

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 696th  
MEETING**



Friday, 9 October 1970,  
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Abdul Samad GHAUS  
(Afghanistan).

**AGENDA ITEM 34**

**The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) (A/8022, A/SPC/L.181, A/SPC/L.182 and Rev.1)**

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that Burundi, Chad, Kuwait, the Philippines, Senegal and Southern Yemen asked to be included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.182.

2. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had agreed to make two amendments in order that support for it could be as wide as possible. First, in the fourth preambular paragraph, the word "decision" had been replaced by the word "resolution". Secondly, so that the draft resolution might conform as closely as possible to Security Council resolution 282 (1970), operative paragraph 2 had been replaced by the following:

"2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to follow closely the implementation of Security Council resolution 282 (1970) and of the present resolution, and to report to the General Assembly not later than 10 December 1970."

3. He added that the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Ecuador had also asked to be included among the sponsors of the draft.

4. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland) said that his delegation welcomed the initiative of the Afro-Asian States in preparing draft resolution A/SPC/L.182 and would support it, as amended. His delegation understood that the purpose of the draft resolution was not to pronounce on the substance of the matter—that had been done by the Security Council acting on behalf of all Member States—but rather to reaffirm the overwhelming support of Member States for the Security Council resolution.

5. His delegation had already made its position clear in the Security Council, when it had emphasized the political importance of the arms embargo. The Security Council resolutions 181 (1963), 182 (1963) and 191 (1964) on the arms embargo had been the first instance in which the international community had moved from words to deeds in order to come to grips with the dangerous situation in

southern Africa. In his delegation's view, the fact that such a decision could be reached in the Council reflected the virtually universal acceptance of the truth that the world community could no longer tolerate the mass violations of fundamental rights and freedoms in South Africa. The arms embargo had thus become a test of the resolve of the international community to carry out the pledge it had undertaken under Article 56 of the United Nations Charter, and it was right that that resolve should be reaffirmed by the General Assembly.

6. His Government had faithfully complied with the earlier Security Council resolutions on the arms embargo and was taking steps to implement the additional provisions of the Council resolution 282 (1970).

7. Mr. BASSETTE (Belgium) said that, although he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.182 as amended, his delegation was not convinced that the draft resolution was entirely compatible with Article 12 of the Charter. The present procedure should not therefore be regarded as setting a precedent.

8. Mr. PETRI (Sweden) said that, at the twenty-fourth session (656th meeting) his delegation had pointed out that the arms embargo was not being scrupulously observed by all States, and that since there was a dearth of comprehensive statistics on arms imports into South Africa, it would be in order to request the Secretary-General to prepare a report containing information obtained through various channels on the delivery of military supplies to South Africa. The brief document on the subject produced by the Unit on *Apartheid*,<sup>1</sup> although valuable, did not contain much new data, nor did it represent the thorough analysis requested at the twenty-fourth session. He hoped that sufficient resources could be made available for such a report to be prepared by the Secretariat.

9. Sufficient information was available, however, for the Security Council to consider ways of tightening the embargo, perhaps by making it obligatory on all Member States.

10. His delegation would consequently vote in favour of the draft resolution which constituted a strong reminder to all States of the need to strengthen the arms embargo.

11. Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation fully shared the profound concern of many Member States over the serious situation caused by the criminal policy of *apartheid*. The situation was being aggravated by the continuing build-up of South

<sup>1</sup> Document 17/70, of May 1970.

Africa's military and police forces resulting from the failure of certain Western countries, including some permanent members of the Security Council, to observe the arms embargo. Their violation of Security Council decisions, and their continued moral, political and even direct military support for South Africa enabled that régime to maintain the lawless policies of *apartheid* and to threaten the younger independent States of black Africa.

12. It was clear from the report of the Special Committee and from other documents that the interests of the imperialist monopolies of the Western Powers were so closely interwoven with the interests of the racists in South Africa, and their common fear of the national liberation movement brought them so closely together that in southern Africa an "unholy alliance" had been formed which was openly flouting the principles of humanity, the Charter of the United Nations and the decisions of its main bodies.

13. The situation had reached the stage where, at the very time of the adoption by the Security Council of its resolution 282 (1970), the United Kingdom Government had openly declared its intention to resume the sale of arms to South Africa, in direct defiance of world and public opinion, the principles of the Charter and the decisions of the Security Council. At the September 1970 meeting of OAU at Addis Ababa that organization had expressed its grave concern over the continued support given to South Africa by NATO member States, certain Western countries and Japan, as well as by international economic and financial interests; it had also condemned the Governments and international economic and financial interests which collaborated with that régime (see A/SPC/L.181). The recent conference of the non-aligned countries at Lusaka had likewise condemned those States which were continuing to sell military equipment to South Africa or to help it to produce arms, and had strongly deplored the declared intention of the United Kingdom Government to resume the sale of arms to South Africa [*ibid.*]. His Government firmly supported the said decisions and was continuing its strict compliance with the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly concerning South Africa by maintaining no relations of any kind with that country.

14. On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, it was imperative that Member States should not only verbally condemn the criminal policies of South Africa, but also comply strictly with United Nations decisions designed to ensure justice for the peoples of that country. His delegation would therefore support the draft resolution as amended.

15. Mr. MUNK (Denmark) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, in order not only to show support for the immediate aim of the resolution but also to confirm once again his country's determined opposition to *apartheid*.

16. The subject of the draft resolution had also been dealt with in a press release issued in September 1970 by the Foreign Ministers of the Nordic countries in connexion with their meeting at Oslo. This delegation welcomed the initiative taken by the sponsors and hoped that the draft

resolution would find broad support. Nevertheless, it felt compelled to express some doubt as to operative paragraph 2: care must be taken to respect the position of the Security Council.

17. Mr. MIKUCKI (Poland) said the fact that more than forty countries had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution before the Committee reflected the concern felt by the overwhelming majority of Member States. His country had fully supported Security Council resolution 282 (1970), since the supply of arms and other military equipment to South Africa constituted support for *apartheid* and, in fact, made South Africa a potential threat to the independent African States. Moreover, his country could not accept the artificial distinction between arms for defence and those for internal use.

18. Since Security Council resolution 282 (1970) was being violated, his delegation would give its full support to the draft resolution, and remained fully committed to strong and speedy United Nations action to solve the problem of *apartheid*.

19. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that his delegation shared the view of many that *apartheid* was odious and totally repugnant. His Government had backed that belief when, as early as 1962, it had voluntarily prohibited the sale to South Africa of arms which could be used to enforce *apartheid*. In 1963, before the adoption by the Security Council of its resolutions 181 (1963) and 182 (1963), his Government had again acted on its own by declaring that after the end of 1963 it would no longer sell any military equipment to South Africa, subject only to the honouring of existing contracts and its right to interpret its future policy in the light of the need to maintain international peace and security. By voting in favour of Security Council resolutions 181 (1963), 182 (1963), and 191 (1964) establishing an arms embargo against South Africa, his country had formally affirmed its obligations. It would continue to fulfil those obligations as it had faithfully done in the past, despite the fact that the Security Council resolutions in question were recommendatory rather than mandatory.

20. During the course of his statement at the previous meeting, the representative of Somalia had alleged that the United States was violating the arms embargo by the delivery of spare parts. There was no such violation. Those deliveries consisted entirely of spare parts stemming from contracts entered into prior to the effective date of the embargo. Delivery of major items of military equipment under those contracts had long since been completed.

21. His delegation had abstained in the vote on Security Council resolution 282 (1970), because its more sweeping provisions might weaken rather than strengthen the degree of compliance required to give practical effect to resolutions of the Council. Since the draft resolution before the Committee called upon States to implement that Security Council resolution, his delegation had no alternative but to abstain. However, his Government had in no way been weakened in its resolve to implement strictly its own voluntary arms embargo.

22. Mr. DURAISWAMY (Ceylon), as a sponsor of the draft resolution under discussion, appealed to all States to

give it their wholehearted support, thereby strengthening their common aim, namely, the eradication of the evils of *apartheid*.

23. Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia), speaking in favour of the draft resolution, of which his country was a sponsor, said that it was an interim measure designed, among other things, to express support of the mission soon to be sent to European capitals by OAU. It was important that the Committee should give the draft resolution the widest possible support, so that the moral leadership of the United Nations might be reasserted. His delegation, for its part, would give the measure the full and unqualified support which it merited.

24. Mr. HELLE (Norway) said that his delegation had had some doubts concerning the adoption of a draft resolution which corresponded to Security Council resolution 282 (1970). Since the Security Council was fully authorized to act on behalf of all Member States, its resolution carried their collective weight. A general Assembly resolution relating to the matter in question ran the risk of weakening the resolution adopted by the Security Council.

25. That was not, however, the intention of the sponsors, and his delegation had taken full note of the statement made by the representative of Somalia at the preceding meeting, when introducing the draft resolution, to the effect that political action at various levels was needed in support of the Security Council resolution. His Government was gravely concerned over the continued supply of arms to South Africa. In 1963 and 1964, as a member of the Security Council, it had actively supported and initiated resolutions establishing the arms embargo. The fact that not all States were heeding the embargo was enabling the oppressive South Africa régime to continue its inhuman policy of *apartheid*, which might eventually lead to armed conflicts and civil wars in southern Africa.

26. In the light of the overriding need to support action aimed at strengthening the embargo, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution. He suggested that operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution should be replaced by the following text:

“2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to follow closely the implementation of the present resolution, as he has been doing with regard to Security Council resolution 282 (1970), and to report to the General Assembly not later than 10 December 1970.”

27. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) said on behalf of the sponsors of the draft that he would be happy to accept the Norwegian amendment.

28. Mr. AVKSENTYEV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his country had always shown great sympathy for the struggles of the African peoples against the various manifestations of racial discrimination and oppression. Unfortunately, the efforts of the Security Council to achieve the implementation of the arms embargo by all States had thus far not been successful.

29. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution which, it hoped, would meet with the full

support of all those who genuinely cherished the ideals of freedom and democracy.

30. Mr. MARSCHIK (Austria) said that his country had faithfully complied with the embargo, and would vote in favour of the draft resolution, which it saw as a further expression of the determined rejection of *apartheid* by the international community.

31. Mr. SANTISO GALVEZ (Guatemala) said that his country's decisive position on the question of colonialism and *apartheid* was well-known, and would be reflected in its unqualified support for the draft resolution, as amended.

32. Mr. HOLDER (Liberia) asked for his country to be included among the sponsors of the draft resolution, as amended.

33. Mr. REECE (Canada) said that his delegation had studied the text of the draft resolution under consideration with great care and that, while it was fully in sympathy with the principles underlying the draft, it would be obliged to abstain from voting on it because the essence of the text was currently under review by the Canadian Government. His country had stringently and consistently enforced the embargo on arms since 1963, but continued to supply South Africa with spare parts under the terms of contracts entered into prior to that time. After the adoption of Security Council resolution 282 (1970), his Government had decided to review the entire question in the light of that important text, but no decision had as yet been taken regarding the continuation of shipments of spare parts. In the circumstances, it would be neither appropriate nor honest for his delegation to vote on the draft resolution until his Government had completed its review.

34. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) said that the draft resolution before the Committee did not appear to be open to challenge on constitutional grounds, especially in view of the fact that it contained no new recommendations. The Committee was entitled to deal with the question since it had been brought to the attention of the General Assembly in the report of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 2, of the United Nations Charter.

35. The draft resolution had been submitted in recognition of the dangers which would result from an increase in the shipment of arms to South Africa in support of that country's policy of *apartheid*. In that connexion, it should be noted that the Government of the United Kingdom had announced its intention to reverse its previous policy of refraining from the exportation of arms to South Africa. There was in fact nothing essentially new in that announcement, for the United Kingdom, together with certain other countries, had frequently been criticized in the past for its support of the South African Government. Indeed, the United Kingdom would not be alone in conducting such a policy, since it was known that various firms having their offices in the Federal Republic of Germany, including Telefunken and Siemens, were soon to provide South Africa with electronic equipment for use in its naval operations.

36. His delegation had listened to the repetitious statements by the delegations of the United States of America and Canada, in which those countries had admitted that they continued to supply strategic materials to South Africa under contracts entered into prior to 1963. He found it somewhat surprising that, during the years since that time, they had been unable to find any means of putting an end to their shipments of strategic materials.

37. His delegation considered that the time had come to call on all States to abide by the resolutions of the Security Council in order to compel the Government of South Africa to act in accordance with the generally recognized principles of international law. Unfortunately, that country's position had so far been unyielding, but any change in its attitude would depend on resolute action by the United Nations. The reluctance of certain States to comply with the United Nations resolutions should not give rise to despair. He called on all members of the Committee to give the draft resolution their unanimous support.

38. Mr. NIMON (Togo) condemned the South African Government for its policy of *apartheid*, together with all countries which maintained trade relations with it. For its part, his country strictly observed the decisions of the United Nations with respect to South Africa.

39. His delegation had abstained from voting on the OAU resolution referred to in the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft under consideration since, in its view, either all or none of the countries which traded with South Africa should have been mentioned by name. He therefore wished to request that a separate vote be taken on the last two preambular paragraphs. His delegation would abstain from voting on those paragraphs, but would vote for the draft resolution as a whole.

40. Mr. CASTALDO (Italy) said that his delegation shared the concerns of the sponsors of the draft resolution before the Committee. It supported the operative paragraphs of the text, since it supported the embargo on arms imposed by the Security Council as a specific measure to help put an end to the practice of *apartheid*. However, his delegation considered it unusual and inappropriate to refer, in a resolution to be adopted by a Main Committee of the General Assembly, to conferences which had no functional link with the United Nations, as had been done in the seventh preambular paragraph. Moreover, the resolution cited in that paragraph contained unfounded allegations regarding his country, totally misrepresenting its policies. He therefore requested the deletion of that preambular paragraph. If it was maintained in the text of the draft resolution, his delegation would be forced to abstain from voting on the draft as a whole.

41. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) said that his delegation was in complete agreement with the sponsors of the draft resolution under consideration and would have no difficulty in supporting it, since it was clear that arms shipped to South Africa would be used to strengthen the policy of *apartheid*.

42. However, his country had abstained from voting on the OAU resolution referred to in the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft under consideration because, although it had agreed that it would be useful to send an

African delegation to States which supplied arms to South Africa, it had felt that a resolution which condemned those States in advance would not be the most appropriate means of facilitating the delegation's task. For that reason, if a separate vote was taken on the sixth preambular paragraph, his delegation would abstain from voting on it.

43. Mr. CORNELISSEN (Netherlands) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution under consideration, although it had certain constitutional reservations based on the provisions of Article 12 of the Charter.

44. Mr. OBAME (Gabon) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution, but wished to record reservations regarding the texts referred to in the last two preambular paragraphs.

45. Mr. MOLEFHE (Botswana), recalling that his country's President had warned the international community of the danger inherent in a military build-up in South Africa and noting the threat to international peace and security represented by the South African minority Government, said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution despite its reservations with respect to the reference to General Assembly resolution 2505 (XXIV) contained in the preamble.

46. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) said that her delegation supported the text of the draft resolution, as amended. Although her delegation would have preferred to see an additional paragraph listing by name those countries which had violated the resolutions of the Security Council regarding an embargo on the shipment of arms to the *apartheid* régime, it would vote for the text as it stood in the hope that it would receive the widest possible support. She hoped the text would be circulated to all Member States to facilitate its implementation despite the fact that the request to that effect originally contained in operative paragraph 2 had been deleted.

47. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) stressed that the purpose of the draft resolution was to make a commitment in favour of the embargo on the shipment of arms to South Africa. Other factors, including what had happened at the conferences referred to in the preamble, were secondary.

48. In the past, his delegation, like others, had been generally appreciative of the United States position regarding the embargo. It seemed inconsistent with that position, however, to continue to supply spare parts for heavy weapons to South Africa, thus enabling its military machinery to continue to function. The policy of *apartheid* was a crime against humanity, and any arms supplied to South Africa would eventually be used to maim or kill black Africans. He therefore appealed to the United States of America to review its policy on the matter. If other nations were to affirm their commitment to human dignity, the United States, because of its special position as a permanent member of the Security Council and as a political, military and economic super Power, must exercise leadership. A country with 30 million inhabitants of African origin could not remain insensitive to the situation in southern Africa.

49. In that connexion, he drew attention to a recent statement made at Chicago by Mr. David Newsom, Assist-

ant Secretary of State for African Affairs of the United States, who had said that the United States would consider licensing the exportation to South Africa of limited numbers of small, unarmed executive-type civilian aircraft. Noting that aircraft of any type could be used for military purposes, he wondered if that represented a change in United States policy. The majority of Mr. Newsom's statement, however, had been consistent with the position taken by the United States in the past.

50. He noted with pleasure that the delegations of Togo, the Ivory Coast and Gabon had voiced their commitment to the arms embargo, and he expressed the hope that the request for a separate vote on certain preambular paragraphs would be withdrawn in view of the primary purpose of the draft resolution.

51. In conclusion, he announced that Saudi Arabia and Chile had asked to have their names added to the list of sponsors.

52. Mr. CASTALDO (Italy) said that the representative of Somalia had stressed two points of fundamental importance: one was that the essential aim of the draft was to obtain the widest possible support for the operative paragraphs, particularly the support of the industrialized countries, and the other was that the reference to the conference of the non-aligned countries was secondary. In the opinion of his delegation those were two excellent reasons for abolishing the last preambular paragraph, thus eliminating "a secondary factor" and gaining wider support for the operative part of the draft.

53. Mrs. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) said it was her delegation's hope that the African States would be unanimous in their support for the draft resolution. She therefore appealed to the delegation of Togo to withdraw its request for a separate vote on the last two preambular paragraphs. Otherwise, her delegation would request that the vote on those paragraphs should be taken by roll-call.

54. Mr. MBEKEANI (Malawi) said that an arms embargo should also be applied to certain parts of Africa which were receiving arms from countries belonging to the Eastern bloc, for it would be unwise to ignore the balance of power in the area. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution, but emphasized that its vote should not be interpreted as a vote against humanity, for reasons which he would make clear when the Committee resumed its general debate.

55. Mr. FINGER (United States of America), recalling the statement made by the representative of Somalia, explained that Mr. Newsom had said that, in accordance with the principles of the embargo, the United States did not license military aircraft or large transport aircraft for military use, and had gone on to say that the small unarmed executive civilian-type aircraft in question were freely sold by other nations and could not strengthen South Africa's military or internal security capacity. He pointed out that no licences for the exportation of such aircraft which were used for VIPs, including many African Heads of State, had yet been issued and that any request for the purchase of aircraft would be thoroughly examined with a view to ensuring that

the type and number of aircraft involved would be unsuitable for military purposes.

56. Mr. CHALIKULIMA (Zambia), referring to the Italian request for the deletion of the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, assured the representative of Italy that his country had been mentioned in the resolution adopted at Lusaka (see A/SPC/L.181) only because it was a trading partner of South Africa. The sponsors of the draft resolution attached great importance to the Lusaka Conference and considered the paragraph in question an integral part of the draft and one which could not be deleted.

57. Mr. NIMON (Togo) explained that he was in no way opposed to the spirit of the draft resolution, but merely to its form. He would vote for the operative paragraphs, but would still be obliged to abstain from voting on the sixth preambular paragraph.

58. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) explained that the purpose of the last two preambular paragraphs was merely to put the goal of the draft resolution in proper perspective. Those paragraphs were of great importance to the sponsors of the draft resolution, although, in a spirit of accommodation, they would be pleased to accept the holding of a separate vote on them. He reiterated, however, that the primary objective of the draft resolution was to express commitment to the arms embargo against South Africa.

59. Mr. CASTALDO (Italy), referring to the remarks made by the representative of Zambia, said that the concept of trading partners was highly ambiguous. Italy maintained trade relations with a number of States; however, it was always prepared to abide by the decisions of the United Nations. The remarks of the representative of Zambia were, in any case, inaccurate; in his earlier statement he had been alluding to paragraph 6 of the resolution of the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-aligned Countries, which unjustly accused Italy of military collaboration with the Government of South Africa. It was for that reason he was unable to accept the reference to that resolution in the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/L.182.

60. With regard to the remarks made by the representative of Somalia, he was grateful for his suggestion that a separate vote should be taken on the seventh preambular paragraph; in that case, his delegation would be obliged to cast a negative vote thereon and consequently to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. He had not said that the OAU Conference was irrelevant; on the contrary, he had been pleased that the resolution adopted by the Conference had been circulated as an official document of the Special Committee. He did not, however, feel that it was necessary to refer to that resolution in a draft resolution of the Committee.

61. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that the representative of Somalia had been reading from a press release of Mr. Newsom's statement, the accuracy of which was the responsibility of the press. However, he had before him a copy of the actual text of that statement for which his Government accepted full responsibility. He would be happy to supply the representative of Somalia with a copy. It was difficult to understand why that representative was

concentrating his attention on the United States, which was scrupulously observing the arms embargo, and yet ignoring States which did not observe the embargo.

62. Mr. TEYMOUR (United Arab Republic) said it was not the first time that reference had been made in United Nations documents to resolutions of OAU; moreover, the resolution in question had been issued as an official United Nations document (see A/SPC/L.181). The resolution adopted by the Council of Ministers of OAU regarding the supply of arms to the racist régime of South Africa contained recommendations for action designed to encourage States Members of the United Nations which were not doing so to support the arms embargo; since the purpose of the draft resolution now before the Committee was to prevent the supply of arms to the racist Government of South Africa, the sponsors had deemed it appropriate to include a reference to the OAU resolution in the draft.

63. He associated himself with the appeal issued to the representative of Togo that he should withdraw his request for a separate vote on the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

64. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq) said that the primary purpose of the draft resolution under consideration was to reaffirm the wish of most members of the international community that States should desist from supplying arms to South Africa, since to do so was a crime against humanity. Industrial assistance could hardly be separated from military assistance and was no less reprehensible.

65. Referring to the remarks made by the representative of Italy, he pointed out that it was not the first time that the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies had referred to the decisions of international conferences.

66. While monopolistic and expansionist imperialist Powers might be reluctant to support the draft resolution, it was particularly distressing to hear fellow-Africans, whose countries had suffered at the hands of colonialism, declare their delegations' intention of abstaining in the vote on certain parts of the draft resolution, and, in one case, of casting a negative vote.

67. With regard to the statement from which the United States representative had quoted, to the effect that his Government might consider granting licences for light, unarmed executive-type aircraft, he pointed out that any aircraft could be used for military purposes. Indeed, twenty-five years earlier Palestine had been invaded by aircraft of that same type, which had been supplied by the United States. It was common knowledge that the United States was now providing heavy, sophisticated weapons and aircraft to its friends in the Middle East. It would hardly be surprising if the United States made a similar shift in its policy with regard to South Africa.

68. If the draft resolution could not be adopted unanimously, the positions of various delegations on the issue should at least be made known. He therefore proposed that a roll-call vote should be taken on the draft resolution as a whole and on separate votes, if any.

69. Mr. AKAR (Sierra Leone) said he was deeply distressed by the fact that the delegation of Malawi had found

it necessary to declare its intention of voting against the draft resolution, particularly since certain non-African countries, which had been named as trading partners of South Africa, had merely said they would abstain in the vote. His delegation did not know how the Government of Malawi viewed the despicable situation in South Africa, but if its voting against the draft resolution was a reflection of that view, it was clearly at variance with the view of the rest of the world. He appealed to the representative of Malawi in the interests of Afro-Asian unity and of the concerned conscience of mankind, at least to modify his vote to an abstention.

70. He requested that a separate roll-call vote should be taken on operative paragraph 1, which contained the essence of the draft resolution.

71. Mr. MBEKEANI (Malawi) said it was true that Malawi had suffered under an oppressive colonial régime. It saw itself as part of Africa and was a member of OAU; however, it did not feel obliged to agree automatically with all the OAU decisions. While appreciating the position of the representative of Sierra Leone, he regretted he was unable to act against the instructions received from his Government. He intended to give a full explanation of his Government's position when the general debate on the question of *apartheid* was resumed.

72. Mr. ISMAIL (Southern Yemen) said that delegations which claimed they could not vote in favour of the draft resolution because they had to honour contracts already held with the South African Government would do well to remember that they had entered into a contract with the whole world, namely, the United Nations Charter, and that the situation in South Africa and their activities in supplying arms to the Government of that country could in no way be interpreted as consistent with the Charter.

73. His delegation unreservedly supported the draft resolution, and trusted that the Committee would decide to take a single vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

74. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) observed that the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/SPC/L.182 merely took note of the resolutions recently adopted respectively by the Organization of African Unity and the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries (see A/SPC/L.181); consequently, by supporting those provisions, delegations would not be committing themselves to a particular position with regard to the substance of the two resolutions concerned. If a separate vote was taken on the two paragraphs in question, his delegation would vote in favour of them.

75. The CHAIRMAN announced that a revised version of the draft resolution, incorporating the changes accepted by the sponsors, had been circulated in all working languages as document A/SPC/L.182/Rev.1. He invited the Committee to proceed to a vote on the revised draft resolution and noted, in that connexion, that the representative of Togo had requested that a separate vote should be taken on the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs.

*At the request of the representative of Mauritania, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Austria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria.

*Against:* Italy, Malawi.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina.

*The sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution were adopted by 75 votes to 2, with 25 abstentions.*

76. The CHAIRMAN recalled that a request had been made that a separate vote should be taken on operative paragraph 1.

*At the request of the representative of Sierra Leone, the vote was taken by roll call.*

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

*In favour:* Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon.

*Against:* Portugal.

*Abstaining:* Canada, France, Malawi, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia.

*Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution was adopted by 96 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.*

77. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.182/Rev.1, as a whole.

*At the request of the representative of Iraq, the vote was taken by roll call.*

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

*In favour:* Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan.

*Against:* Malawi, Portugal.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Canada, France, Italy, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 94 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.*

78. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) said he hoped it would be possible for the Committee's recommendation to be submitted to the General Assembly before the opening of the commemorative session. The delegation set up in accordance with the resolution adopted by OAU in September 1970 would be starting its mission on 14 October and would doubtless be fortified in its resolve by an expression of support from such an overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations. He hoped that those delegations which had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution would reconsider their positions and decide to give unqualified support to draft resolutions on the subject. That appeal was addressed in particular to the delegation of Canada, on whose support the sponsors had been relying.

79. The CHAIRMAN said he had been informed that it would be possible for the General Assembly to consider the draft resolution just adopted by the Committee in the early part of the following week.

*The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.*