

2000th meeting

Tuesday, 11 May 1976, at 5 p.m.

President: Mr. Siméon AKE (Ivory Coast).

E/SR.2000

AGENDA ITEM 3

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (continued)* (E/5759 and Add.1, E/5760 and Add.1, E/5763, E/5799, E/5813, E/5815, E/5819, E/L.1713, E/L.1714, E/L.1717 and Add.1)

1. Mr. HARRIMAN (Nigeria), introducing draft resolutions E/L.1713 and E/L.1714 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the formulation of draft resolution E/L.1713 had been arrived at after a great deal of consultation and compromise and reflected the views of most members of the Council. An attempt had been made to achieve unanimity on the matter, and he hoped that draft resolution E/L.1713 would not prejudice other resolutions on racism.

2. Draft resolution E/L.1714 was designed to set in motion administrative measures to lay an effective foundation for the proposed World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Although the Council itself had been designated as the preparatory committee for the Conference, the heavy workload it already had might prevent it from addressing itself fully to the detailed aspects of the matter. The sponsors therefore proposed that a preparatory sub-committee, smaller than the full Council, should be established to deal with such matters as the provisional agenda, rules of procedure, timing and costs. The establishment of preparatory committees of that kind for major conferences was not new in the United Nations. Indeed, such committees constituted an essential part of any successful major conference. The distribution of the members of the preparatory sub-committee would be the following: 7 members from the Afro-Asian Group, 3 from the Latin American Group, 3 from the Group of Socialist States of Eastern Europe and 3 from the Group of Western European and other States. In proposing the establishment of a preparatory sub-committee, the sponsors did not intend or expect that such a sub-committee would incur unnecessary expenditure while carrying out its mandate. The members would be drawn from the membership of permanent missions in New York, and the sub-committee would meet in New York for a period which should not exceed 10 days. The sponsors expected that it would be possible for the sub-committee to meet during the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, preferably in the closing stages when most Committees would have completed their work and when conference facilities would be available at no additional cost. Since officials of the Division of Human Rights would be in New York for the General Assembly, one or two of them might be detailed to assist the sub-committee in its work. Once the sub-committee was established, it would have full authority over its procedures. The proposal in operative paragraph 4 (c) was therefore not mandatory and should be understood as constituting merely a suggestion to the sub-committee. If the sub-committee considered it necessary, it could

invite any of the bodies listed to submit recommendations or proposals in writing. The draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly was just as self-explanatory as the Council's own draft resolution. Although the sponsors of the draft resolution were of the opinion that exceptions to General Assembly resolution 2609 (XXIV) should be made only after the most careful and judicious evaluation of all available evidence, they considered the request by Ghana to be justified and trusted that the General Assembly would see no serious objection to responding to it in an appropriate manner.

3. He informed the Council that Kenya had asked to be listed among the sponsors of both draft resolutions. There were two small changes to be made in the texts of the draft resolutions. In draft resolution E/L.1713, the words "the resolution" in the first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly should be replaced by the words "its resolution 3057 (XXVIII)". In draft resolution E/L.1714, no number should be given after "Economic and Social Council resolution" in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly. The Secretariat would insert the final number of draft resolution E/L.1713 when it had been adopted.

4. Mr. WILSON (Liberia) said that at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly his delegation had not voted in favour of all the resolutions adopted on racism. For it to welcome the adoption of those resolutions would be contrary to the stand it had taken in the General Assembly. If paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1713 was put to the vote, his delegation would therefore be unable to support it.

5. Ms. MATTESON (United States of America) said that her delegation, for reasons which it had explained previously, would not participate in the voting on any draft resolutions relating to the Decade. Furthermore, paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1714 and paragraph 3 of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly ran contrary to and risked undermining a long-established rule in the United Nations. Any decision based on draft resolution E/L.1714 would constitute an unfortunate precedent since it might lead to squandering resources on meetings rather than using them for substantive programmes. As could be seen from document E/L.1717, the additional cost to the regular budget of the Organization would be substantial. Her delegation shared the fears expressed by the Secretary-General and felt that the question should be considered in the appropriate forums. If her delegation had been participating in the vote, it would have voted against the paragraphs in question. She hoped that other delegations would carefully consider the questions she had raised before they voted.

At the request of the representative of Belgium, a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1713.

* Resumed from the 1993rd meeting.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 32 votes to 9, with 7 abstentions.

Draft resolution E/L.1713, as a whole, was adopted by 40 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions (resolution 1989 (LX)).

At the request of the representative of Belgium, a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly in draft resolution E/L.1714.

Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly was adopted by 33 votes to 8, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution E/L.1714, as a whole, was adopted by 40 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions (resolution 1990 (LX)).

6. Mr. RAE (Canada) noted that his country's views on the situation in southern Africa were well known and that Canada had applied sanctions against Southern Rhodesia very soon after the adoption of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). In the light of the commitment made at the Meeting of Commonwealth Heads of Government at Kingston in May 1975 and of Security Council resolution 386 (1976), his country planned to assist Mozambique by providing grant funds for Canadian food aid. It also held the view that South Africa should recognize the right of the people of Namibia to immediate independence.

7. His country had always opposed racial discrimination, particularly *apartheid*, and had repeatedly stated that those evils must be attacked both internationally and nationally. It had therefore supported the adoption of General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), proclaiming the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, and had since done much to promote the cause of the Decade, as could be seen from the reports it had submitted to the United Nations under the Programme for the Decade and the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination. It was precisely because of its commitment to the original aims of the Decade that his country could not and would not accept any attempts to forge a link between racism and Zionism. It had vigorously opposed resolution 3379 (XXX) and felt that the passage of that resolution at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly had seriously compromised the Decade, particularly by tainting resolution 3377 (XXX), dealing with the Decade, and resolution 3378 (XXX), dealing with the World Conference.

8. It was regrettable that recent attempts within the Council to agree on universally acceptable texts had failed. The language in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1713 could still be regarded as indirectly encompassing resolution 3379 (XXX), and his country thus had no choice but to oppose it as well as the entire resolution. It was equally unable to support draft resolution E/L.1714, since no exception could be made to paragraph 10 of resolution 2609 (XXIV), under which the host country bore the additional financial burden of holding a conference away from Headquarters. While he appreciated the difficulties experienced by the Ghanaian Government, he trusted that some other way would be found to deal with the situation. Moreover, paragraph 2 of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly in draft resolution E/L.1714 contained am-

biguities in its relationship to resolution 3379 (XXX) and could be said to lend support to that resolution.

9. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the two draft resolutions and was pleased that they had been adopted by such a large majority, which confirmed his country's feeling that all forms of racism, wherever they arose and whatever ideology they resulted from, should be condemned. The resolutions just adopted were not fully satisfactory to his delegation because they contained ambiguities. His delegation had decided not to insist on more precise formulations because it shared the hope of other delegations that unanimity would be achieved on the texts; however, he had noticed on other occasions that certain delegations and press organs sometimes interpreted ambiguous texts as they wished and he therefore felt it necessary to explain his delegation's interpretation of the two resolutions just adopted by the Council.

10. First, his delegation considered that the Council was not competent to act for the General Assembly in defining policy or determining the political views of the international community as a whole. That could not be the role of the Council since it represented only a small fraction of the international community. Since the Council was not competent to replace the General Assembly, it clearly could not overturn decisions of the Assembly or ignore resolutions adopted by that body. It was therefore clear to his delegation that the resolutions just adopted fell within the general framework of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly concerning racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

11. Secondly, the two resolutions just adopted should be understood in the light of General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX). His country, people and Government were committed to combating all forms of racism, and they considered that Zionism was equivalent to racism as it continued to resemble racism in its acts and to inspire discriminatory and expansionist policies. His delegation reserved the right to comment further on the matter when it came up for discussion in the General Assembly.

12. Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) said that he wished to make an explanation of vote on behalf of the members of EEC represented in the Council, namely his own country, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom. The other three members of EEC—Ireland, Luxembourg and the Netherlands—shared the views he was about to express. The EEC delegations had abstained in the vote on both draft resolutions; they had had considerable difficulty in deciding on that course but had wished above all to respond to the efforts made by the sponsors to take into account the divergent views on the subject. Their abstention did not in any way prejudice the votes that they might cast on the two draft resolutions recommended for adoption by the General Assembly. The EEC delegations' main difficulty was connected with General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX). He recalled that the representative of Italy had said in the Third Committee¹ on 16 October 1975 that the Governments of the EEC countries categorically rejected the concept that Zionism was a form of racism and racial discrimination. The EEC delegations wished to make it clear that their

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Third Committee*, 2132nd meeting.

Governments' position on that question had not and would not change. The delegations noted that the two resolutions just adopted were ambiguous in that regard and they had therefore voted against operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1713 and operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly in draft resolution E/L.1714. The statements made by some delegations during the general debate on the item had only served to reinforce their position. They also had reservations regarding some aspects of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly in draft resolution E/L.1714 and regarding operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1714 itself. They had nevertheless chosen to abstain in the vote on the two draft resolutions because they had been able to show their positions on certain points in the separate votes which had been requested and because they wished to respond to the concern of the African delegations, in particular regarding the goals of the Decade. Their position had also been motivated by their abhorrence of *apartheid* and their support for the self-determination and independence of Namibia and Southern Rhodesia. The EEC delegations would continue to support the goals of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and the Programme for the Decade as defined in General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), and they were determined to continue the struggle against racism as defined in article 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

13. Ms. FINBORUD (Norway) said that the Norwegian Government had strongly opposed the adoption of General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) because it felt that it was totally unacceptable to equate zionism with racism and racial discrimination. It had expressed deep regret that the alien elements introduced into the Decade would make it impossible for it to participate actively in the Decade and to make the contribution it had hoped to make. During the current session of the Council, her delegation had witnessed efforts to bring the Decade back on the right track; it welcomed those efforts because the Norwegian people and Government strongly supported the struggle against racism and racial discrimination as defined in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. On the basis of those considerations, her delegation had abstained in the vote on the two draft resolutions. It hoped that the trend that had emerged during the current session would gain strength during the thirty-first session of the General Assembly so that her Government would be able to give full support to the Programme for the Decade.

14. Mr. STRASSER (Austria) said that his Government firmly supported all efforts to eradicate racial discrimination, particularly *apartheid*, and had wholeheartedly subscribed to the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

15. It had therefore been with profound regret that, at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly, his delegation had had to withdraw its support for the Decade and abstain in the vote on resolution 3377 (XXX) on the implementation of the Programme for the Decade because of the introduction of elements which were totally alien to the cause of eradicating

racism. His country's opposition to resolution 3379 (XXX) had not changed.

16. Draft resolutions E/L.1713 and E/L.1714 constituted a first step towards a return to the original aims of the Decade and he hoped that they would reopen the way towards a definition of the purposes of the Decade which met with broad agreement.

17. His delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution E/L.1713 because the wording of that document, in particular operative paragraph 3, was not fully compatible with the Programme for the Decade or with the definition of racism and racial discrimination given in article 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. His delegation interpreted paragraph 4 (b) of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly as meaning that all available peaceful means should be employed to achieve the goals of the Decade. Regarding paragraph 4 (c), his delegation attached great importance to the principle of freedom of movement, as set out in article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, with which it would continue to comply.

18. His country had abstained in the vote on General Assembly resolution 3380 (XXX) concerning the Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* because the evolution of an international penal law required certain legal pre-conditions which had not yet been met. That Convention also raised a number of constitutional problems. If paragraph 4 (c) and paragraph 4 (h) of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly in draft resolution E/L.1713 had been voted on separately, his delegation would therefore have been unable to vote for them.

19. His delegation warmly welcomed the offer of the Government of Ghana to act as host to the World Conference. That was particularly appropriate since it was the African continent which had been and unfortunately continued to be the main victim of racism. It was for those reasons, and because of the generous financial contribution offered towards the Conference by Ghana, that his delegation had been able to support draft resolution E/L.1714, even though it had serious reservations about making exceptions to the principles contained in resolution 2609 (XXIV).

20. Mr. GAMMOH (Jordan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolutions E/L.1713 and E/L.1714 and was glad that they had been adopted by overwhelming majorities since they advanced the cause of combating racism and racial discrimination. His delegation had supported the resolutions because they focused on the issues of African liberation and human rights. It also considered that they fell within the general context of all Council and General Assembly resolutions concerning the need to combat racism and racial discrimination, especially General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX), which had unmasked the racist nature of zionism as an ideology and a political movement and had been a landmark in the struggle against racism and racial discrimination. His delegation considered that the two resolutions just adopted complemented and reinforced previous resolutions on the subject.

21. Mr. GUNA-KASEM (Thailand) said that his delegation firmly supported the ideas behind the Dec-

ade and had therefore voted for both of the resolutions just adopted. He wished to make it clear, however, that his delegation's vote in favour of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1713 was without prejudice to its stand on General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX).

22. Mr. ALEMAN (Ecuador) said that his delegation's votes in favour of the two draft resolutions had confirmed its consistent support for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. He wished to make it clear, however, that in the view of his delegation zionism was not a form of racism and racial discrimination, as stated in General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX); he recalled that his delegation had abstained in the vote on that resolution.

23. Mr. AL-SAIDI (Yemen) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the two draft resolutions in order to show its support for the Decade. His delegation interpreted operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1713 as making a direct reference to all General Assembly resolutions pertaining to racism and racial discrimination, and especially to General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX), which had determined that zionism was a form of racism and racial discrimination.

24. Miss ROMAN (Mexico) said that her delegation's vote in favour of the two draft resolutions should be interpreted in the light of the statement made by the representative of Mexico in the General Assembly on 15 December 1975, during the consideration of the report of the Third Committee on the International Women's Year.²

25. Mrs. HSUEH Jun-wu (China) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution E/L.1713. However, it had reservations regarding certain parts of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 387 (1976), which were referred to in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. With regard to its position on related matters, her delegation had already stated its views at the meetings of the Security Council on 30 January³ and 31 March 1976⁴ and at the 1991st meeting of the Economic and Social Council. She would not repeat those views at the current stage.

26. Mr. LAMB (Australia) said that his delegation had abstained in the votes on the two draft resolutions. It felt that the financial questions raised in draft resolution E/L.1714 should not be prejudged by decisions and recommendations of the Council. It therefore reserved its position on the matter until it was discussed in the General Assembly.

27. Mr. RIVAS (Colombia) recalled that when it had abstained in the vote on General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) his delegation had explained that the Government of Colombia did not feel obliged to apply the measures adopted against zionism by the international community in the struggle against racism and racial discrimination. That reservation should be taken into account in respect of his delegation's votes in favour of draft resolutions E/L.1713 and E/L.1714, which his delegation had supported just as it had supported all other resolutions relating to the Decade.

28. Mr. SAKO (Ivory Coast) said that his delegation wished to make it clear that it had voted in favour

of both draft resolutions in order to confirm its attachment to the goals of the Decade and to associate itself with the consultations which had made it possible to conclude the debate on the item. His delegation had abstained in the votes on the two individual paragraphs because it did not wish to give the impression that it had changed its position on General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX). His Government's determination to contribute to the elimination of racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* could not be doubted, and it assured Ghana that it fully supported the World Conference and would assist in ensuring its success.

29. Mr. S. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution E/L.1713 in the belief that it represented a new advance towards achieving the goals of the Decade, particularly in the light of paragraph 6 (b) of the Programme for the Decade (resolution 3057 (XXVIII), annex). His delegation had also had in mind the goal of the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination as described in paragraph 13 (a) of the Programme and reproduced in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly in draft resolution E/L.1714.

30. His delegation had therefore voted in favour of draft resolution E/L.1713 on the basis of its understanding of the goals of the Decade. It wished to stress its view that any attempt to limit the sphere of application of General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII) would be incompatible with the goals of the Decade and the spirit and letter of the Programme for the Decade. As his delegation had said on previous occasions, the Programme was a complex of interlinked measures and should be implemented fully in all its parts.

31. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution E/L.1714 because it believed that the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was one of the main events of the Decade, at which the progress made in implementing the goals of the Decade could be assessed and further ways of implementing United Nations decisions on combating racism and racial discrimination could be planned. His delegation had already said that, taking into account the contribution of the Government of Ghana to the preparation of the Conference, including its financial contribution, it did not object to the request that part of the expenses of the Conference be defrayed from the regular budget of the United Nations. However, his delegation wished to stress that it did not consider that that should set a precedent for other conferences.

32. Mrs. OGATA (Japan) said that her delegation had voted for the two draft resolutions, the substance of which was in accordance with its policy of active participation in the Decade. However, her delegation reserved its position on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1714 and operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution recommended therein for adoption by the General Assembly. She sympathized with Ghana's request that an exception be made from resolution 2609 (XXIV), particularly since strict adherence to that resolution might in future prevent a number of developing countries from acting as host to similar conferences. However, such exceptions could become a general rule, and she therefore proposed that the General Assembly be requested to discuss the matter with the Committee

² *Ibid.*, Thirtieth Session, Plenary Meetings, 2441st meeting.

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-first Year*, 1885th meeting.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1906th meeting.

on Conferences and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

33. Her delegation had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1713, and on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly in draft resolution E/L.1714.

34. Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolutions because they were in accordance with his country's position on racism, particularly as it was practised in South Africa. However, it had reservations concerning certain points which were similar to those it had expressed at the time of the adoption of resolution 3379 (XXX).

35. Mr. DAMMERT (Peru) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolutions because they were in accordance with Peru's position on racism and its support for the Decade. However, that vote must not

be taken to reflect a change in his delegation's position on resolution 3379 (XXX), on which it had abstained.

36. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that he supported the Decade and had voted in the affirmative in the four votes on the draft resolutions. However, his delegation's vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1713 and on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly in draft resolution E/L.1714 should not be construed as representing a change in its position on resolution 3379 (XXX), on which it had abstained.

37. Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) said that his delegation supported all efforts to combat racism and all United Nations resolutions on that subject, including all the resolutions adopted on the Programme for the Decade at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly. It was in that spirit that he had voted for the two draft resolutions.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

2001st meeting

Wednesday, 12 May 1976, at 11.15 a.m.

President: Mr. Siméon AKE (Ivory Coast).

E/SR.2001

AGENDA ITEM 14

Elections (E/5770, E/5774, E/5775 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1-6, E/5776, E/5826, E/L.1693, E/L.1694 and Add.1 and 2, E/L.1695 and Corr.1, E/L.1696-1699, E/L.1701)

1. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take the elections in the order in which the bodies concerned were listed in the annotations to item 14 in the provisional agenda for the sixtieth session (E/5770), beginning with the Statistical Commission.

STATISTICAL COMMISSION (E/L.1693)

2. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect eight members of the Statistical Commission for a term of office of four years beginning on 1 January 1977.

3. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates: for the two seats allotted to Asian States: Japan and Malaysia; for the two seats allotted to Latin American States: Brazil and Panama; for the three seats allotted to Western European and other States: France, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; for the seat allotted to the socialist States of Eastern Europe: Romania.

4. The PRESIDENT suggested that those countries should be elected by acclamation.

Brazil, France, Japan, Malaysia, Panama, Romania, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland were elected members of the Statistical Commission by acclamation.

POPULATION COMMISSION (E/L.1693)

5. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect nine members of the Population Commission for a term of office of four years beginning on 1 January 1977.

6. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates: for

the two seats allotted to African States: Rwanda and Zaire; for the seat allotted to Asian States: Thailand; for the two seats allotted to Latin American States: Brazil and the Dominican Republic; for the three seats allotted to Western European and other States: the Netherlands, Norway and Spain; for the seat allotted to the socialist States of Eastern Europe: Hungary.

7. The PRESIDENT suggested that those countries should be elected by acclamation.

Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Hungary, the Netherlands, Norway, Rwanda, Spain, Thailand and Zaire were elected members of the Population Commission by acclamation.

COMMISSION FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (E/L.1693)

8. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 10 members of the Commission for Social Development for a term of office of four years beginning on 1 January 1977.

9. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates: for the two seats allotted to African States: Guinea and Madagascar; for the two seats allotted to Asian States: Iraq and the Philippines; for the two seats allotted to Latin American States: Chile and Ecuador; for the three seats allotted to Western European and other States: Denmark, Italy and Turkey; for the seat allotted to the socialist States of Eastern Europe: Poland.

10. The PRESIDENT suggested that those countries should be elected by acclamation.

Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Guinea, Iraq, Italy, Madagascar, the Philippines, Poland and Turkey were elected members of the Commission for Social Development by acclamation.

11. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had strong reservations regarding the election of Chile to the Commission for Social Development, since that country constantly violated the human rights