

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 713th  
MEETING**



Tuesday, 3 November 1970,  
at 3.35 p.m.

NEW YORK

*Chairman:* Mr. Abdul Samad GHAUS  
(Afghanistan).

*Tribute to the memory of Mr. Zygfryd Wolniak,  
Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland*

1. The CHAIRMAN offered the condolences of the Committee to the Polish Government on the death of Mr. Zygfryd Wolniak, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland.

2. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) conveyed to the Polish representative the condolences of the representatives of the Eastern countries on the death of Mr. Wolniak, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs.

3. Mr. PAL (Pakistan) said that the Government of Pakistan had appointed a committee to investigate the accident at Karachi which had resulted in the death of the Polish Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs. He presented his condolences to Mr. Wolniak's family and to the Polish people.

4. Mr. FRELEK (Poland) thanked delegations which had tendered their condolences; he would pass them on to the family of the deceased and to the Polish people.

**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 and Add.1, A/8109, A/8117, A/SPC/L.181, A/SPC/L.183, A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.185, A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2, A/SPC/L.187-191)**

5. The CHAIRMAN announced that Southern Yemen wished to become a co-sponsor of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.183 and A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1, Mauritius and the People's Republic of the Congo of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2, Mali of draft resolution A/SPC/L.187, Burma, Libya, Sierra Leone and Syria of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188, and Guinea and Syria wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.190.

6. Mr. DURAISWAMY (Ceylon) said it was distressing to note that in spite of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations, the South African Government had not only continued to persecute the opponents of *apartheid*, but was intensifying its policy of racial segregation. Despite such setbacks the United Nations had to persevere in its efforts, as was testified by the seven draft resolutions before the Committee. Ceylon was one of the sponsors of draft

resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2, which was so drafted as to reflect the views expressed by a number of delegations, and it would also support draft resolution A/SPC/L.187.

7. The sponsors of the original text of draft resolution A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1 had amended that text by replacing the words "to the movements" in the first preambular paragraph by the words "to the national movement", by adding, after the words "promote assistance" in operative paragraph 1, the words "in the economic, social and humanitarian fields" and by inserting before the words "oppressed people", in the same paragraph, the words "national movement of the". Since the United Nations had recognized the legitimacy of the struggle being carried on by the national liberation movements in southern Africa, it was logical that assistance should be given to the oppressed population of South Africa. The underlying principle of the draft was the same as that of draft resolution A/SPC/L.187, sponsored by the Nordic countries, Somalia and Zambia.

8. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.183 provided for expanding the membership of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa with a view to promoting concerted effort embracing all sections of opinion in the United Nations and the international community. Moreover, the elimination of duplication of effort by various United Nations organs, as required under operative paragraph 2 of that draft, would increase the effectiveness and lower the cost of the campaign against *apartheid*.

9. The delegation of Ceylon hope that draft resolution A/SPC/L.185, which provided for wider dissemination of information on *apartheid*, would be unanimously adopted. Though useful work was being done by the Office of Public Information and the Unit on *Apartheid* of the Secretariat, no effort should be spared to awaken the conscience of man, even among the upholders of *apartheid* policies.

10. The measures proposed in draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2 were intended to make the evils of the policy of *apartheid* even clearer to international opinion. The sponsors hoped that the trade union movements of the world would lend their powerful support in the fight against racism and racial discrimination.

11. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) introduced draft resolutions A/SPC/L.188 and A/SPC/L.190. In connexion with the latter he said that in the General Assembly (1872nd plenary meeting) President Kaunda of Zambia had spoken of the need for setting up an effective system permitting the application of all conventions already adopted, and had suggested the establishment of an international crimes tribunal. In line with that idea, the sponsors of the draft resolution, pointing out that *apartheid* was not only a crime

against the conscience and dignity of mankind but a crime against humanity, had proposed that a study should be made of the implications of the crime of *apartheid* in terms of international law.

12. Turning to draft resolution A/SPC/L.188, he drew attention to operative paragraph 3, by which the establishment of “Bantustans” in so-called African reserves would be condemned as fraudulent and a violation of the principles of self-determination. By the same draft resolution the continued co-operation by certain States and foreign economic interests with South Africa in the military, economic, political and other fields would be strongly deplored, as such co-operation encouraged the South African Government in the pursuit of its inhuman policies. The draft resolution provided for a number of measures in that connexion, including those envisaged under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Finally, the draft resolution proposed a joint meeting between the three organs of the United Nations mainly concerned with *apartheid*, with a view to preventing some duplication, co-ordinating objectives and harmonizing activities. Such a meeting would be in the interests of the United Nations. It could be held at New York and should not entail any organizational difficulties.

13. Some delegations had objected that the proposed measures would not be acceptable because they provided for the application of Chapter VII of the Charter, but he would point out that in dealing with racism, no changes could be made without the use of coercive measures. In the United States of America between 2,000 and 3,000 troops had had to be called out to enforce school integration, and he would remind those who were reluctant to adopt energetic measures of what had happened elsewhere in such situations and ask them to give full support to the draft resolution.

14. Several delegations had asked for more information on the proposal for co-operation with OAU in arranging broadcasts to southern Africa. At the twenty-fourth session the Special Committee had made a recommendation to that effect, which the General Assembly had endorsed in its resolution 2506 B (XXIV). In connexion with the need for better co-ordination, he recalled that at the same session, on the recommendation of the Third Committee, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 2547 B (XXIV), paragraph 11 of which requested the Secretary-General to set up a unit of the United Nations Radio Services in Africa to produce and broadcast radio programmes for the peoples of southern Africa. Before the adoption of that resolution, the Secretary-General had indicated that he would implement it in the light of resolution 2506 (XXIV), that is, in consultation with OAU. The Sub-Committee on Information on *Apartheid* had been informed that consultations had taken place between the Office of Public Information and OAU on the subject of a broadcasting station. Following on those consultations, OAU was prepared to have programmes translated into various southern African languages and to arrange for them to be broadcast by African radio stations. The cost of that operation would amount to \$50,000 a year for weekly programmes, a much lower figure than the \$130,000 estimated for a United Nations radio unit. The Special Committee therefore supported the provision of such a grant to OAU for that purpose.

15. In that connexion, he wished to draw the attention of the Special Political Committee to paragraphs 22 to 24 of the report<sup>1</sup> on the question submitted by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly and on the agenda of the Third Committee; it was unfortunate that that report was not altogether clear.

16. He suggested that the Committee should ask the Office of Public Information to provide it with all necessary information on the consultations with OAU on the subject.

17. Turning to the financial aspect of the question, he regretted that document A/SPC/L.189 concerning the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/SPC/L.183 stated that, in the event the Special Committee as a whole held sessions or attended conferences elsewhere than in New York, the increased membership would result in proportionately higher costs for travel and subsistence of its members. No meetings held away from Headquarters were being considered for the financial year 1971. If one or two members of the Special Committee had to attend international conferences or seminars, that did not mean that all members would have to leave Headquarters. His delegation considered therefore that that document merely made matters more confused.

18. Referring to a remark made by the representative of Denmark (710th meeting) on the reduction of the budget of the Special Committee, he said he understood that the figure of \$5,000 given under section 17 of the budget estimates for the financial year 1971<sup>2</sup> was a provisional one. He regretted however that the Secretariat had not left the amount blank until the Special Committee had established its plans for 1971. The Special Committee had always been prudent in expenditure, and the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was a particularly bad time to reduce the appropriations for a body that was combating *apartheid*. At a time when the United Nations was, for example, allocating more than \$300,000 to the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and more than \$5 million to the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, it could hardly be proposed that the Special Committee should be content with \$5,000. Some delegations, while condemning *apartheid* in their speeches, were opposing any political action against it, but his delegation was firmly resolved that effective measures should be taken against *apartheid* and would oppose any manoeuvres to paralyse that action on grounds of economy. If one thought of the tremendous profits, estimated at over \$100 million a year, made by foreign economic interests from the slavery in southern Africa, the small expenditure that the draft resolution under consideration might entail seemed pitiful.

19. Mr. DE STEXHE (Belgium), referring to draft resolution A/SPC/L.183 which dealt mainly with the terms of reference and the composition of the Special Committee, said his delegation could well understand the concern which had made its sponsors point out that the Special Committee was competent to deal with all aspects of the policy of

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda items 53 and 60, document A/8057.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, *Twenty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 6*.

*apartheid* and propose that the membership of the Committee should be increased.

20. His delegation was happy to note that the sponsors wished to avoid any duplication of effort, thereby evidently wishing to affirm the exclusive competence of the Special Committee. He regretted that by operative paragraph 5 of the draft, organizations that were more political than technical would be invited to join in the struggle against *apartheid*. The same logic that required overlapping to be avoided between United Nations bodies should also require that overlapping should be avoided between the United Nations on the one hand and specialized agencies and regional organizations on the other.

21. He wished to point out also that operative paragraph 5 of resolution A/SPC/L.183 duplicated operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185. His delegation considered that draft resolution A/SPC/L.183 would be more logical and consistent if operative paragraph 5 was deleted. If that proposal were adopted, the words "and the specialized agencies" in the third preambular paragraph, which referred to operative paragraph 5, should also be deleted.

22. He hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would show a spirit of compromise by accepting the small changes he had just proposed.

23. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) fully supported draft resolution A/SPC/L.183, which called on United Nations organs to avoid all duplication of effort. His own delegation, like many others, had already pointed out that the great number of resolutions adopted by the many organs dealing with *apartheid* reduced their effectiveness. He therefore proposed that in operative paragraph 2, after the words "United Nations organs", the words "and subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly" should be inserted, so that all documentation on *apartheid* should be transmitted to the Special Political Committee. Furthermore, operative paragraph 5 should be deleted in order to avoid confusion.

24. His delegation considered that draft resolutions A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1 and A/SPC/L.187 were related in that the former dealt with the assistance to be provided to the oppressed people of South Africa, in their legitimate struggle against *apartheid*, while the latter appealed for contributions to voluntary organizations engaged in relief to persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa.

25. As for draft resolution A/SPC/L.185, he was convinced of the importance of keeping world public opinion informed of the wrongs of *apartheid*. However, the resolutions adopted must be drafted within the framework of the Charter and must not be likely to turn against those who adopted them. By its resolution 2505 (XXIV) the General Assembly had expressed the firm intention of the United Nations, acting in co-operation with OAU, to intensify its efforts to find a solution to the grave situation in southern Africa. Thus, there was nothing to prevent the Secretary-General from helping to make arrangements for the radio broadcasts referred to in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, without, however, limiting them to southern

Africa. Therefore, the phrase "to southern Africa" should be deleted.

26. His delegation intended to submit amendments to draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2 in the same spirit as the sponsors, amplifying the idea expressed in operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.183. It was indeed appropriate for the United Nations to launch a campaign against *apartheid*, which would be outlined by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Special Committee. The campaign would be aimed primarily at the young people who would be their countries' future leaders. The international conference on *apartheid* in which trade union representatives were to participate could be organized within the framework of that campaign, but, as the Hungarian representative had pointed out (711th meeting), the existing text raised a number of practical difficulties; moreover, since trade unions were organized into world federations and confederations, the number of participants in the conference might be limited.

27. He drew attention to the contradiction between operative paragraphs 2 and 4 of that draft: the former provided for the organization "in principle" of an international conference of trade unions in 1972, while the latter referred to arrangements for the conference. Moreover, the General Assembly could hardly be asked to determine the actions of trade union organizations. The Secretary-General, in consultation with the Special Committee and OAU, could determine the date of the proposed conference and convene it at the most appropriate time.

28. He recalled that the difficulties experienced by the World Youth Assembly had been due in part to the lack of rules of procedure. He therefore proposed that the rules of procedure of the General Assembly should be applied, with any changes which might be proposed by the Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat.

29. By its resolution 2506 B (XXIV), the General Assembly had requested the Special Committee to hold consultations with representatives of the South African national movement and to co-operate with the various organizations concerned with the problems of southern Africa. However, in view of the expenses which the organization of the conference would entail, it would be desirable for the Special Committee to limit its travel so far as possible, while maintaining its presence at the Yaoundé Seminar and the international conferences on *apartheid* to be held during the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

30. Mr. DIABATE (Guinea) wondered how, in spite of the resolutions adopted over twenty-five years by the General Assembly and the Security Council, it was possible for South Africa to continue, with complete impunity, to draft new repressive legislation, to fight against the liberation movements, to prosper economically and even to extend *apartheid* to neighbouring territories. While the Security Council, and its permanent members in particular, ought to be the guarantor of international peace and security, three of its members, France, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, without whose agreement the Council could neither take nor execute effectively any decision, were the most powerful economic and military allies of

South Africa. Thus, one was led to the paradoxical conclusion that, through them, the United Nations had in fact contributed to the strengthening of *apartheid*.

31. Article 2 of the Charter placed an obligation upon Member States to refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations was taking preventive or enforcement action. Perhaps logic and right would have triumphed if the States which proclaimed great humanitarian principles had acted on them in the case of *apartheid*.

32. In reality, while the colonial era had been marked by confrontations between the colonizing Powers, those same Powers, having lost their empires, were now uniting to hold that last colony. They were determined to fight, within NATO, for the maintenance of white supremacy in southern Africa by supporting the Pretoria-Salisbury-Lisbon axis.

33. Through their action in the United Nations, the forces of peace must make South Africa's allies discharge their obligations under the Charter. He emphasized that any policy of rapprochement with South Africa and tolerance for its policy of racial discrimination should be regarded as a betrayal of Africa and the South African freedom-fighters.

34. A solution to the problem of *apartheid* would imply first of all an examination of the South African Government's right to represent South Africa in the United Nations. In addition, the United Nations should organize and increase material aid to the freedom-fighters, promote the international campaign against *apartheid*, denounce the complicity of South Africa's main trading partners and make the embargo on arms for South Africa compulsory. The draft resolutions before the Committee represented the least that could be done by the United Nations and would constitute a decisive step towards respect for its fundamental principles.

35. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) welcomed draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2, but regretted that not all the proposals submitted in writing by his and other delegations had been taken into account in the revised text. It would therefore be difficult for him to support it without reservation.

36. Operative paragraph 2 raised a problem which had already been taken up by the representative of Mexico, namely that the General Assembly could not decide what trade unions should do, but could at the most invite them to take certain measures. Since the basic idea of that paragraph also appeared in operative paragraphs 3 and 4, in more acceptable terms, he proposed that operative paragraph 2 should be deleted.

37. He noted with satisfaction that operative paragraph 3 referred to "all" trade union organizations, and he could therefore accept the text, which was less restrictive than the previous one. However, as the Mexican representative had just stated, operative paragraph 4 raised a number of difficulties: it would be impossible to make arrangements for the proposed international conference until the decision to organize it had been taken. In order to bring that paragraph into harmony with the rest of the text, he therefore proposed that the phrase "the arrangements for"

should be replaced by "the possibility of holding". Moreover, the reference to the ILO implied certain limitations; recent events had clearly demonstrated how vulnerable that organization was to certain national groups which threatened its budget. In addition, the ILO applied a policy of discrimination with respect to important trade unions in certain countries.

38. If the trade unions organized the proposed conference, it would be out of place for the General Assembly to decide that its own rules of procedure should be followed, as the representative of Mexico had proposed. In spite of some disagreements, there was in fact co-operation between the trade unions which could be channelled towards the activities against *apartheid* suggested in operative paragraph 3 of the draft; the General Assembly could then consider the possibility of holding a large-scale international conference in 1972.

39. The end in view was to promote the struggle against *apartheid*, not only in the United Nations but also elsewhere, and he was convinced that the trade union movement would take a constructive attitude towards the problem. If the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2 took his suggestions into account his delegation would be prepared to join them. Consideration would also have to be given to the observations made by various other representatives, in order to avoid overlapping between the draft resolutions.

40. Mr. TEYMOUR (United Arab Republic), recalled that his country was one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.188 which he said the Committee should adopt because of its humanitarian nature. It was impossible not to sympathize with the victims of *apartheid*, and States Members of the United Nations were bound to honour the obligations they had assumed under the Charter.

41. Mr. AMONOO (Ghana), referring to draft resolution A/SPC/L.183, of which his country was a sponsor, felt that in proposing the deletion of operative paragraph 5 and of the words "and specialized agencies" in the third preambular paragraph, the representative of Belgium had misunderstood the sponsors' intention. Reference was made to the specialized agencies because it was felt that all possible resources should be used in the international campaign against *apartheid* and that they should be co-ordinated to avoid duplication and to ensure that the campaign was as effective as possible. It was therefore difficult to accept the Belgian representative's proposal, which would amount to questioning the efforts of other bodies concerned with *apartheid*, and would do nothing to facilitate the Committee's work. It would however be interesting to learn if Belgium and other countries which thought like Belgium could indicate whether they would be prepared to serve on the Special Committee if the sponsors of the draft agreed to the requests of the Belgian representative.

42. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) pointed out to the representative of Belgium that the Special Committee had to avail itself of the co-operation of UNESCO and the ILO in its struggle against *apartheid*. Nevertheless, the sponsors were prepared to reconsider the text of draft resolution A/SPC/L.183, if that would be in the interests of the struggle against *apartheid*.

43. Replying to the observations made by the representatives of Mexico and Hungary on draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2, he said he would have no difficulty in deleting operative paragraph 2, since operative paragraphs 3 and 4 dealt with the same question. He had no objection to replacing in the latter paragraph the expression "arrangements for" by "possibilities for".

44. He proposed that the following new paragraph should be added to the preambular part of the draft:

"Believing that an international conference of trade unions to promote concerted action by trade unions against *apartheid* would be desirable,".

45. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would comment on the draft resolutions before the Committee later, after studying them more closely. For the time being, he wished to make some observations on draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2. His delegation was firmly in favour of any measure designed to combat *apartheid*, provided that it was effective and well prepared. In the Soviet Union an extensive programme of action to support the anti-*apartheid* movement was being carried out. By that draft resolution it was proposed that the General Assembly should decide, in principle, to organize an international conference of trade unions in 1972 to promote concerted action by trade unions against *apartheid*. While his delegation certainly had no objection to the idea *per se*, he wished to make some reservations on its application.

46. The proposal, as formulated, was contrary to the Charter and encroached on the authority of the General Assembly. Moreover, it trespassed on the sovereign rights of the trade unions which might even see it as a challenge. The history of the trade unions was well known: they were groups formed on a voluntary basis to struggle against the exploiting classes. Their tradition of independence could not be reconciled with a decision by the General Assembly taken without even consulting them, to organize an international conference of trade unions, impose a programme and objectives on them and decide all the details of the conference in advance. Surely it would be better to ask their opinion? They were in a better position than the United Nations to decide under what conditions they should meet, who should participate in the meeting and what its objectives should be. The most the General Assembly could do was to request them to promote concerted action against *apartheid* and to offer them advice on the subject.

47. His delegation supported the amendments submitted by the Hungarian and Mexican delegations to the draft resolution, providing for the deletion of operative paragraph 2 and the replacement, in operative paragraph 4, of the expression "arrangements for" by "possibilities for".

48. The international conference of trade unions would have to be prepared extremely carefully, and hasty decisions should therefore be avoided. A lesson could be learned from the World Youth Assembly which, because it had been prepared hastily, without consulting youth organizations in advance, had very nearly not materialized. The representative of Somalia had said that it did not really

matter who would take part in the international conference of trade unions. His delegation felt, on the contrary, that that was extremely important. It deplored the fact that many young people, including the heroic youth of Viet-Nam, had been unable to attend the World Youth Assembly.

49. The more people, particularly among the working class, who participated in the struggle against *apartheid* the better that would be, but it should be remembered that the responsibility of the United Nations would increase correspondingly. An international conference of trade unions was highly desirable but if it was to be a success it was essential that it should be carefully prepared and well-thought-out. Since the statement of the representative of Somalia, although made only on behalf of his delegation, had been sympathetic towards the amendments proposed by the Hungarian and Mexican delegations, he hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would give thought to his own observations.

50. Mr. CHALIKULIMA (Zambia) pointed out to the representatives of Hungary and the Soviet Union that draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2 had been submitted two weeks earlier, and that time could have been saved if they had submitted their suggestions in writing to the sponsors when the draft was being prepared.

51. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied that the socialist group of countries had held consultations with the representatives of the sponsors and suggestions had been submitted in writing.

52. His delegation supported the proposals made by the representative of Hungary and accepted by the representative of Somalia, namely that operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2 should be deleted and that the phrase "arrangements for" in operative paragraph 4 should be replaced by "possibilities for".

53. Mr. TEYMOUR (United Arab Republic), speaking on behalf of his delegation, accepted the suggestions made by the representative of Hungary. However, he felt that the words "to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session"—or "in 1971"—should be inserted after the words "to report" in operative paragraph 4.

54. Mr. SPÁČIL (Czechoslovakia) said that if the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2 accepted the amendments just proposed and if the paragraph proposed by the Somali representative was added to the preamble, Czechoslovakia would ask to join the sponsors of the draft.

55. Mr. S. TRAORE (Mali) said that the main objective of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2 was to draw organizations able to influence peoples and Governments into the United Nations struggle against *apartheid*. So far as his delegation was concerned, any amendment was acceptable as long as it did not affect the main objective.

56. He felt that the words "as practised in South Africa" in the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/L.190 were superfluous, since *apartheid* was practised only in South Africa.

57. Mr. AHMED (Sudan), recalling that the Sudan was a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2, said that the suggestions or amendments submitted by the Mexican, Hungarian and Soviet Union representatives appeared to be acceptable to his delegation. He hoped that the new text would meet with the approval of all those who were sincerely struggling to abolish *apartheid*.

58. Mr. AMONOO (Ghana), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2, said that he accepted the amendments submitted by the Hungarian, Soviet and Czechoslovak representatives. He expressed the hope that the revised draft as amended would receive wide support.

59. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) said that he would not come to a decision on the amended text of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2 until he had consulted a number of other representatives.

60. Mexico's suggestion to exclude South Africa from the United Nations was perhaps premature. The Special Committee might perhaps consider the possibility and submit a report to the General Assembly in due course, as the Moroccan representative had suggested (704th meeting).

61. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) welcomed the spirit of co-operation being displayed in the Committee. He accepted the additional preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2 proposed by the Somali representative and supported by the Czechoslovak representative. He also accepted the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Arab Republic, namely, the insertion of the words "in 1971" or "to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session" after the words "to report" in operative paragraph 4.

62. In regard to draft resolution A/SPC/L.190, he felt that the phrase "as practised in South Africa" should be deleted from the first preambular paragraph, since the existing wording might imply that other forms of *apartheid* were tolerable. The phrase should read "the South African Government's *apartheid* policy".

63. Mr. MUNK (Denmark), exercising his right of reply, said that the Somali representative appeared to have misinterpreted the reasons for his statement at the 710th meeting. The remarks he had then made on the financial implications of the draft resolutions under consideration were intended only to draw the Committee's attention to rule 154 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, and intended to support the Somali representative's statement at that meeting. It was quite proper for him to draw attention to the figures set out in the budget estimates for 1971 and to the Secretary-General's statement<sup>3</sup> before the Fifth Committee on 5 October 1970 (1357th meeting). Unfortunately, his final remarks had not been included in the summary record of the 710th meeting. He had therefore requested that a correction should be made to the effect that he had made his remarks in a spirit of co-operation, without in any way intending to pass judgement on the substance of the draft resolutions in question

and simply in order to ensure that they received the attention they deserved.

64. In any case, neither the Somali representative nor any other should mistake the sincerity of Denmark's struggle against *apartheid*.

65. Mr. FARAH (Somalia), exercising his right of reply, said that he had not intended to cast doubts on the sincerity of Denmark's support of the struggle against *apartheid*. However, he viewed with alarm the fact that the Fifth Committee was considering an appropriation of only \$5,000 for the struggle against *apartheid* in 1971, when the problem was becoming worse. He had suspected some manoeuvre intended to paralyse the activities of the Special Committee. He had wished only to set the record straight.

66. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) approved the text of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2, as amended. Following consultations with her Government, Bulgaria might become a sponsor of the draft.

67. Turning to draft resolution A/SPC/L.183, she proposed that the words "and other appropriate United Nations bodies" should be inserted after the words "to co-operate with the Special Committee" in operative paragraph 5.

68. Mr. AHMED (India) said that the terminology of draft resolution A/SPC/L.190 was legally necessary. However, it could perhaps be somewhat modified. For example, the beginning of the first preambular paragraph might read: "*Recognizing* that the South African Government's policy and practice of *apartheid* . . .".

69. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) pointed out that *apartheid* also existed in Namibia and Southern Rhodesia. Furthermore, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was not part of international law. Reference should therefore be made to the international covenants on human rights adopted by several countries, the provisions of which could be considered equivalent to rules of international law and on the basis of which the criminal nature of *apartheid* could be established.

70. Mr. FARAH (Somalia), referring to the Belgian representative's remark that operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.183 was similar to operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185, said that the sponsors would consider what could be done to deal with that point.

71. He felt that the wording of the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/L.190 could be improved.

### *Organization of the Committee's work*

72. The CHAIRMAN expressed the hope that the Committee would be able to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.183, A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.185, A/SPC/L.186/Rev.2 and A/SPC/L.187 at the end of the following meeting. Then, while the delegations were holding consultations on the other draft resolutions relating to agenda item

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes, agenda item 73, document A/C.5/1309.

34, the Committee could take up agenda item 36, which dealt with the question of peace-keeping operations.

73. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) said that the sponsors of the draft resolutions on the question of *apartheid* would meet the following morning with a view to submitting final texts. The Committee would therefore be able to vote at the afternoon meeting.

74. Mr. SPÁČIL (Czechoslovakia) said that before voting the Committee should have final texts of the drafts before it.

75. The CHAIRMAN decided that the following morning's meeting should be cancelled, and suggested that the draft resolutions should be put to the vote in the afternoon.

76. Mr. MUNK (Denmark), referring to the Somalia representative's remarks concerning the possibility of hearing information on broadcast programmes on *apartheid*

from a representative of the Office of Public Information, asked whether the Committee could obtain that information.

77. The CHAIRMAN said that a representative of the Office of Public Information could provide the requested information.

78. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the circulation of documents relating to the financial implications of draft resolutions should be speeded up. He expressed the hope that all those documents would be available before the vote was taken.

79. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat had noted the Soviet representative's request. The Committee would take up agenda item 36 on Thursday, 5 November 1970.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*