

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1165th
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 6 November 1962,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 87:	
<i>The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued):</i>	
(a) Race conflict in South Africa;	
(b) Treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa	
Report of the Special Political Committee (continued)	677
Agenda item 77:	
<i>The urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests</i>	
Report of the First Committee	684
Organization of work	688

President: Mr. Muhammad ZAFRULLA KHAN
(Pakistan).

AGENDA ITEM 87

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued):

- (a) Race conflict in South Africa;
- (b) Treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/5276) (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of Colombia who wishes to make a statement on the voting.
2. Mr. VASQUEZ (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): On behalf of my delegation and expressing what I believe to be the wish of some other delegations, I would request a vote by division on two paragraphs of the draft resolution now before us, which is contained in document A/5276. The votes by division on these paragraphs would be as follows.
3. In paragraph 4, I should like a vote on the words "the following", and on sub-paragraphs (a) to (e). Thus, if those parts are not adopted, the paragraph would read:

"4. Requests Member States to take measures, separately or collectively, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, to bring about the abandonment of those policies."

My delegation would also like a vote by division on paragraph 8.

4. The PRESIDENT: The effect of the proposal made is that, in operative paragraph 4, which reads:

"4. Requests Member States to take the following measures"

a separate vote be taken on the words "the following". If these words remain, the paragraph will remain as it is; but if a separate vote is taken and these words are removed, then the first part of that paragraph would read as follows:

"4. Requests Member States to take measures, separately or collectively, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, to bring about the abandonment of those policies"

then follow sub-paragraphs (a) through (e).

5. If there is no objection to the proposal made, a separate vote will be taken on those two words.

6. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) (translated from French): With all due respect to the distinguished representative who has just left the rostrum, I wish to state that my delegation is opposed to a vote by division.

7. Mr. JANTUAH (Ghana): I wish to register my delegation's support for the objection raised against division on the voting on our draft resolution.

8. The PRESIDENT: I would like to know from the representative of Mauritania whether he opposes the proposal or supports it. Only two delegations may speak either in support or in opposition. Two already have spoken in opposition: no more may speak in opposition.

9. Mr. HASSAN (Mauritania) (translated from French): I wish to speak as one who opposes the motion for division ...

10. The PRESIDENT: The representative is out of order. I now call on the representatives who wish to speak in support of the proposal.

11. Mr. ASTROM (Sweden): I would like to register the support of my delegation for the proposal just made by the representative of Colombia. We have before us a draft resolution which contains many different things. We are asked to condemn, in strong language, the evil practices of racial discrimination. With only a few exceptions, all delegations will want to record their concurrence on this verdict. They will then join in voicing what is, in effect, a strong world opinion. It is important that delegations who feel that way should be allowed, when voting, to express their opinions clearly. The draft resolution wants us to set up a special committee to follow developments in South Africa. Many delegations, among them the Swedish delegation, are in sympathy with this idea, although we would like the terms of reference to be both broader and more specific. We also would like to be able to cast our vote in favour of this idea.

12. Finally, there are provisions in the draft resolution which call for drastic measures that can only be described as sanctions or enforcement measures on the part of Member States or of the Security Council. Many delegations feel that such measures are now necessary, politically appropriate, and legally justified. Nobody questions the sincerity of their convictions or their

rights to cast their votes accordingly, but there are other delegations who just as sincerely doubt the wisdom, the efficacy and the legal foundation of such action. They also want to be able to express their views in voting. As my delegation now supports the motion of a separate vote, we do so not only because an opposite procedure would be against the normal practice of the General Assembly, but also because we think it would be wrong to deprive a considerable part of the body of opinion in this Assembly of its right to vote in accordance with its diversified views.

13. Such action on the part of the Assembly would, in our view, not be in accordance with the laws of courtesy, fairness and mutual respect which the Assembly is bound to observe on all occasions. It would also, we feel, be against the highest ideals of democracy which we all share. Democracy is, of course, ruled by majority but it also has respect for the minority. When the General Assembly raises its voice in this matter, of all matters, it should be careful to modulate it so as to recall, as far as possible, the real temper of the Assembly. Only by doing so will that voice speak with the authority and sincerity proper to the grave and pressing issue of human rights and racial equality.

14. These are the reasons why the Swedish delegation hopes that the proposal made by the delegation of Colombia will be carried. I would like on behalf of the Swedish delegation to add the proposal that the two operative paragraphs dealing with setting up the special committee be voted on separately.

15. The PRESIDENT: Only one more speaker may speak in support of the proposal of Colombia.

16. Mr. VASQUEZ (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): I am speaking, not on the substance of the proposal, but simply on a point of order, with a view to clearing up an error in interpretation which, as some English-speaking delegations have told me, has arisen in connexion with the votes by division that I requested.

17. What I am asking is that for paragraph 4 there should be votes by division, one on the words "the following" and the other on sub-paragraphs (a) to (e). These would be separate votes, as I explained, and there would also be a vote by division on paragraph 8.

18. I think that this makes my proposal clear.

19. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): The United States supports the motion by the representative of Colombia for a separate vote on the words of operative paragraph 4 mentioned by him and on operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution before us contained in the report of the Special Political Committee [A/5276].

20. We believe that these paragraphs are particularly important because their sponsors ask us to break new ground in General Assembly resolutions, namely to impose far-reaching sanctions on South Africa and to ask the Security Council to impose such sanctions and to consider the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations.

21. It is clear from the debates in the Special Political Committee and in the General Assembly today that although there is almost complete unanimity as to the end to be achieved by the draft resolution, there are substantial differences among delegations on whether these two paragraphs embody wise measures which actually would help to achieve that end.

22. The Charter of our Organization properly calls for approval of important resolutions by a two-thirds majority. And past practice in the General Assembly makes it clear that important paragraphs of draft resolutions should receive equally strong support before they are accepted by this Assembly. We do not believe that the Assembly should now depart from the fair and healthy United Nations tradition of letting delegations not only be heard on separate points, but also be able to vote on separate points. It is particularly important in this case that delegations be allowed to vote their views since they were not permitted to do so in the Special Political Committee.

23. We therefore earnestly hope that all delegations will support the motion of the representative of Colombia on the very important matter before us. If, in accordance with the motion of the representative of Colombia, the words in operative paragraph 4, specified by him, are not adopted, and if operative paragraph 8 is not adopted, the United States will vote for the draft resolution. I repeat my hope that the General Assembly will permit the paragraph vote which has been moved and that the result will be a draft resolution that all of us can support.

24. The PRESIDENT: That closes the debate on the proposal of the representative of Colombia.

25. There are several proposals. For the sake of priority, before I proceed to take a vote on the proposal of the representative of Colombia, as added to by the representative of Sweden, I shall specify how the vote will be taken and what each vote will be supposed to decide. I shall first put to the vote whether a separate vote should be taken on the words "the following" in the opening part of operative paragraph 4 of the resolution; I shall then put to the vote whether a separate vote be taken on sub-paragraph (a) of operative paragraph 4; I shall then put to the vote whether a separate vote be taken on sub-paragraph (b) of operative paragraph 4; I shall then put to vote whether a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 5, as proposed by the representative of Sweden; I shall then put to the vote whether a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 6, as proposed by the representative of Sweden; I shall then put to the vote whether a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 8, as proposed by the representative of Colombia; I trust that this is clear.

26. I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

27. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): I am informed that there was a mistranslation into English and that the motion was to vote separately on sub-paragraphs (a) to (e) inclusive of operative paragraph 4. If I am incorrect, I stand corrected; but my understanding is that that was the motion in Spanish.

28. The PRESIDENT: In the interpretation I certainly heard the representative of Colombia say "sub-paragraphs (a) and (b)". But in order to clear up the point, I will call upon the representative of Colombia to explain what was his proposal with respect to the sub-paragraphs of operative paragraph 4. I do this before we proceed to the vote.

29. Mr. VASQUEZ (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): I am sorry to take up the Assembly's time by coming to the rostrum so often, but I want to explain that my proposal is for votes by division on the words "the following" and on sub-paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d)

and (e) of paragraph 4; that is, for a separate vote on the words "the following" and, in addition, on sub-paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of paragraph 4.

30. Mr. JANTUAH (Ghana): I regret to interrupt the proceedings at this stage, but there seems to be a discrepancy between rule 130 and the interpretation of the procedure which you, Mr. President, are now proposing. Our objection is that there should be no division or that there should be no separate voting on any part of the draft resolution. Rule 130 clearly says: "A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately." Our objection is that no parts of our proposal should be voted on separately. Our understanding, subject of course to your wise direction, Mr. President, is that the proposals before the Assembly are: first, that the draft resolution should be voted on separately and, as against that, we maintain that the draft resolution should not be vote on separately. I think that this must be the question at issue before the Assembly.

31. The PRESIDENT: The proposals before the Assembly are with regard to separate votes on several parts. But should it be the wish of the Assembly, and so long as that is clearly understood and there is no confusion about it, that all the proposals that have been made with regard to a separate vote should be put, at one time, to the vote of the Assembly, I am prepared to do that. I personally have no objection to it, but I do not want it felt that there was any misunderstanding as to what the Assembly was proceeding to vote on. Therefore, I shall first repeat the proposal and then explain what is being put to the vote.

32. The proposal is that in the opening part of operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution the words "the following" should be separately voted on and that sub-paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of that paragraph also be voted on separately; further, that operative paragraph 5 be separately voted on; further, that operative paragraph 6 be separately voted on and, finally, that operative paragraph 8 be separately voted on. I will proceed to put this proposal to the Assembly. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Uganda, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey.

Against: Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia,

Sudan, Syria, Tanganyika, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia.

Abstaining: Federation of Malaya, Israel, Jamaica, Laos, Lebanon.

The proposals were rejected by 52 votes to 49, with 5 abstentions.

33. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee, which appears in the report [A/5276]. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Ceylon, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ceylon, Chad, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tanganyika, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon.

Against: France, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada.

Abstaining: Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Italy, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Sweden, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil.

The draft resolution was adopted by 67 votes to 16, with 23 abstentions.^{1/}

34. The PRESIDENT: In operative paragraph 5 of the resolution just adopted the General Assembly has decided to establish a Special Committee, consisting of representatives of Member States, to be nominated by the President of the General Assembly. Pursuant to this decision, I shall give careful consideration to the proposition of the Special Committee and shall, in due course, put my suggestions before the Assembly.

35. I recognize the representatives who wish to explain their vote.

36. Mr. LICHTVELD (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation deeply regrets the fact that it has been forced to vote on a resolution which not only condemns the theory and practice of apartheid in South Africa, but which also imposes sanctions on that country and opens the possibility of its expulsion from the family of the United Nations. My delegation had to do so because there was no possibility for us to vote separately on the various most important operative paragraphs.

^{1/} The representatives of the Central African Republic (see 1167th meeting, paras. 68-70) and of Gabon, who were absent at the time of voting, subsequently indicated to the Secretariat that, had they been present, they would have voted in favour.

37. My delegation has declared, during the general debate on this issue in the Special Political Committee, that, although recognizing that many countries are guilty of some form of discrimination, we can hardly find a formula severe enough to express our abhorrence of the systematic infringements of human rights suffered by the non-white population of South Africa as a result of the deliberate policy of that country. We also firmly believe in the necessity of changing the hearts and minds of the South African Government. But this is a difficult task requiring patience, and one which can be fulfilled only if South Africa remains in our midst and has not itself been placed in a position of national apartheid among the nations of the world. We also do not believe in the efficacy of punishment meted out to a country as a whole, and we think that collective measures in this respect—that is, sanctions made compulsory for all Members of the United Nations—not only will prove to be harmful to precisely that majority of the South African people which we are morally bound to defend and assist in their struggle for freedom, but can be implemented only if they are put into practice voluntarily and according to the possibilities and the individual viewpoints of the protesting countries, as has already been done for more than a year by Surinam, one of the three autonomous parts of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

38. It was for these reasons that my delegation, although wishing to associate itself with the almost unanimous condemnation of apartheid, could not pronounce itself in favour of the resolution on which we have just voted. We are against two of its main paragraphs, namely operative paragraph 4, concerning sanctions, and operative paragraph 8, containing the possibility of the expulsion of South Africa as a Member of this Organization. Had we been allowed a separate vote, paragraph by paragraph, the Netherlands delegation would have voted in favour of both operative paragraphs 1 and 2.

39. Nevertheless, we want to go on record as one of the very many countries that are continuously concerned with the fate of the non-white populations of South Africa. We once more solemnly confirm that we shall continue to do whatever is possible to influence the South African Government to mend its ways before it is too late.

40. Mr. WEN (China): I would like to say a few words by way of explanation of our vote on the resolution just adopted.

41. My delegation voted in the affirmative for the motion to vote by paragraphs. Had such a motion been carried, we would have abstained on operative paragraphs 4 and 8 because my delegation has reservations regarding them. But since the motion for voting by paragraphs was not carried, my delegation has voted for the resolution as a whole, because my delegation disapproves of any policy of racial discrimination. This has been made abundantly clear in the statement made by my delegation on 8 October 1962 in the Special Political Committee [327th meeting].

42. Mr. ENCKELL (Finland): The delegation of Finland has on several occasions stated here how utterly incompatible the policies of apartheid are with our opinions, our traditions, our beliefs and our role. The oppressive measures that the Government of South Africa has again taken recently have aroused in us a deep feeling of indignation through their denial of basic concepts that we honour. I shall not, however, elaborate

further on our general attitude towards apartheid and shall restrict myself to explaining why my delegation, much to its regret, could not support the resolution just adopted.

43. The resolution covers a wide range of different conceptions and suggestions in regard to which there was known to exist a number of divergent opinions. We find it therefore most unfortunate that we have been deprived of the opportunity to vote separately on its various parts. I feel compelled to declare that my delegation cannot consider the practice which has been resorted to as being in keeping with the standards we would like to see applied to the work of this Assembly.

44. The delegation of Finland supports the aim of this resolution in so far as it tends to lead to the abandonment of the policy of apartheid. We wholly share, in this respect, the sentiments by which its authors were inspired. We are all the more sorry not to find it possible to give them our support, but we cannot consider that the practical means recommended in the resolution are such as to help towards the attainment of a successful solution to this problem. We have strong doubts about the advisability and even the legitimacy of the contents of operative paragraph 4. The actions suggested in that paragraph amount to sanctions, even if they are called measures, and as such do not fall within the competence of the General Assembly. We cannot share the views to the contrary which have been expressed here on this point.

45. We have already explained, on previous occasions, our attitude towards measures of such a nature. The United Nations, in our view, whatever the difficulties, has to settle its problems together, through combined efforts, and to strive for constructive solutions. These solutions can hardly be attained through means which, if applied, would, as in this case, very likely contribute to exacerbating the situation. We want to help the population of South Africa to achieve dignity, equality and harmony; we want to avoid anything which might add to their difficulties.

46. The delegation of Finland believes in co-operation, not isolation. We fail to see in what sense the exclusion of a Member State would possibly advance the cause of this Organization, or serve any useful purpose. My delegation has consistently advocated the universality of the United Nations; we intend to abide by that principle.

47. Finally, I must add that my delegation cannot associate itself with recommendations requesting Member States to take steps and adopt practices of a kind that we could not implement or follow in Finland within the framework of our legal system.

48. Mr. SILVA (Brazil): I would like to explain the vote of my delegation on the resolution which has just been approved. The abstention of the Brazilian delegation does not mean any hesitation in strongly condemning the policy of apartheid on the part of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. For many years the Brazilian delegation has been taking a very clear and firm stand in condemning the policy of apartheid. In so doing we expressed the deep-seated convictions and ideals of the Brazilian nation, which is, I am proud to recall, a multiracial society and a remarkable example of harmony and understanding of men of all races.

49. The policy of apartheid is the crudest negation of the fundamental principles upon which the Brazilian nation was built. The Brazilian delegation, however,

could not vote in favour of this resolution because, in our view, the application of sanctions, the implementation of which by all Member States is extremely difficult and would weaken the United Nations, would hinder our fight against racial discrimination in South Africa.

50. Mr. VASQUEZ (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): I have asked for the floor in order to explain my delegation's vote.

1. The delegation of Colombia wishes to make quite clear that, throughout this debate, it has never questioned the principle that it was necessary to condemn the Republic of South Africa's policy of apartheid. However, my delegation deplores the rigid application of the majority principle in the Special Political Committee and in the General Assembly, which prevented us from voting as we wished on the draft resolution submitted by the African-Asian countries, namely by abstaining on paragraph 4 in regard to the sanctions listed therein, about which we have very definite reservations.

2. It is not proper that an elementary right to dissent should be eliminated from United Nations practice, particularly in connexion with a long resolution which involves difficult points regarding the constitutional interpretation of the United Nations Charter. Faced with the alternative of accepting views which we do not share or of abstaining, we were obliged to choose the second course.

3. Despite our utter rejection of the policy of apartheid and despite our unshakable faith in democracy, we could not vote for paragraph 4, for two reasons: first, because this paragraph places on any Government that accepts it the obligation to apply measures which, under the Constitution of Colombia, lie within the competence of Congress; and secondly, because the same paragraph specifically provides for measures mentioned in Article 41 of the Charter, which are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Security Council.

4. We differ from the majority on a juridical point regarding collective action under the United Nations Charter. For us, if there is a threat to peace and security, action should be taken, not through individual measures which are left to the judgement of each State, but in accordance with a plan of co-operation drawn up by the Security Council to meet a serious situation.

5. In this manner, Colombia reasserts its democratic position, which is entirely at variance with racial discrimination, and reaffirms its respect for the rules of the United Nations Charter. We do not believe that we are entitled to violate the Charter or to develop or revise it through our proposals, even in order to condemn a violation of human rights. International action must, in our view, be confined within the framework of the law which governs it.

6. Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): The Venezuelan position regarding the problem of the application of the policy of apartheid by the South African Government was clearly explained in the statement made by my delegation in the general debate on that item in the Special Political Committee.

7. Venezuela rejects and condemns this policy because it is contrary to human rights and is a violation of this Organization's Charter.

8. Venezuela's position on the substance of the question has never varied, and my delegation will continue

to co-operate fully with a view to bringing South Africa to change its behaviour and abandon its policy of racial discrimination.

59. My Delegation understands the deep concern of the African countries regarding the policy of apartheid, and shares their desire to put an end to this policy once and for all. It feels, however, that any decisions by the Assembly on this problem must not only be effective, which is a sine qua non for all its resolutions, but must also and at all times be in line with the provisions of the Charter.

60. My delegation was obliged to abstain in the vote on the present resolution, because it considered that paragraphs 4 and 8 conflicted with the express provisions of the United Nations Charter.

61. With regard to paragraph 4, my delegation feels that the General Assembly is not competent to impose sanctions on a Member State. Competence in this matter lies with the Security Council alone. As for paragraph 8, it is my delegation's view that the procedure laid down in the Charter for the expulsion of a Member State is precisely the contrary of what is envisaged in the resolution. Under the Charter, the Security Council is the organ competent to make a recommendation for the expulsion of a Member State.

62. These reservations, which are exclusively legal in character, prompted the delegation of Venezuela to abstain on the vote on the resolution which has just been adopted.

63. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark): It was with great regret that the delegation of Denmark had to abstain on the resolution. We would have voted with satisfaction and absolutely unreservedly for the paragraphs of the resolution which, in even stronger and more vigorous terms than last year, condemn the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa and deplore its total disregard of its Charter obligations and its aggravation of racial issues. But, with regard to operative paragraphs 4 and 8, we found that the approach proposed was not realistic and effective and would fail to lead to the result we aim at.

64. In the Special Political Committee, I outlined what I thought should be the contents of a strong, but sober and realistic, resolution. I suggested the establishment of a special committee consisting of a few highly qualified individuals, which could inquire from Member States what measures they had taken, and would consider to be practical and effective, to dissuade the Government of South Africa from pursuing its regressive policies. The committee should report its findings to the General Assembly or to the Security Council, or both, as appropriate. In our opinion, such an approach would be more effective than that set out in operative paragraph 4 of the resolution, which my delegation could not support as it stood.

65. The debate in the Special Political Committee made it evident that the proposed sanctions would only be meaningful if the Member States most directly concerned were prepared to take such measures. To adopt a policy doomed to failure can only lessen the influence of, and even harm, the United Nations. As we see it, in the same way, the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations would be a completely negative approach since it would not advance our objective. On the contrary, it would make its achievement more difficult. In the United Nations, the Government of South Africa is subject to world opinion which exerts a pressure that,

I hope, will eventually prove effective. They very Membership of South Africa and her clear violation of Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter is the basis which, in particular, makes her policy a legitimate concern of all of us. Therefore, a policy of expulsion would defeat its own ends. We of the delegation of Denmark do not believe in expulsion as an instrument of international co-operation. Therefore, if we had been allowed to express our attitude according to well-established parliamentary procedure, we would have voted against operative paragraphs 4 and 8.

66. I would have found it desirable if our colleagues from Africa and Asia had discussed the resolution with their friends outside their group who share their anxiety with regard to the situation in South Africa. In the Committee the other day I made an urgent appeal for broad consultations to be undertaken with a view to reaching agreement on a text of the relevant paragraphs which could have gained wider support, including the support of the Member States most directly concerned. The delegation of Denmark deeply regrets that that appeal was in vain.

67. Mr. GOMEZ-ROBLEDO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Before explaining its vote, the delegation of Mexico wishes to voice its keen regret that once again a motion rejecting a vote by division has been pushed through by mere force of numbers, a motion which is in every way anti-democratic and contrary to the spirit of rule 130 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure.

68. If this rule is interpreted honestly, it is obvious that it is intended to prevent captious and arbitrary votes by division on a proposal, or a sentence, which in itself forms a whole, but never to prevent votes by division on parts which obviously stand by themselves. In the draft resolution that we have just adopted, the condemnation of a policy and the sanctions recommended are just as different as, for instance, in a court case, the indictment for an offence and the sentence (which may or may not be carried out) imposed for it—or the one and the other may be based on different considerations.

69. Our only reason—but a powerful and decisive one—for voting in favour of the resolution, despite what I have just said, is that the paragraphs providing for sanctions constitute, legally speaking, the adjective part of the resolution, while the substantive part, the core, is the condemnation of the policy of racial discrimination followed, with such lamentable contumacy, by the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

70. Since my Government has at all times strongly censured this execrable policy, regardless of the country in which it appeared; since it has never practised such a policy at any time in its history; and since, unlike the sponsors of the draft resolution, we always act in a spirit of compromise, as the representative of Trinidad and Tobago expressed it in the plenary meeting this morning, we felt obliged to reaffirm our traditional and unshakable position by voting for the draft resolution.

71. Having fulfilled this duty, however, I feel it is equally my duty to reserve the position and freedom of my Government with regard to those parts of the resolution on which, had they been the subject of a vote by division, we should have voted in a different way. The first of these is operative paragraph 4, particularly sub-paragraphs (b) and (d), which contain recommendations that, before we could give effect to them,

we should have to consider in the light of Mexican legislation. The second is paragraph 8, to which we are opposed, not for the reasons given by other delegations but because we know only too well that in other cases, affecting other States which might be liable to expulsion under Article 6 of the Charter, that sanction will not be applied.

72. Our attitude is very far from being a mere immediate reaction to the situation with which we are now faced. In fact, ever since the San Francisco Conference—or rather ever since we first knew what the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were—Mexico has been opposed to the inclusion, in the Charter, of the Article on expulsion: we feel it to be inequitable, as it will never be applied to the permanent members of the Security Council, however often they may violate the Principles of the Charter. In saying this, I wish, by no means to offend any of them, but merely to draw attention to their legal status under the Charter. Lastly, we feel that this provision—and this was our second reason for permanently opposing it after the San Francisco Conference—unnecessarily weakens the ideal of universality which should inspire the Organization's present and future composition.

73. Mr. HAUGLAND (Norway): I should like to explain Norway's vote on the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly. The Norwegian delegation would have voted against the comprehensive sanctions proposed in operative paragraph 4 of the resolution. We understand the feelings of those nations which have prompted strong demands, both inside and outside the United Nations, that the Organization should call without further delay for coercive measures against the Government of South Africa. But the discussions in the Special Political Committee clearly showed that the recommended sanctions would not be effective.

74. A policy of sanctions would have meaning only if South Africa's principal trading partners were willing to carry it out, and be effective only if all Member States were willing to participate in such a policy. Under the present circumstances this policy would, in our view, be doomed to failure and accordingly have adverse consequences for the future of the United Nations.

75. The Norwegian delegation would have voted against operative paragraph 8 of the resolution raising the question of expulsion under Article 6 of the Charter. We believe in South Africa's continued membership in the United Nations and in particular its obligations under the Charter, which make the racial conflict a matter of concern to us all, both politically and juridically, and that only by having South Africa in the Organization can we hope to bring about a change in its racial policies through the machinery of the United Nations.

76. The Norwegian delegation today abstained on the resolution as a whole. When a similar resolution, 1663 (XVI), was voted upon during the sixteenth session of the General Assembly [1067th meeting], we voted against it. This change in votes reflects the deep concern of the Norwegian people and the Norwegian Government in regard to the new and further measures instituted by the Government of South Africa in order to force through apartheid.

77. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) (translated from Spanish): Guatemala's attitude with regard to the policy of apartheid and racial discrimination of the Republic of South Africa is well known and perfectly clear. This position has never varied over the years, and at the Assembly's present session a clear statement of it is

to be found in the records of the Special Political Committee.

78. The delegation of Guatemala was almost one hundred per cent in favour of the resolution which the General Assembly this afternoon adopted by an overwhelming majority. Our views coincided with those of the sponsors on nearly all the points of their resolution, particularly so far as condemnation of the policy of apartheid and racial discrimination was concerned. The Guatemalan delegation agrees that this systematic policy and this constant defiance of the General Assembly's resolutions in so important a matter as the protection of human rights justify the Organization in decreeing sanctions against South Africa. My delegation would even agree that the Government of South Africa deserves expulsion from the Organization for its policy, because, as we have repeatedly stated, despite the principle of universality and although all countries in the world should belong to the United Nations, we sincerely believe that the country in question, whose policy is incompatible with the basic principles of the United Nations, has no right to belong to the Organization.

79. But—and this is why we are in fundamental disagreement with the resolution which has just been adopted, and why we abstained—we believe that, under the Charter, the General Assembly is not competent to decree sanctions. Sanctions and the expulsion of a Member State are both matters which lie exclusively within the competence of the Security Council. For that reason, and because paragraph 4 of the resolution approved this afternoon gives far too great an impression that the Assembly is decreeing sanctions, my delegation abstained.

80. For the rest, I should like to say that my delegation deeply deplores the fact that the best traditions of the United Nations are falling into decay. I refer to the traditions of democracy and freedom for each and every delegation.

81. There has always been a majority group in the General Assembly. There has always been a group which are not equally acceptable to all delegations. But there had always been tolerance and a democratic give-and-take in the United Nations. Today we are faced with a form of totalitarian intransigence which merits our peremptory rejection.

82. Mr. MOLLINEDO (Bolivia) (translated from Spanish): When it spoke in the general debate in the Special Political Committee, the delegation of Bolivia defined its views and condemned the shameful policy of apartheid practised by South Africa.

83. We have our reservations regarding paragraphs 4 and 8 of the draft resolution approved by the Committee, which was referred to the General Assembly for consideration and adoption.

84. We are concerned at the way in which this resolution was adopted, without the request for a vote by division being granted, and at the fact that a majority imposed its view and refused to accept even the smallest amendment or modification.

85. For this reason, and as a protest against such dictatorial action, we were very regretfully obliged to abstain, since this imposition of the majority view prevented us from stating our reservations. We consider this to be an attack on the democratic principles of the Charter.

86. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of South Africa in exercise of his right of reply.

87. Mr. LOUW (South Africa): I have not come here to explain our vote; we have nothing to explain. We know that we are acting in the interests of the Bantu and the other non-white populations of our country. During the years I have come to this Assembly since 1948, my experience has been that delegations that come to this rostrum to explain generally have a motive for the explanation and the motive is not always an honest one.

88. I have come to the rostrum to clear up what seems to have been an obvious misunderstanding this morning on the part of the representative of the United States. After I had spoken he came to the rostrum and seemed to be moved with a certain amount of indignation. He said that he had come to reject—I think those were his words—the comparison between South Africa and the United States which he alleged that I had made in the course of my statement. I am quite prepared to accept that the representative of the United States had not quite correctly heard what I had said—he probably did not pay special attention at that moment—but I have come to the rostrum to deny that I made any comparison whatsoever between the racial policies, the racial position of my country and that of the United States. I did not raise the question, I could say very much on that subject if I wished to, but I purposely did not do so. What I did refer to, and I have the copy of my speech as I used it this morning, was the fact that the basis of the South African policy, having regard to the fact that we are three and a quarter million whites as against a very large majority of non-whites, was as follows:

"Put briefly, it is the natural and elemental human urge to survive, an urge that is common to every nation represented in this Assembly. That is something which should be understood and appreciated by the white population of the North American countries, whose early history is similar to that of the European population of South Africa." [1164th meeting, para. 32.]

89. I then went on to say:

"The position of South Africa's permanent white population (in that respect) is in no way different from that of the descendants of the original immigrants that established their homes in North America and developed the United States and Canada to what they are today." [Ibid., para. 37.]

—In both cases an original settlement of Dutch settlers over 300 years ago; in America only a few years before they settled in South Africa; and those that followed them in the three centuries afterwards built up and developed the countries into what they are today, in South Africa and here in this country. I said further: "South Africans of Dutch, French and also of British descent", are South Africans and they "cannot return to live in their respective countries of origin". I am of Dutch descent on my father's side and of French-Huguenot descent on my mother's side. But Holland and France are to me foreign countries. I could not possibly think of going to live there nor could my children; we are South Africans. I then went on to say, to make that comparison; "... any more than shall I say, the Roosevelts can return to Holland; —Dutch descent —the Eisenhowers to Germany"—the Eisenhowers are of German descent—"the Duponts to France". Today they are Americans. This is their home, here in America. I continued: "The African representatives

speak of us as 'settlers'. We are continually referred to as settlers even though we have been there for three centuries. I continued: "Will they be consistent and speak of the old-established American families as 'settlers'?"

90. That was the only comparison I made to show the similarity in the early settlement of our respective countries, very close to each other by a few years. One after the other, both here and in my own country, the people have become permanent settlers, as far as we are concerned, where a white population is undoubtedly in the minority, there is a natural urge to survive. It would have been exactly the same if in this country, with its population of approximately 180 million people, there were the proportion between Negro and white which there is in South Africa; in my hypothesis there would have been about 30 or 40 million whites and about 140 million Negroes, and in that case those whites would have had the same urge to survive. That was the comparison I was making. In order to get the record straight it was necessary, in view of the misunderstanding—unquestionably a misunderstanding on the part of the United States representative this morning—for me to come to the rostrum to clear up that misunderstanding.

AGENDA ITEM 77

The urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/5279)

91. The PRESIDENT: In connexion with the financial implications of the draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee, the Fifth Committee has observed as follows:

92. The Fifth Committee decided to inform the General Assembly: (a) that the adoption of draft resolution A recommended by the First Committee would give rise to an additional expenditure in 1962 estimated at not more than \$213,000 or \$145,000, depending on whether the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and the Sub-Committee on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon Tests meet in Geneva concurrently or otherwise; and (b) that the Secretary-General proposes to report again on this matter later in the present session, at which time it will be possible to submit a precise estimate of the total supplementary credits required for inclusion in the 1962 budget estimates for the purposes under reference.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the First Committee.

Mr. Csatorday (Hungary), Rapporteur of the First Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/5279).

93. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia): I shall be very brief. In draft resolution A of the report [A/5279], the first paragraph of the preamble, the word "unchecked" appears. I explained in the Committee yesterday that this word was used unintentionally and I asked for its removal. There was objection yesterday, but this morning I consulted with a number of delegations and now there is complete agreement that they do not wish to retain this word in the draft resolution.

94. My objection to the use of this word is that it implies if nuclear weapon tests are checked they could

continue. The actual intention of the authors of the draft resolution was to say "Deeply concerned with the continuation of nuclear weapon tests".

95. With this explanation, I hope that the General Assembly will agree to remove the word "unchecked".

96. The PRESIDENT: Unless I hear any objection to the proposal made by the representative of Ethiopia, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to it.

It was so decided.

97. The PRESIDENT: As there are no requests to speak in explanation of vote before the voting, the Assembly will proceed to the vote. The recommendations of the First Committee appear in paragraph 16 of the report [A/5279], which contains draft resolution A and draft resolution B. I propose first to put draft resolution A to the vote.

98. Mr. USACHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation requests a separate vote by roll-call on the tenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A in the First Committee's report [A/5279], beginning with the words:

"Considering that the joint memorandum of 16 April 1962, submitted to the Eighteen-Nation Committee ..."

and so on as in the text.

99. The Soviet delegation also requests a separate roll-call vote on each operative paragraph of draft resolution A.

100. The PRESIDENT: In the absence of objection, the Assembly will proceed according to the proposal of the Soviet representative.

The proposal was adopted.

101. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will therefore proceed to vote on the nine preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A.

Those paragraphs were adopted by 86 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

102. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the tenth preambular paragraph. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Ireland, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first:

In favour: Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, China, France, Greece, Iceland.

The tenth preambular paragraph was adopted by 81 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

103. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the two remaining paragraphs of the preamble.

The eleventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs were adopted by 94 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

104. The PRESIDENT: We now come to the operative paragraphs. On each of these paragraphs a separate roll-call vote has been requested.

105. The Assembly will first vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Morocco, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Mongolia.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 78 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

106. The PRESIDENT: A vote will now be taken on operative paragraph 2.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana,

Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia.

Against: South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Greece, Italy, Portugal.

Abstaining: Thailand, China, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 84 votes to 10, with 8 abstentions.

107. The PRESIDENT: I put to the vote operative paragraph 3.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Canada, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon.

Against: None.

Abstaining: China, France.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 100 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

108. The PRESIDENT: I put to the vote operative paragraph 4.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Canada, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,

Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 101 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

109. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put operative paragraph 5 to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Greece, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 101 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

110. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on operative paragraph 6.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Costa Rica, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Syria, 2/ Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United

Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia.

Against: Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Abstaining: France, Guinea, Iraq, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Tanganyika, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad.

Paragraph 6 was adopted by 66 votes to 10, with 26 abstentions.

111. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on operative paragraph 7.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Afghanistan, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Algeria, Cambodia, France, Guinea, Mali.

The paragraph was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

112. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put the whole draft resolution A, unamended, to the vote.

The resolution was adopted by 75 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

113. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to vote on draft resolution B contained in the report [A/5279].

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Turkey, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic,

2/ The representative of Syria subsequently indicated to the Secretariat that he wished to be recorded as abstaining.

Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago.

Against: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania.

Abstaining: United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tanganyika, Togo, Tunisia.

Mali did not participate in the voting.

Resolution B was adopted by 51 votes to 10, with 40 abstentions.

114. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representatives who wish to explain their vote.

115. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation considers it necessary to explain the motives which inspired it in the vote just held on the draft resolutions concerning the cessation of nuclear weapons tests. It is well known that the Soviet Union is a convinced advocate of the speediest possible cessation of all nuclear weapons tests without exception, whether in the atmosphere, under water, in outer space or underground.

116. It is quite clear from the discussion in the First Committee that the cessation of all types of nuclear weapons tests is now the general demand of all peoples. During the vote, the Soviet delegation approached the draft resolutions from the standpoint of how well they answered this demand of the peoples for the earliest possible ending of all nuclear tests.

117. There were two draft resolutions before us: one was submitted by thirty-seven delegations, the other by the United States and the United Kingdom. The thirty-seven-Power draft, as its sponsors explained exhaustively in the First Committee, was based on the need for the cessation of all nuclear tests, in whatever environment and by whomsoever made. It provided that 'in two months' time' at the latest, from 1 January 1963 onwards, test explosions of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons should cease for ever on our earth.

118. Taking into account the actual position in the negotiations for the cessation of nuclear tests, the thirty-seven-Power draft resolution referred to the now generally recognized basis for the evolving of an international agreement to prohibit tests—the memorandum of the eight non-aligned States.^{3/} The provisions of the thirty-seven-Power draft resolution were correct, and we therefore voted for the relevant parts of that resolution. At the same time we consider it necessary to observe, as we also did in the First Committee, that the thirty-seven-Power draft resolution was not in every respect consistent, and the Soviet delegation in the First Committee pointed out the weaknesses and inadequacies of individual provisions of

that draft. We accordingly showed what we thought of the various provisions of this resolution, when it voted upon paragraph by paragraph.

119. We could not agree, in particular, with the inclusion in the thirty-seven-Power draft of its operative paragraph 6, which contained a provision opening up the possibility of deviating from, of undermining the positive and constructive ideas contained in it. That is why the Soviet delegation was obliged to abstain in the vote on the thirty-seven-Power draft resolution as a whole.

120. As for the United Kingdom-United States draft resolution, it contained yet another restatement of the well-known position of the Western Powers on nuclear tests—a position which, as we all know and as the sponsors of this draft themselves realize, cannot serve as a basis for agreement. Under the terms of this draft, it would still be possible to continue underground tests of nuclear weapons. It does not envisage a specific date for the cessation of tests, but puts forward, as a basis for further negotiations, what are essentially, despite certain alterations, the Western Powers' proposals regarding the so-called control and inspection system, which are unacceptable to the Soviet Union and are not justified by necessity.

121. The United Kingdom-United States draft contained a series of reservations, with the aid of which those opposing the cessation of nuclear tests in all environments could continue to delay a final and positive solution of the whole problem. The United Kingdom-United States draft, as is well known, was not supported by many Members of the United Nations; this was shown by both the vote in the First Committee and the vote which has just taken place here. It was clear to many delegations that to adopt a resolution of that kind would not contribute towards bringing about a cessation of nuclear tests.

122. It was apparently an awareness of this danger which prompted the delegations of a number of neutralist States, in the First Committee, to appeal to the United States and the United Kingdom not to press for a vote on their draft resolution; and we must stress here that these appeals reflect, perhaps more clearly than the vote itself, the real attitude of many States towards the United Kingdom-United States draft resolution.

123. For the reasons I have described, the Soviet delegation voted against that draft resolution during the present plenary meeting.

124. In conclusion, I would draw attention to one further point. The United States and the United Kingdom, as well as certain other members of the Western military blocs, not only attempted to convert the discussion of the question of the cessation of nuclear tests into an endorsement of the position of the Western Powers, but also tried, by means of amendments and sub-amendments, to emasculate the positive provisions of the resolution submitted by the thirty-seven neutralist States. Those delegations, supported by a small group of countries allied with them, have shown by their actions that, despite their assurances, they do not really want to take the eight-nation memorandum as a basis for further negotiations. They have no intention of suspending all nuclear weapons tests from 1 January 1963, as called for by almost all Members of the United Nations. It must be observed that such an approach on their side is not promising for talks on the cessation of nuclear testing.

^{3/} See Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January 1961–December 1962, document DC/203, annex I, section J.

125. Nevertheless, we anticipate that the Governments of the Western Powers will carefully analyse the records of the debate, as well as the results of the votes just held on the individual parts of the thirty-seven-Power draft resolution and on their own draft resolution, and will realize that their present position runs counter to the demands of the times and to the interests of the peoples.

126. The events of the very recent past, which have alarmed the peoples of all countries, call for new and bold steps by all statesmen to safeguard international peace and security. The positions of the two sides on the question of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests are close, but, if they are finally to be brought together, further efforts by all parties are needed.

127. The Soviet Union, which advocates the cessation of all nuclear tests from 1 January 1963 onwards, and negotiations on the basis of the eight-nation memorandum, expects the Western Powers to adopt this position too. It will then become possible, as the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, indicated in his message of 27 October 1962 to Mr. Kennedy, President of the United States of America:

"...to make a splendid present to the peoples of the world and give them also the pleasure of knowing that an agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests has been concluded."

128. For its part, the Soviet Union will spare no effort to attain this noble objective as soon as possible.

129. The PRESIDENT: Before I recognize the next speaker, I wish to mention that on the termination of the consideration of this item, which we trust will be in a few moments time, I will have some information to give to the Assembly regarding the order of business during the next two or three days which might be of some slight interest to the delegates.

130. Mr. JACOME (Ecuador) (translated from Spanish): In the debate in the First Committee (on the thirty-seven-Power draft resolution contained in paragraph 16 of document A/5279, the delegation of Ecuador expressed the hope that the meaning of operative paragraphs 2, 4 and 5 would be clarified so that it could vote for the text as a whole. Fortunately, in connexion with paragraph 2, the representative of Mexico—the original sponsor of the idea taken up in the draft resolution—explained that the setting of a date after which, at the latest, nuclear weapons tests should cease, had the immediate object of preventing the continuation of this kind of competition between Powers, each seeking to be the last to carry out tests, but that it did not mean that the parties to the proposed agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests could not insist on clauses for safeguards additional to that implicit in good faith. Furthermore, paragraph 3 of resolution A which we have adopted is a clear and precise interpretation of paragraph 2.

131. As for paragraph 6, which corresponds to paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, its real scope was defined by the explanations which the representatives of Sweden and Brazil gave, during the debate in the Committee, regarding the meaning of the memorandum of the eight non-aligned Powers on effective control of a ban on nuclear weapons tests.

132. With this elimination of ambiguities that might have left room for different interpretations and hence for more disagreement between the Powers to which

the appeals of mankind and the recommendations of the Assembly are addressed, my delegation voted with a clear conscience in favour of the resolution, and it likewise voted with a clear conscience for resolution B, since it feels that they are not incompatible with each other.

133. Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): I only wish to intervene for one moment in explanation of vote of the United Kingdom. Indeed, I had not intended to intervene at all, had it not been that the representative of the Soviet Union chose not only to interpret his own vote but a good many other people's as well.

134. As far as I am concerned, I would make it quite clear that the position of the United Kingdom in relation to the thirty-seven Power draft resolution was made abundantly clear in the Committee. I do not need to labour it further. We abstained on the resolution as a whole because of certain lack of clarity in one or two directions, which is fully understood, I think, by the sponsors of that resolution, and our position is abundantly clear. But the representative of the Soviet Union chose to cast doubts upon the motives of the United Kingdom and the United States in regard to negotiations on a nuclear test ban treaty. I would only say that if the representatives of the Soviet Union would expend as much energy in trying to achieve a treaty on the cessation of nuclear tests as they do in trying to wriggle out of their wholly negative position, we would get on a great deal faster.

135. I hope when we return to Geneva that they will indulge in genuine negotiation with us and then we will get the treaty that everybody here wants.

Organization of work

136. The PRESIDENT: That concludes the consideration of this item. It will be noted that the Journal for tomorrow announces that there will be two meetings of the plenary: one in the morning and one in the afternoon. In the morning the Assembly will take up the Draft Convention and draft Recommendation on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages. This item has been considered by the Third Committee. Two amendments to the Draft Convention have been submitted; they are mentioned in the Journal.

137. Tomorrow afternoon we should be ready to take up one of the major items allocated to the plenary: The situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. The report of the Special Committee is contained in document A/5238.

138. As representatives are aware, chapter II of that report deals with the question of Southern Rhodesia. This is a separate item on the agenda of the seventeenth session. It was considered by the Fourth Committee and was acted upon last week by the plenary; so that we can regard chapter II as having been disposed of, at least for the time being.

139. Chapter IX deals with the question of South West Africa. This also is a separate item on the agenda of the seventeenth session and is now being considered by the Fourth Committee, which in due course will no doubt report it to the plenary.

140. Chapter XI deals with the question of Angola. Here again, the situation in Angola is a separate item on the agenda. The reports of the Sub-Committee, established under General Assembly resolution 1603

(XV), and of the Government of Portugal will be submitted to the General Assembly later.

141. Since these three chapters of the report of the Special Committee concern matters which have been dealt with separately, that is to say, chapters II, IX and XI, on Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Angola, it would seem reasonable that the discussion in plenary and the report of the Special Committee should be centred only on the remaining chapters. I would, therefore, propose that the general debate on

these remaining matters in the report of the Special Committee should begin tomorrow afternoon. I would invite representatives to inscribe their names as soon as possible in the list of speakers. In other words, there will be one general debate on the whole report excluding from its scope the items that have been dealt with separately. When, of course, we come to resolutions, each resolution will be taken up separately.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.