the United Nations system" should be inserted after the words "the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees" and, in that same paragraph, the word "all" should be inserted after the words "to the plight of".

85. Miss AIOUAZE (Algeria) said that the wording just read out did not reflect the compromise agreed upon. Her delegation had understood that operative paragraph 12 would be of a general character and would not mention any specific agencies.
86. **Mrs. TAVARES DE ALVARES** (Dominican Republic) said that, taking those remarks into account, paragraph 12, in its entirety, would read: "Urge all relevant United Nations agencies dealing with refugees to pay special attention to the plight of all elderly refugees".

87. **Mrs. KABA** (Côte d'Ivoire) said that her delegation wished to become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution.

88. **Mr. WALDROP** (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, recalled that in introducing the draft resolution, the original sponsors had requested that the sponsorship should be limited. Under the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, such a request was binding, thereby precluding the addition of new co-sponsors.

89. **Mrs. TAVARES DE ALVARES** (Dominican Republic) confirmed the point made by the representative of the United States.

90. **Mr. BORG OLIVIER** (Malta) said that the three original sponsors had decided to limit the co-sponsorship to avoid politicizing the issue.

91. **Mrs. KABA** (Côte d'Ivoire), withdrawing her request to become a co-sponsor, deplored the absence of any African countries among the sponsors because the question of aging was increasingly of interest to the African region.

92. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.15/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.

93. **Mr. BEN-YOHANAN** (Israel) said that he wished to draw the Committee's attention to the attempt on the part of Arab delegations to politicize the deliberations. The question of aging was of universal importance and should not be used for political purposes.

94. **Mrs. MBELLA** (Cameroon) said that her delegation agreed fully with the objections raised to the manner in which the resolution had been politicized. Some delegations which had co-sponsored a similar resolution in 1988 had originally wanted to become sponsors of the resolution just adopted. During the informal consultations, those delegations had been informed that they could co-sponsor the draft resolution from the floor. She was therefore surprised that they had been excluded. Nevertheless, owing to the importance of the issue, her delegation had decided not to block the consensus.

95. **Mrs. WARZAZI** (Morocco) said that it was somewhat shocking to be accused of politicizing the draft resolution simply by virtue of having added the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) to paragraph 12. In the opinion of her delegation, the omission of any mention of that agency in the resolution was, in itself, a political decision.

*The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.*