



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 32nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 67: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME FOR THE DECADE FOR ACTION TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 74: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
- (b) FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
- (c) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
- (d) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE SUPPRESSION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF APARTHEID (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 66: ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES FOR THE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS OF POLITICAL, MILITARY, ECONOMIC AND OTHER FORMS OF ASSISTANCE GIVEN TO COLONIAL AND RACIST REGIMES IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 75: IMPORTANCE OF THE UNIVERSAL REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND OF THE SPEEDY GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES FOR THE EFFECTIVE GUARANTEE AND OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.3/35/SR.32  
7 November 1980  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 67: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME FOR THE DECADE FOR ACTION TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/C.3/35/L.3, L.8/Rev.2, L.10, L.15 and L.18)

AGENDA ITEM 74: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/C.3/35/L.7 and L.13)
- (b) FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
- (c) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/C.3/35/L.4 and L.9)
- (d) STATUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE SUPPRESSION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF APARTHEID (continued) (A/C.3/35/L.5)

AGENDA ITEM 66: ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES FOR THE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS OF POLITICAL, MILITARY, ECONOMIC AND OTHER FORMS OF ASSISTANCE GIVEN TO COLONIAL AND RACIST REGIMES IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued) (A/C.3/35/L.11)

AGENDA ITEM 75: IMPORTANCE OF THE UNIVERSAL REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT OF PEOPLE TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND OF THE SPEEDY GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES FOR THE EFFECTIVE GUARANTEE AND OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS (continued) (A/C.3/35/L.6 and L.12)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited discussion of the draft resolutions presented under agenda items 67, 74, 66 and 75.

2. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) said, in explanation of vote, that Argentina would support the draft resolutions in documents A/C.3/35/L.3, L.4, L.5, L.7, L.11 and L.12. It would abstain on the amendment proposed in document L.9, because it did not agree with the notion that human rights could only be defended against the acts of Governments.

3. With reference to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.7 her delegation would have preferred that it contain a paragraph inviting the Secretary-General to do everything possible to help the Committee by transmitting to it, at its request, information submitted by the States Parties. On operative paragraph 13 of that draft resolution, Argentina shared the views of the Secretary-General expressed in paragraph 6 of document A/C.3/35/L.13. However, it should be made clear that States Parties which would have to report to the Committee at any meeting held away from United Nations Headquarters would be consulted in order to ensure that they would be able to participate, and that measures would be taken to help them to do so.

(Miss Richter, Argentina)

4. Her delegation thanked Jamaica for having introduced the draft appearing in document A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2. With regard to document A/C.3/35/L.11, it considered that maintaining relations with South Africa should not be regarded as an expression of support for the apartheid régime. Referring to agenda item 75, she said that her delegation attached particular importance to resolution 1514 (XV) and considered that it should be mentioned in draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.6; it also approved of the deletion therefrom of the reference to resolution 29 (XXXVI) of the Commission on Human Rights. It was unnecessary to reinsert operative paragraph 8 into draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.12, because it had already been approved by the General Assembly and was currently under discussion in the Sixth Committee.

5. Mr. DLAMINI (Swaziland) said that, even though his delegation had not taken part in the general debate, his country nevertheless resolutely condemned discriminatory practices in any form. Swaziland subscribed to the general principles of the struggle against apartheid and racial discrimination and would therefore vote for most of the resolutions. However, it had reservations about operative paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.13 and paragraph 5 (d) of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.11.

AGENDA ITEM 67: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME FOR THE DECADE FOR ACTION TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/C.3/35/L.3, L.8/Rev.2, L.10, L.15 and L.18).

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3

6. Mr. NYAMEKYE (Ghana) introduced amendment A/C.3/35/L.15 to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3.

7. The SECRETARY of the Committee recalled the financial implications of that draft resolution and of the amendment, contained in documents A/C.3/35/L.10 and A/C.3/35/L.18 respectively.

8. Amendment A/C.3/35/L.15 was adopted without a vote.

9. At the request of the representative of Israel, a record vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3, as amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India,

Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania.

Abstaining: Greece, Guatemala, Japan, Portugal.

10. The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 106 votes to 19 with 4 abstentions.

11. Mr. HALFHUID (Suriname) said, in explanation of vote, that his country was in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3 because it condemned the illegal occupation of Arab territories by Israel and certain practices of the Israeli armed forces towards the Palestinians. His Government, however, had certain reservations on operative paragraph 2, where Israeli policy was equated with racism and racial discrimination.

12. Mr. DOMINGUEZ-PASIER (Spain) said he had voted for the draft resolution but expressed reservations as to its wording. He reiterated the reservations of his country on certain paragraphs of the Programme of Action adopted at the 1978 Geneva Conference.

13. Mr. DYRLUND (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, recalled that the Nordic Governments had persistently voiced their condemnation of racism, racial discrimination and apartheid. In March 1978 the Nordic Foreign Ministers had agreed on a joint programme of action against South Africa which involved, for example, prohibition or discouragement of new investments in South Africa, recommendations for discontinuing sports and cultural contacts with South Africa and increased support to refugees, liberation movements and victims of apartheid. They firmly believed that without increased pressure from the international community, the South African Government was not likely to undertake the necessary reforms. The Arms embargo had constituted an important breakthrough in that regard. The cessation of further new foreign investments and financial loans would be

(Mr. Dyrlund, Denmark)

an effective complement to the arms embargo. A resolution calling upon the Security Council to consider such measures was initiated in the General Assembly in 1976 by the Nordic countries.

14. The Nordic delegations, therefore, supported a number of paragraphs in the draft resolution and would continue to support the objectives of the Decade of Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination as set forth in General Assembly resolution 3057 of 2 November 1973. However, the resolution also referred to the Declaration and the Programme of Action adopted by the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, to which their delegations had not been able fully to subscribe. They were also unable to accept operative paragraph 4 of the resolution which supported armed struggle. The Nordic countries would have to reserve their position on operative paragraph 8, as it failed to take into account that only the Security Council could adopt a decision binding on Member States. To their regret, the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden had voted against the draft resolution.

15. Mr. MÜNCHEN (Luxembourg) observed that the nine member States of the European Community, on whose behalf he was speaking, had voted against draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3, because they considered that the Declaration and the Programme of Action adopted by the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination had introduced unacceptable elements into the initial Programme for the Decade. Nevertheless, they remained firmly committed to the implementation of the principles and objectives of the initial Programme as set out in General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII).

16. The Nine would also like to recall that they had often given expression to their deep concern with regard to the situation in the Middle East. Nevertheless, they continued to feel that the complex political situation there must not be considered by the Third Committee, but by other appropriate bodies of the United Nations.

17. The Nine had always been opposed to the South African Government's policy of apartheid and has steadfastly condemned it. They contributed actively to activities aimed at bringing about a peaceful and fundamental change in South Africa. Some believed that armed struggle alone could put an end to apartheid, but the Nine were convinced that the United Nations had as its prime obligation the encouragement of a search for peaceful solutions. They could not, therefore, accept that the General Assembly should give implicit support in its resolutions to recourse to armed struggle.

18. The Nine were also prevented by a certain number of other factors from giving their support to the draft resolution presented in document A/C.3/35/L.3. Although desiring the complete abolition of the apartheid system, they were unable to accept a definition or a formulation according to which the situation in the Republic of South Africa constituted a problem of decolonization.

/...

19. Mrs. AKAMATSU (Japan) pointed out that, in spite of the strong opposition of the people and Government of Japan to all forms of racial discrimination, and in particular to the hateful system of apartheid practised in South Africa, the Japanese delegation had been forced to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.3/35/L.3, as amended, because it would have been difficult for it to accept certain ideas formulated therein.

20. Mrs. HAFT (United States of America) recalled that her Government had participated in the adoption of resolution 3057 (XXVIII), in which the General Assembly designated the period 1973-1978 as the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, and it continued to support the fundamental purpose of the resolution, namely, the total and unconditional elimination of racism and racial discrimination.

21. In 1975 the General Assembly had adopted resolution 3379 (XXX) which contained a concept so deeply offensive to her Government and the people of the United States, and which so fundamentally undermined the purpose of resolution 3057 that the United States had withdrawn from the Decade and its activities. Consequently, her delegation had not participated in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3.

22. Mr. ERRAZURIZ (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3 because of its condemnation of racism, racial discrimination and apartheid but it wished to reiterate the reservations it had expressed when the resolution had been adopted by the Economic and Social Council; it also found the wording of certain paragraphs regrettable and maintained the reservations it had expressed at the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination regarding certain paragraphs of the Programme of Action adopted on that occasion.

23. Mr. ROUCOUNAS (Greece) said that his delegation's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3 did not reflect any change in its attitude either to racial discrimination, which it continued to condemn resolutely, or to the achievement of the objectives of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination to which it remained firmly committed. Its abstention had been based solely on the doubts it continued to have regarding the justification of certain provisions of the text. Greece believed that the fundamental concern of the United Nations must be to safeguard international peace and security and that therefore it could in no circumstances support the use of force.

24. Mrs. MODISI (Botswana) said that Botswana supported all measures aimed at eliminating racial discrimination as was demonstrated by its penal code. It had therefore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3, as amended, and fully approved of the spirit of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, because of its extreme vulnerability resulting from its landlocked status, Botswana wished to reserve its position on operative paragraph 13 of the text. For the same reasons, it wished to reserve its position on operative paragraph 5 (d) of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.11.

25. Miss FAWTHORPE (New Zealand) said that her delegation had been obliged to vote against draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3 for reasons similar to those already mentioned by several other delegations. Her Government had on many occasions placed on record its horror of the policy of apartheid and it was deeply committed to the cause of the elimination of racial discrimination. It also continued to support fully the initial objectives of the Decade as defined in General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII). Nevertheless her delegation, for a very specific reason, had not been able to accept the Programme of Action for the Decade adopted at the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and it had therefore been unable to support several subsequent draft resolutions, including draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3 because of the support expressed in it for the Programme. New Zealand also wished to make it clear that it would have serious reservations about the value of a second world conference if the goals and objectives were not clarified. It could not accept the reference to support for armed struggle in the draft resolution under consideration.
26. Mr. CASCAIS (Portugal) said that he wished to reaffirm the Portuguese Government and people's firm opposition to all forms of racism, racial discrimination and apartheid. Nevertheless, his delegation could not accept the reference to armed struggle in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3 and it had therefore had to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.
27. Mr. GOODEN (Jamaica) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3 but it reserved its position on operative paragraph 2 as worded.
28. Mr. MBENNA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3 although the electronic voting system had indicated the opposite.
29. Mrs. KEKEDO (Papua New Guinea) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3, and supported the spirit of that draft resolution; nevertheless, it wished to reiterate the reservations it had already expressed about operative paragraph 4.
30. Mrs. SHERMAN-PETER (Bahamas) said that she had been absent during the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3 but would have voted in favour of it if she had been present, despite her delegation's reservations about several paragraphs, particularly operative paragraph 4 which referred to armed struggle.
31. Mr. ZELAYA BOCKLER (Guatemala) said that despite his country's unconditional support for the struggle against racism and racial discrimination, his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3 because of the reference to the political problems of the Middle East contained in operative paragraph 16.
32. Mr. LIGAIRI (Fiji) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3 but wished to place on record its serious reservations about operative paragraph 4.

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2

33. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation firmly believed in the role that national non-governmental organizations and similar bodies could play in the prevention of racism. It therefore firmly supported the spirit of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2 and also believed that the contribution of international non-governmental organizations working to promote the elimination of racial discrimination should not be overlooked.
34. The reference in the first preambular paragraph to a resolution which his delegation had had to vote against in the previous year seemed out of place. Nevertheless, because of the way in which that paragraph was worded, he felt that a separate vote on it was not justified.
35. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) said that his delegation would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8. It had had to vote against draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2 because it referred to General Assembly resolution 34/24 which his delegation continued to find unacceptable.
36. Mrs. SANTANDER-DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) said that Papua New Guinea should be omitted from the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2.
37. Mrs. KEKEDO (Papua New Guinea) said that Papua New Guinea had unfortunately been forced to withdraw from the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2; it had supported the original text, but it found the revised text unacceptable.
38. Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2 was adopted by 133 votes to 1.
39. Mrs. GU (China) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2, but that the electronic voting system had not recorded that vote.
40. Mr. BERGTHUN (Norway), speaking in explanation of the vote of the Danish, Finnish, Icelandic, Swedish and Norwegian delegations, said that those delegations felt that it was superfluous to refer to General Assembly resolution 34/24 in draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2. He recalled that the Nordic countries had voted against that resolution. Nevertheless, the Nordic delegations felt that the words "Recalling the relevant provisions" referred to the elements of General Assembly resolution 34/24 that they could accept.
41. Mrs. HAFT (United States of America) explained that the United States had unfortunately not been in a position to participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2, first because it pertained to agenda item 67 concerning the implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, in which the United States was not participating, and secondly because the draft resolution referred to General Assembly resolution 34/24, which had been adopted in 1979 after a vote in which her delegation had not participated.



42. Mrs. PHIRI (Zambia) said that she had been absent at the time of the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2, but that she would have voted in favour of it if she had been present.
43. Mrs. WELLS (Australia) said that Australia firmly supported the initial principles of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, set forth in General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), and that it was genuinely committed to implementing important international instruments in that field, including the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Her Government deplored the apartheid policies and practices of the South African Government and found it regrettable that the consensus on the Programme of Action had been broken. Australia had voted against draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.3 in the Economic and Social Council and, for reasons already placed on record, it had not changed its position.
44. Her delegation wished to point out, however, that it had voted in favour of part A of resolution 14 (XXXVI) on the Implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination adopted at the thirty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights. Although it had abstained on the resolution as a whole, its vote had been seen as an indication of Australia's preparedness to participate, wherever possible, in promoting the basic objectives of the Decade. It had thus been pleased when Jamaica had tabled draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8; it believed that there was value in placing emphasis on the role that non-governmental organizations could play in realizing the objectives of the Decade. Australia would have preferred it if the text had not been revised, but it had nevertheless voted in favour of it.
45. Mr. ALMOSLECHNER (Austria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2 although it felt that the reference to General Assembly resolution 34/24 was superfluous. His delegation had voted against General Assembly resolution 34/24 in 1979, and it believed that the words "relevant provisions" in the first preambular paragraph referred to the provisions that were acceptable to his Government.
46. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands) said that his delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.8/Rev.2 did not imply that it approved of the reference made to General Assembly resolution 34/24 in the first preambular paragraph.
47. His delegation believed that national non-governmental organizations included national branches of international non-governmental organizations which played a role in the elimination of racial discrimination. In its view the reference to organizations or institutions included trade unions, in view of the important contribution they were making to the struggle for the elimination of racial discrimination by defending, for example, the rights of migrant workers.
48. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.4, on the status of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, and the amendment to it in document A/C.3/35/L.9; draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5 on the status of the International Convention on the

(The Chairman)

Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid; and draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.7 on the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, together with document A/C.3/35/L.13 containing the financial implications of that draft resolution.

49. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) read out the list of new sponsors of the draft resolutions under consideration. The following States had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.4: Afghanistan, Cape Verde, Congo, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda and Yemen.

50. Costa Rica had become a sponsor of document A/C.3/35/L.9, containing an amendment to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.4.

51. Jordan, Niger, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda and Yemen had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.7.

52. The following States had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5: Afghanistan, Angola, Burundi, Cape Verde, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Nicaragua, Sao Tome and Principe, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda and Yemen.

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.4 and its amendment A/C.3/35/L.9

53. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.4 accepted the amendment in document A/C.3/35/L.9.

54. Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.4 had been consulted before the submission of the amendment but that some of them wished to have a separate vote on it.

55. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the amendment in document A/C.3/35/L.9.

56. The amendment to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.4, contained in document A/C.3/35/L.9, was adopted by 92 votes to 1, with 37 abstentions.

57. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.4, as amended.

58. Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland), speaking on a point of order, said that at previous sessions the Committee had followed the practice of adopting the resolution on the item under consideration without a vote.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.4, as amended, without a vote.

60. Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.4, as amended, was adopted without a vote.

/...

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5

61. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5 without a vote.
62. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said that his delegation would like a vote to be taken on the draft resolution.
63. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5.
64. Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5 was adopted by 113 votes to 1, with 22 abstentions.
65. Mr. GIUSTETTI (France) said that his delegation had inadvertently voted against draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5, when it had meant to abstain.
66. Mrs. AKAMATSU (Japan) said that her delegation had had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5 because some of its provisions contained ambiguous definitions.
67. Mr. GURAKAM (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5, because of Turkey's firm opposition to the odious practice of apartheid. However, he reiterated his delegation's reservations concerning certain provisions of the draft resolution which were incompatible with Turkish law.
68. Mr. ERRAZURIZ (Chile) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5, the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid was in certain respects incompatible with Chilean legislation and for that reason Chile was not a party to it.
69. Mr. MÜNCHEN (Luxembourg) said that the nine States members of the European Economic Community had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5 because although they were firmly opposed to the policy and practice of apartheid, which they regarded as a flagrant violation of the most elementary human rights, they did not regard the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid as an instrument which would enable the international community to take effective measures to put an end to apartheid. They had reservations about the fact that a State party could condemn acts committed outside its jurisdiction by persons who were not its nationals, in particular where there was not the slightest link between the acts committed and the State Member concerned. Moreover, the Convention did not clearly define the violations to which it referred. The nine States members of the European Economic Community particularly objected to article IX which entrusted the responsibility for implementing the Convention to an organ of the United Nations even though a large number of States Members had not ratified the Convention. At all events, they believed that the Convention should apply only to States which had ratified it.
70. *The reservations of the nine States members of the European Economic Community did not concern the objectives of the Convention, only the means of achieving them.*

71. Mrs. HAFT (United States of America) said that although her delegation had already made it clear how much her country disapproved of apartheid, it was unable to accept a number of provisions of the draft resolution; in particular the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 10, in which the definition of apartheid was far too vague. Her delegation had therefore had to abstain. The United States of America would not sign the Convention, nor encourage States members which had not yet done so to become parties.

72. Mr. ROUCOUNAS (Greece) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5 even though his country was firmly opposed to the policy of apartheid. Greece was not yet a party to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid but the competent Greek authorities were at present carefully studying it.

73. Mr. KABBANI (Saudi Arabia) said that his delegation would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5 had it been present for the vote.

74. Mr. CASCAIS (Portugal) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote. The International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid contained provisions which were incompatible with Portuguese law.

75. Mrs. GU (China) pointed out that the electronic voting system had not correctly recorded her delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.5.

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.7

76. Mrs. SANTANDER-DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) reminded the Committee that the Yugoslav representative, when introducing draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.7, had made an amendment to operative paragraph 6 whereby the words "migrant workers and indigenous populations" in the second and third lines were to be replaced by the words "and indigenous populations as well as migrant workers".

77. Mr. MATELJAK (Yugoslavia) asked whether the Argentine delegation maintained its proposal concerning the draft resolution under consideration.

78. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) said that she would have liked to see a paragraph added to the draft resolution inviting the Secretary-General to make every effort to assist the Committee by sending it, on request, information communicated by States parties. However, if some of the sponsors of the draft resolution found her proposal unacceptable, she would not press it.

79. Mr. MATELJAK (Yugoslavia) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had considered the Argentine proposal but had not accepted it, since they did not feel that there was enough reason for adding such a provision, which was based on a single case. However, if Argentina wished to maintain it, the Yugoslav delegation would be prepared to accept it provided that the other sponsors did not object.

80. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) said that her delegation would not make a formal proposal unless all the sponsors of the draft resolution were prepared to accept it, in which case her delegation would join the sponsors.
81. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that although the sponsors of the draft resolution had decided not to accept the Argentine proposal, his delegation could accept it if it was submitted officially.
82. Mr. MYAMEKYE (Ghana) said that his delegation could not accept such an amendment, since it would set a dangerous precedent. There had been nothing to complain of in the work of the Committee of Experts since its establishment and it would therefore be unjustified to add a provision to the draft resolution which could be interpreted as a criticism.
83. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) suggested that the Argentine amendment would be clearer if instead of saying "by sending it ... information", the words "when sending ... information" were used.
84. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) said that he assumed that the amendment referred to the reproduction and translation of documents communicated by States Parties. Recently, when the United Kingdom had submitted information to the Committee of Experts, with reports of parliamentary commissions and organizations concerned with racial relations attached, the Secretariat had said that it could not have the documents translated. Interpreted literally, the amendment might well place a further burden on the Secretariat which it could not assume. In any case, the Secretariat must have latitude to decide which documents should be translated.
85. Mr. MATELJAK (Yugoslavia) said that his acceptance of the amendment was dependent on the agreement of the other sponsors. As some of them seemed to find the Argentine proposal unacceptable, perhaps it would be better to abandon it.
86. Miss NAJI (Egypt) said that her country was a member of the Committee of Experts and she agreed with the representative of Ghana about the Argentine amendment; she appealed to the Argentine delegation not to press its proposal.
87. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) said that she would not insist on her proposal. For the information of the United Kingdom representative she explained that the information her delegation had in mind was that submitted by States parties at the Committee's request: the Secretariat should therefore facilitate its transmission as much as possible.
88. Miss FAWTHORPE (New Zealand) drew attention to an error in the first preambular paragraph: the reference in the second line should be to "34/26", not "34/27".
89. Mr. NYAMEKYE (Ghana) pointed out that in the third line of operative paragraph 13, the word "preferable" should read "preferably".
90. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the representative of Yugoslavia had suggested that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote.
91. Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.7 was adopted without a vote.