

lutions. In the case of draft resolution A/SPC/L.331, his delegation disagreed with, or had reservations concerning, five preambular and nine operative paragraphs. Both in tone and in content, the draft resolution was contrary to the approach adopted by the Canadian Government, and his delegation had therefore been compelled to vote against it. He drew the attention of the Committee to the full account of the Government's policy on *apartheid* contained in the earlier statement by his delegation during the general debate on agenda item 53 (963rd meeting).

25. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic had requested him to announce that the Syrian delegation would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.331 had it been present at the time of the vote.

26. Mr. BUX (Bangladesh) said that his delegation, too, would have voted for the draft resolution had it been present.

27. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) to address the Committee.

28. Mr. SIBEKO (Observer, Pan Africanist Congress of Azania), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, expressed the gratitude of PAC and the people of Azania to those countries which had voted in favour of the very crucial draft resolution on the situation in South Africa which had just been adopted. He regretted that a number of countries which had until now been closely identified with the struggle against *apartheid* had not voted in favour of the draft resolution. He regarded as fallacious the arguments which they advanced to justify their position. To those who invoked the principle of universality, he pointed out that

universality would best be served by putting an end to the illegal rule of the white minority in South Africa. The argument that contacts should be maintained with South Africa in order to promote peaceful change was hopelessly idealistic. The enactment, year after year, of ever more repressive legislation by the South African Fascist régime led to the conclusion that contacts merely served to embolden the régime. That conclusion was also borne out by the statements of the South African Prime Minister to the effect that South Africa was far too important to the Western countries for them ever to support any punitive action against it.

29. As to the argument that the situation in South Africa did not constitute a threat to international peace and security, he pointed out that South African troops were at present deployed in Zimbabwe and were occupying parts of Angola under the pretext that South Africa had the right to pursue African freedom fighters across the border into neighbouring countries. Should the Government of Angola, after independence was attained, attempt to expel the South African troops from its territory, war would inevitably ensue. The battle lines were drawn in southern Africa, and support had been pledged to the African liberation movements from many quarters. He therefore appealed to those delegations which had not voted in favour of the draft resolution to reconsider their positions and to recognize that the time had come to take exceptionally firm action against the South African régime.

30. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegations of Cuba, Mauritania, Morocco and Oman had become sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.332.

The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.

973rd meeting

Thursday, 6 November 1975, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roberto MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras).

A/SPC/SR.973

AGENDA ITEM 53

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (concluded) (A/10050-S/11638, A/10052-S/11641, A/10103-S/11708, A/SPC/174, A/SPC/L.332, A/SPC/L.333):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* (A/10022);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/10281)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded) (A/SPC/L.332, A/SPC/L.333)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegations of Egypt, Iraq, Mauritius, Qatar and Tunisia had become sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.332; he drew the

attention of the Committee to the note by the Secretary-General (A/SPC/L.333), which set out the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution.

2. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) expressed the gratitude of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* to the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania for his kind words in introducing the draft resolution on its programme of work at the preceding meeting of the Committee. He also thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution and the many delegations which had commended the work of the Special Committee. He then read out the text of a telegram addressed to the Secretary-General by Mr. Oliver Tambo, Acting President-General of the African National Congress of South Africa, which stated that the victims and genuine opponents of South Africa's inhuman

policies warmly acclaimed draft resolution A/SPC/L.327, adopted by the Committee at its 969th meeting, rejecting the "bantustans" and the so-called "independence" of the Transkei and that the Committee's decision justified the faith of the vast majority of the world's peoples in the United Nations as a promoter of just causes and a defender of human rights.

3. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/SPC/L.332 by consensus in view of the absence of facilities for mechanical voting in the conference room.

4. Mr. VON UTHMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had received instructions not to join in a consensus on draft resolution A/SPC/L.332.

5. Miss BENNATON (Honduras) suggested that, in the absence of mechanical means of voting, the Committee should proceed to a roll-call vote on the draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the draft resolution.

Senegal, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, 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, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Barbados, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands.

The draft resolution was adopted by 98 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

6. Mr. YANG Ming-liang (China) said that his delegation had consistently supported the concerted efforts of the international community to expose the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa and it accordingly agreed in principle with draft resolution A/SPC/L.332. His delegation had, however, outlined its position of principle regarding the World Peace Council at the 951st meeting of

the Committee and did not believe that the Special Committee against *Apartheid* should have any relations with that body.

7. Mr. VON UTHMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) expressed the regret of his delegation at not having been able to vote in favour of the draft resolution. While the wording of the text was more moderate than the resolution on the same subject adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session (resolution 3324 D (XXIX)), his delegation none the less had difficulties with the language used in the fourth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 1 (a). In the view of his delegation, the struggle against *apartheid* was unrelated to the process of decolonization and a distinction should therefore be drawn between them in the draft resolution. His delegation's main objections were to operative paragraphs 1 (c) and 3. His delegation did not feel that the holding of a seminar, which was to take place in Havana, to formulate a co-ordinated strategy of action against economic collaboration with South Africa was an appropriate means of helping the oppressed population of South Africa. The character and outcome of that seminar, the estimated cost of which, according to the administrative and financial implications in document A/SPC/L.333, would be about \$100,000, was easily predictable and in view of the scarcity of resources for other activities his delegation felt that the amount involved might be better used for another purpose. As his delegation had already stated at the 961st meeting, during the general debate on *apartheid*, the struggle against *apartheid* was a matter of concern to all, not only to Africans, and confrontation between African and Western European countries over the path to follow in striving for the elimination of *apartheid* would only serve the purposes of the Pretoria Government.

8. Mr. SERUP (Denmark) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to give expression once again to its support for the struggle against *apartheid*. Nevertheless, his delegation had reservations regarding operative paragraph 1 (c) because it believed that that struggle should be directed against the Government of South Africa and not against countries which, like his own, maintained consular relations with South Africa that in no way implied approval of its policies of *apartheid*.

9. Mr. KAMOSHIDA (Japan) said that his delegation had an abiding respect for the work carried out by the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to demonstrate support for the basic goals set out in that text. Nevertheless, his delegation had difficulties with the fourth preambular paragraph and with operative paragraphs 1 (a) and 1 (d).

10. Mr. VROON (Netherlands) said that his delegation sincerely regretted not having been able to vote in favour of the draft resolution, particularly because it was less controversial than the resolution adopted the previous year on the same subject (General Assembly resolution 3324 D (XXIX)). In the view of his delegation the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 (a) might be suitable when dealing with a colonial situation but were not appropriate to the situation in South Africa. Furthermore, his delegation could not support operative paragraph 1 (c) because it did not believe that the severing of all ties with

South Africa would contribute to the eradication of *apartheid*. His delegation hoped that a common effort would be made by all Member States the following year to reach a consensus on the Committee's draft resolutions on *apartheid* so as to underline the universal opposition to that inhuman policy.

11. Mr. CRAIG (Ireland) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in accordance with its strongly held view that the United Nations had a particular role to play in the campaign against *apartheid* by making the world aware of the evils of that system. However, his delegation had reservations regarding operative paragraphs 1 (a) and 1 (c) and also regarding the proposal contained in paragraphs 223 and 224 of the report of the Special Committee (A/10022). As his delegation had stated on previous occasions, the struggle against *apartheid* must be conducted in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and contacts with the Government and white community of South Africa should be used to convey to them the views of the international community. Finally, his delegation would have preferred to see a clearer distinction drawn between the situation in South Africa and a classic colonial situation.

12. Mr. WHISTLER (United States of America) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because of its reservations concerning the language of several operative paragraphs. In particular, paragraphs 1 (c) and 3 might lend themselves to arbitrary interpretations and misuse. His delegation also had misgivings about language in the draft resolution which seemed to condone the use of violence against the South African régime.

13. Mr. BRIGHTY (United Kingdom) said that the draft resolution would have been acceptable to his delegation had the text not posed certain familiar problems. Specifically, it contained language which could suitably be applied to a colonial situation, but not to the situation in South Africa. Moreover, his delegation had doubts whether the apparent call for a campaign against trade with South Africa in operative paragraph 1 (c) was appropriate in a draft resolution whose main purpose was to promote publicity about the practice of *apartheid*. The projected increase in expenditures which the programme of work would entail was a large one in view of the scarcity of funds available for other worth-while purposes. Finally, his delegation hoped that the Committee would be able to reach a consensus on the draft resolutions it adopted on *apartheid* the following year.

14. Mr. SCARANTINO (Italy) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because of its firm opposition to *apartheid* and its desire to manifest its understanding for the feelings and aspirations of the non-white population of South Africa. It had done so despite the fact that it had certain difficulties with the wording of the draft resolution, because it wished to underline its agreement with the philosophy which underlay the work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. Nevertheless, his delegation continued to believe that the struggle against *apartheid* would be best served by focusing attention on *apartheid* itself and not on issues which had, at times improperly, been considered in connexion with it. His delegation also regretted that the Special Committee had on occasion shown a lack of objectivity by overemphasizing the contacts of certain Western countries with South Africa, and he hoped that the Special Committee and the Unit on *Apartheid* would bear that in mind in 1976 when they organized the seminar and campaigns envisaged in operative paragraphs 1 (c) and 3. His delegation was concerned at the financial implications of the proposed international seminar and also had reservations regarding the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 (a) because of their wording. It would have preferred to see the draft resolution make a clear distinction between the situation in South Africa and a typical colonial situation and recognize that the campaign against *apartheid* should be conducted in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

15. Mr. DUCLOS (Canada) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because it recognized the value of the work performed by the Special Committee in drawing the attention of the international community to the inherent injustices of *apartheid*. It had reservations, however, regarding the concept of "collaboration" contained in operative paragraph 1 (c). Canada traded in non-military goods with all countries in the world without regard for political considerations and did not consider such trade to be a form of "collaboration".

16. The CHAIRMAN said that the representatives of Czechoslovakia and Haiti had requested him to announce that, had they been present during the vote, they would have voted in favour of the draft resolution. He then stated that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of item 53.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.