

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION
*Official Records**



COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
L-201 (4th floor)

THIRD COMMITTEE
22nd meeting
held on
Friday, 16 October 1981
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 22nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 76: INTERNATIONAL YOUTH YEAR: PARTICIPATION, DEVELOPMENT, PEACE:
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 77: POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES RELATING TO YOUTH (continued)

- (a) PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS EXCHANGES AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (b) CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND YOUTH AND YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (c) CO-ORDINATION AND INFORMATION IN THE FIELD OF YOUTH: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 78: NATIONAL EXPERIENCE IN ACHIEVING FAR-REACHING SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGES FOR THE PURPOSE OF SOCIAL PROGRESS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 80: QUESTION OF THE ELDERLY AND THE AGED: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 84: WORLD ASSEMBLY ON AGING: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 90: CRIME PREVENTION AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 81: 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.3/36/SR.22
6 November 1981
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

CONTENTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 82: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 76: INTERNATIONAL YOUTH YEAR: PARTICIPATION, DEVELOPMENT, PEACE:
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/36/215 and Add.1; A/C.3/36/L.15)

AGENDA ITEM 77: POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES RELATING TO YOUTH (continued) (A/C.3/36/1)

- (a) PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS EXCHANGES AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE: REPORT
OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/36/409)
- (b) CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND YOUTH AND
YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/36/427)
- (c) CO-ORDINATION AND INFORMATION IN THE FIELD OF YOUTH: REPORT OF THE
SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/36/135)

AGENDA ITEM 78: NATIONAL EXPERIENCE IN ACHIEVING FAR-REACHING SOCIAL AND
ECONOMIC CHANGES FOR THE PURPOSE OF SOCIAL PROGRESS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-
GENERAL (continued) (A/36/115)

AGENDA ITEM 80: QUESTION OF THE ELDERLY AND THE AGED: REPORT OF THE
SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/36/70)

AGENDA ITEM 84: WORLD ASSEMBLY ON AGING: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
(continued) (A/36/806 and Add.1, A/36/357, 472)

AGENDA ITEM 90: CRIME PREVENTION AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE DEVELOPMENT: REPORT
OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/36/442)

/...

1. Mrs. SOW (Guinea) said that the objectives of the International Youth Year, namely the full development of young people and their active participation in the development of society, must become a reality in all Member States and must be given priority in their development plans. At its first session in Vienna the Advisory Committee for International Youth Year, of which her country was first Vice-Chairman, had identified methods by which to achieve the objectives of the draft programme of International Youth Year, which had the full approval of her delegation. Since her country's accession to full sovereignty, the Government had considered the education and training of its rising generations as a priority component of its national policy. Young Guineans, in both urban and rural areas, had been formed into a national youth organization, Jeunesse de la revolution democratique africaine, whose programme of action was fully in line with the ideals of freedom, justice and human advancement around which the Guinean nation was mobilized.
2. Structured in that way, the young people of Guinea were actively participating in the national development process. They were taking the first steps in the exercise of responsibility by playing their part in the achievement of the goals assigned to various sectors of national life. She wished to mention in that connexion, their contribution, inter alia, to the transformation of socio-economic conditions in the rural areas as a result of which agricultural yields had been substantially increased. Development required the establishment of a viable framework within which young people could be education and trained and could learn to shoulder their responsibilities. In that respective, Guinean youth had embarked on a campaign against alcoholism, drug use, sexual depravity, and other vices which caused young people to become unstable and self-destructive. Ever since the country's accession to independence, it had embarked on active co-operation with numerous youth organizations everywhere which were inspired by the ideals of freedom, justice and peace which were the levers of the conscience of the world.
3. Referring to the Preamble and to Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter of the United Nations, she stated that the maintenance and preservation of peace were essential for the full flowering of mankind; moreover, through dynamic international co-operation the problems of man's existence could be resolved. Her Government was very actively involved in preparations for International Youth Year, and the various media in the country had already begun to inform and mobilize national public opinion to undertake the various activities which were included in the programme for International Youth Year
4. Mrs. FAWTHORPE (New Zealand), confining her remarks to preparations for International Youth Year, the report of the first session of the Advisory Committee for International Youth Year and preparations for the World Assembly on Aging, said that her country fully supported the emphasis that had been put on activities at the national level in the report of the Advisory Committee.

Social policies developed nationally were obviously more effective because they were more in harmony with the traditions and customs of a particular society than was any global strategy. Ills such as unemployment or illiteracy, though perhaps experienced more intensely by young people, nevertheless remained the problems of society as a whole; efforts to assist the young should therefore be an integral part of the social and economic development policies of the community.

5. Her delegation did not wish at that stage to comment in detail on the draft programme of measures for International Youth Year, which had been discussed by the Advisory Committee; since it was a detailed and complex document, Member States should not be expected to endorse it before having had an opportunity to examine it carefully. Before any specific measures were undertaken as part of the preparations for International Youth Year, which was still three years away, it was important to consider them thoroughly.

6. As far as the strategy for the International Youth Year was concerned, the New Zealand delegation felt that it looked less like the programme for an international year than one for a quadrennium. Although it was good that there should be thorough preparation for an international year, it would seem advisable given the limited resources of people and money in each country in the field, to avoid too much preparatory work and to concentrate rather on the Year itself. It was also advisable, as other delegations had suggested, that youth-related activities should not be excessively bureaucratized, since young people did not care for bureaucracy.

7. Sub-paragraph (viii) of paragraph C of the guidelines for international action in the programme suggested that "an appropriate international instrument on youth" should be prepared. Her delegation thought that was unnecessary, however, because the problems of youth should be considered as part of those of society as a whole. Universal ratification and implementation of existing instruments, in particular the two International Covenants on Human Rights, was more important than drafting another instrument for a specific group. New Zealand fully supported the objectives set out in the draft programme and the guiding principles for the International Year itself (sections A and B of the General Guidelines). In New Zealand, activities for the International Year would be co-ordinated by the Department of Internal Affairs, in line with the primary objective of government policy regarding youth, in other words, the integration of young people into society by the provision of appropriate opportunities for education, employment and recreation.

8. The concerns of the Government of New Zealand with regard to the elderly were very similar to those just expressed in regard to young people: to promote their active participation in national life and their independence and to ensure their well-being. It should be recalled, however, that, as in the case of youth, the problems of the elderly were those of society as a whole and the search for solutions to them should take all social groups into account. The World Assembly on Aging, to be held in Vienna in 1982, could be expected to produce fresh ideas on the situation of older people in all societies. Aware as it was of the effects that the absolute and relative increase in the number of elderly in the forthcoming decades would have on social and economic structures, the New Zealand delegation supported the proposal that the discussions to be held at the World Assembly on Aging should emphasize the humanitarian and development aspects of policies for the elderly and the aged.

9. The New Zealand delegation was glad to note that the Advisory Committee, like that established for the International Youth Year, had stressed the importance of activities at the national level. That was in line with New Zealand's own position, which recognized that different societies and cultures differed in their attitudes towards older people. Preparations for the World Assembly on Aging were co-ordinated in New Zealand by a National Committee consisting of members of the Board of Health Committee on the Care of the Aged, among others. The New Zealand delegation was also pleased to note that many agencies, including the ILO, FAO, WHO, UNFPA AND UNESCO, would be contributing to the World Assembly on Aging.

10. New Zealand supported the recommendation of the Advisory Committee that two further meetings should be held to finalize preparations for the World Assembly, and hoped that the preparations could be completed before the Assembly began, so that the maximum benefit could be drawn from the meeting itself. Lastly, the New Zealand delegation wished, before closing, to refer to the remarkable work of the non-governmental organizations; it hoped that full recognition and encouragement would be given to their activities and that their skills should be utilized in the formulation and implementation of the programmes of action that would be adopted in due course.

11. The CHAIRMAN said the general debate on the second group of items on the agenda was concluded for the afternoon, and announced that the meeting would be suspended for 15 minutes to allow the members of the Committee to complete their consultations.

The meeting was suspended at 3.35 p.m. and resumed at 4.00 p.m.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 81: 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 (continued) (A/C.3/36/L.10, L.11, L.16 and L.17)

AGENDA ITEM 82: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/C.3/36/L.8, L.13/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2)

Draft Resolution A/C.3/36/L.8

12. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to documents A/C.3/36/L.13/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2, containing the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution, and read them out as they were not yet available.

13. The CHAIRMAN invited those representatives who wished to do so to explain their votes.

14. Mr. FURSLAND (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, said that the Members of the Community would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.8 because they were fully committed to working for the elimination of racial discrimination and had all made strenuous efforts to achieve that objective. The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination was a very important instrument for eliminating racial discrimination throughout the world. The Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, as the body responsible for the implementation of the Convention, had a primary role to play in that respect. The Member States of the European Community had condemned apartheid on many occasions as a gross violation of human rights and had expressed their concern at the situation in Namibia. They considered that it was of the utmost importance that Namibia should be able to exercise its right to self-determination.

15. The members of the European Community welcomed the revisions which the sponsors had made in draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.8, which had improved the balance and correctness of the text. They regretted, however, that it still retained some in appropriate elements. The mandate of the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination was to examine on an equal basis reports on all the States Parties on the basis of the provisions of the Convention. The Committee should not therefore direct its activities to particular situations, no matter how serious, nor should it extend the obligations deriving from the Convention or impose on the States Parties obligations which were not explicitly stated in it.

/...

16. In relation to operative paragraph 2, he wished to reiterate the well established and understood position of the member States of the European Community on the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council. The member States of the European Community also had reservations about operative paragraph 3, which gave a distorted picture of the mandate and activities of the Commission on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Those reservations applied equally to operative paragraph 5. In relation to operative paragraph 12, he noted that the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination had been unable to adopt a unanimous view on that point. Lastly, in relation to operative paragraph 13, the member States of the European Community had sympathy with the idea of publicizing the Committee's work more widely. However, they noted with concern that despite the revisions made by the sponsors, which they welcomed, that paragraph still contemplated subsidizing from the United Nations regular budget the additional expenses involved in holding the twenty-fifth session of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in Africa. That was contrary to the principles set out in General Assembly resolution 31/140 and would impose a burden on the regular budget. The member States of the European Community wished to bring their hesitations and reservations on certain elements in the draft resolution to the serious attention of all the members of the Sixth Committee, and in particular, of the sponsors of the draft resolution.

17. Mrs. LORANGER (Canada) said that her country took its responsibilities under the Convention very seriously and it had in the past joined in the consensus on the draft resolutions on the Committee's report, despite its reservations concerning the wording of those drafts. She regretted that it had not been possible to reach a consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.8, but her delegation was now in a position to support it, thanks to the revisions made by the sponsors, particularly in paragraph 3. She wished to point out, however, in connexion with operative paragraph 13, that although it seemed advisable in principle, for the Committee to meet once in Africa before the end of the decade, which would be an event of real as well as symbolic importance, the decision for it to do so would have to be taken in conformity with General Assembly resolution 31/140, which laid down rules for the financing of meetings held away from Headquarters. Subject to that proviso, the Canadian delegation supported draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.8.

18. Mr. DYRULND (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Finland, Ireland, Norway and Sweden, recalled that those delegations had supported the Committee's work on the important question under discussion and approved most of the provisions of the draft resolution. They welcomed the revisions but wished to express reservations about several of the operative paragraphs. As the Convention was the only juridical basis for the Committee's work, neither the Committee nor the General Assembly was entitled to impose on the States parties any obligations that they had not accepted in ratifying it. In

connexion with operative paragraph 2, he emphasized that the division of competence between the different organs laid down in the Charter must be respected; in connexion with paragraph 11, he pointed out that it was not for the General Assembly to take decisions on the Committee's work, since the mandate of the Committee to meet away from Headquarters must be conformity with General Assembly resolution 31/140.

19. Mrs. FAWTHORPE (New Zealand) said that New Zealand would vote for the draft resolution, but it was concerned to note that there was a tendency, while the report of the Committee was under consideration, to focus attention only on certain countries or certain regions; the Convention was an instrument to eliminate all forms of racism. New Zealand was willing nevertheless to accede to the Committee's requests and it therefore submitted reports on its relations with South Africa. She feared that paragraph 13, in its revised form, might be contrary to the principles laid down in General Assembly resolution 31/140. However, her delegation was not opposed in principle to the Committee holding some of its meetings away from Headquarters.

20. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) said that in the past the sponsors of resolutions on the present item had refrained from introducing political considerations into their texts. The United States would vote against the draft resolution because of the wording of operative paragraph 2. The political and economic measures called for in paragraph would affect every sector of the South African population, but would fall most heavily on the Blacks. It was necessary to include that controversial question, which was already mentioned in three other draft resolutions submitted under items 74, 81 and 82. Its inclusion would make it impossible to adopt the draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.8 by consensus.

21. In connexion with operative paragraph 13, he emphasized that any meeting away from Headquarters had to be financed in accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/140.

22. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that Angola, Benin, Czechoslovakia, Mozambique and Sierra Leone had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/36/L.8. He drew attention to the new paragraph 7 and the new wording of paragraph 13 submitted at the 20th meeting (see A/C.3/36/SR.20) and announced that separate recorded votes had been requested on the retention of operative paragraphs 2 and 5.

24. A recorded vote was taken on operative paragraph 2.

25. The Committee decided by 115 votes to one, with 19 abstentions to retain operative paragraph 2.*

*Owing to a technical failure, the electronic device did not record the distribution of votes during the vote on this paragraph.

25. A recorded vote was taken on operative paragraph 5.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Columbia, Cosmoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czenchoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatamala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saotome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swasiland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom

26. The Committee decided by 112 votes to none, with 20 abstentions, to retain operative paragraph 5.

27. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.8, as revised.

In Favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia,

/...

Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Maruitania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua, New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwands, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

28. Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.8 was adopted by 134 votes to one. Draft Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.11

29. The CHAIRMAN announced that, following the revision of the text, the Lebanese amendment had been withdrawn.

30. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) read out paragraph 18 as revised:

"Strongly condemns the expansionist activities of Israel in the Middle East and the continuous bombing of Palestinian civilians, which constitute a serious obstacle to the realization of self-determination and independence of the Palestinian people."

31. New paragraph 19 would read:

"Strongly condemns the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the continuous bombardment and destruction of its cities and villages, and all acts that constitute a violation of its sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity,

/...

and security of its population, and hinder the full implementation of Security Resolution 425."

32. Mr. FURLAND (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the countries members of the European Economic Community, said that although they supported the right to self-determination as set forth in the Charter and the international conventions on human rights, those countries would not support draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.11. In their view, that resolution contained elements which were totally unacceptable or could only be accepted with difficulty, as for instance the allusion to the nature of the relations which some States maintained with southern Africa or the highly subjective references to the situation in the Middle East. They also believed that the General Assembly should refrain from encouraging armed struggle and questions the idea that the fact that a State maintained relations with another State meant that it approved of or encouraged the policies of that State's Government. Finally, it was somewhat strange that a resolution on self-determination should mention certain specific situations and yet ignore such flagrant violations of the principle as were being perpetuated in Afghanistan or Kampuchea.

33. Mr. DLAMINI (Swaziland) said that, for the reasons he had already given to the African Group which had sponsored the draft resolution, his delegation was not happy with operative paragraph 13 and found it hard to go along with. That position should not, however, be interpreted to mean that his country opposed the right of self-determination of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa.

34. Mr. STIBAY (Turkey) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution since it supported the struggle waged by peoples against colonialism in order to achieve self-determination and independence. It could not, however, accept the reference to NATO in operative paragraph 11 and reserved its position in that regard.

35. Mr. RIERA (Panama) said that his delegation would have preferred a different wording for operative paragraph 11, 18 and other related paragraphs. Since it supported the general principle set forth in the draft, however, it would vote in favour of the resolution.

36. Ms. QOANE (Lesotho) said that her delegation reserved its position on operative paragraph 13 but would vote in favour of the draft resolution. Her delegation had explained its position on the Paris Declaration and its remarks on that occasion were also applicable to operative paragraph 13.

/...

37. Mr. CORTI (Argentina) said that his country, as a staunch defender of the principle of self-determination, would support the draft resolution. Since it supported the struggle against colonialism and the right of peoples to choose freely their social and economic system, it endorsed the main thrust of the draft resolution but regretted that the sponsors had seen fit to include references to armed struggle which ran counter to the Charter and the aims of the United Nations. His delegation could not accept that certain states or groups of States should be singled out for criticism, as that made the resolution totally ineffective. With regard to operative paragraph 14, after voting in favour of the resolution adopted at the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, his delegation had expressed reservations on some of its provisions, particularly the fact that SWAPO was described exclusively and a priori as the sole representative of the Namibian people and that armed struggle was seen as a means of achieving independence and exercising the right to self-determination. Under the Charter, the Security Council alone had the right to apply sanctions. With regard to operative paragraph 19, the solution to the Palestinian question lay in recognizing the right of all States in the region to exist, within safe and recognized borders. It should also be realized that the occupation of Palestinian and Arab territories had been the result of the 1967 war. He hoped that expressions like those used in the draft resolution, which were more provocative than descriptive, would be avoided in the future since they did not enhance the prospect for a favourable political outcome.

38. Mr. CHAVANAVIRAJ (Thailand) said that, as could be seen from its vote in favour of the various draft resolutions, his country supported the rights of the Namibian and Palestinian peoples. While he had reservations on the wording of some paragraphs, which he considered to be partial, and preferred former paragraph 18 to new paragraph 19, he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.11.

39. Mrs. WEGWAILA (Botswana) said that her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution but had some reservations on paragraph 13 for reasons which she did not need to reiterate.

40. Mrs. BHUIYAN (Bangladesh) said that she would have preferred a different formulation for paragraph 11 but would nonetheless vote for draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.11. She wished, however, to emphasize that her country condemned all States that maintained relations of any kind with South Africa, whatever States they might be and whatever intergovernmental organizations (NATO and otherwise) they might belong to.

41. Mr. LEVIN (Israel) said that he would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.11 since some of its paragraphs, for instance paragraph 18 and the

/...

amendments thereto, completely distorted the facts by failing to mention the underlying causes of the situation in Lebanon. Beside the fact that it bore no relation to the title of the resolution, new paragraph 19 submitted by Angola made no mention of the fact that the Syrian Army had occupied Lebanon since 1976 and that more than 100,000 civilians, including Palestinians, had died as a result of that occupation. The Arab States chose to ignore that flagrant violation of Lebanese sovereignty and the fact that the civilian population had been decimated by the Syrian invaders. As usual, those States were consigning that uncomfortable fact to oblivion, but it was distressing to see so many other representatives tolerate that practice with such indifference. The representative of Lebanon had tried to amend paragraph 2 by adding a number of significant elements, but to no avail for Angola had rejected his proposal on behalf of those to whom Lebanon's sovereignty was a matter of no importance. The causes of the situation in Lebanon were to be found in Syria's long-cherished ambition of annexing Lebanon or, failing that, reducing it to the level of a satellite State. The semblance of justice that some of the paragraphs were designed to impose warranted careful reflexion.

42. Mr. CHAN (Singapore) said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.11. Although he quite understood why operative paragraph 11 had been included, he nonetheless had reservations on it and believed that it might serve purposes other than the struggle against racism in South Africa.

43. Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation would vote for draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.11 because it fully agreed with its spirit and purpose. However, she had some reservations to make about certain paragraphs, in particular paragraph 2. It did not become the United Nations to encourage unrestrained armed struggle and she would have liked the proposed amendment contained in document A/C.3/36/L.16 to be accepted, because that amendment would have offered the international community certain guarantees in cases where armed struggle proved to be necessary. With regard to paragraph 18, she deplored the fact that only one of the protagonists in the Middle Eastern conflict, and therefore in the tragedy of which the Lebanese people was a victim, had been named. Nor was the new paragraph 19 objective, in her opinion: the Committee knew perfectly well which State Member - Israel - had bombarded another State Member - Lebanon. If there was a separate vote on those paragraphs, Costa Rica would abstain on paragraph 18 and vote for paragraph 19.

44. The CHAIRMAN announced that a vote had been requested on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/36/L.11.

45. The draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/36/L.11 was adopted by 111 votes to 17, with 8 abstentions.

46. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) read out the amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10 which had been presented orally. They called for the addition at the end of the first preambular paragraph of the words "as well as in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960"; the addition to the fourth preambular paragraph, line 3, after the word "refugees", of the words "and displaced persons"; the insertion in paragraph 1, line 1, of the word "all" before "peoples", and after "peoples" the phrase "including those under colonial, foreign and alien occupation". He made it clear that the amendments were the outcome of lengthy consultations; the sponsors of the draft resolution had striven to draw up a text on which there could be unanimity and had accepted the amendments in the belief that they in no way altered its scope and purpose, provided, however, that there were no other amendments. He recommended that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote.

47. The CHAIRMAN announced that Malaysia, Jordan and Kuwait had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

48. He said that if he heard no objections, he would take it that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/36/L.10, as amended, had been adopted without a vote.

49. It was so decided.

50. Mrs. GUELMAN (Uruguay), speaking in explanation of vote, said that she had voted for the draft resolution (A/C.3/36/L.11), Uruguay defended the right of peoples to self-determination unconditionally. However, she did not approve of the biased and politicized nature of certain paragraphs, in particular the call for armed struggle in the United Nations context. She drew attention to the Uruguayan representative's statement at the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly concerning resolution A/ES-8/2 of 14 September 1981.

51. Mr. AUNG SWE (Burma) said that he had voted for the draft resolution published in document A/C.3/36/L.11 although he had certain reservations about paragraphs 18 and 19; if there had been a separate vote on those paragraphs, he would have abstained.

52. Mr. OTTO (Austria) said that after much hesitation he had voted for the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/36/L.8, since Austria was determined to see racial discrimination eliminated throughout the world. He was fully aware of the very important tasks performed by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in examining reports presented by States

/...

parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination with regard to implementing the Convention's provisions. Although he fully shared everyone's concern about the tragic situation described in the draft resolution, he regretted that it contained a certain number of elements which had little to do with the Committee's report. He drew attention to paragraphs 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 13 in particular. With regard to paragraph 13, he thought that the additional expenses entailed by holding the meeting of the Committee away from Headquarters should be covered in accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/140.

53. Mr. LIGAIRI (Fiji) said that he had voted for the draft resolution in document A/C.3/36/L.11 to express Fiji's firm support for the right of colonial peoples - including those in Non-Self-Governing Territories - to exercise self-determination and achieve independence in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. However, he had reservations about paragraph 2. Fiji adhered to the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes and wanted a peaceful decolonialization of Namibia on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). He did not approve the selective condemnation of certain States Members of the United Nations which appeared elsewhere in the text.

54. Mr. LAGOS (Chile) said that respect for the right of peoples to self-determination and the elimination of the remnants of colonialism, racism and racial discrimination were part of Chile's moral and political traditions and he had therefore voted for the draft resolutions in documents A/C.3/36/L.11. Although he endorsed the general sense of those draft resolutions and understood the intentions which had motivated their sponsors, he thought that certain paragraphs had been formulated in excessive and biased terms. The provisions of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.8 went beyond the framework of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and went into political considerations alien to the Convention. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.11, he expressed reservations on paragraphs 2, 11 and 18: he could not accept either an invitation to armed struggle or a selective condemnation of certain States Members of the United Nations. With regard to paragraph 14, he pointed out that Chile had voiced certain reservations concerning resolution A/ES-8/2, which certain parties could use as a pretext for rejecting a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem. In that connexion, he declared that implementation of the programme presented by the contact group of five Western States and endorsed by the Security Council by its resolution 435 (1978) remained the only means of achieving a peaceful solution of the Namibian question. He thought, moreover, that the draft resolution's new paragraph 19 did not take account of all the factors in the situation.

55. Mrs. AKAMATSU (Japan) said she had voted for draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.8 and stated, with regard to its paragraph 13, that the pattern of conferences

/...

which was the subject of General Assembly resolution 31/140 should be rigorously followed.

56. Mr. JESS JANI (Zimbabwe) said that he had voted for the draft resolutions in documents A/C.3/36/L.8 and L.11. The texts dealt with questions which were of prime importance, in particular for Zimbabwe whose achievement of independence owed much to the efforts made by the international community. He reminded the members of the Committee that the United Nations was the only forum today where an attempt was being made to identify threats to international peace and security and where measures could be taken to resolve disputes peacefully. But, in spite of all the efforts made by the countries of southern Africa to demilitarize the region, the apostles of apartheid continued to commit aggression against States in the region in order to destabilize them. He noted with consternation that there was no real political will to find a genuine solution to the threat posed by apartheid in southern Africa. He particularly deplored the frivolous arguments put forward by some to justify maintaining their relations with the South African racist regime. He rejected the thesis that maintenance of those relations did not amount to approving the regime's policy and echoed the Zimbabwean Prime Minister's words: Zimbabwe's achievement of independence must not be used as a pretext for doing nothing against the South African racist regime.

57. The CHAIRMAN reminded members of the Committee that the general debate was over and that they must confine themselves to explanations of vote.

58. Mr. RIERA (Panama) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10. While he endorsed the general spirit of the project, he believed that mention should have been made of indirect military intervention since that was the most common form of interference in the internal affairs of States.

59. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) said that, during the general debate on the items under consideration, his delegation had always maintained that the question of the right of peoples to self-determination should be considered from a universal viewpoint. His delegation had therefore joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10; he noted with deep satisfaction that the draft resolution in question could quite obviously apply to Afghanistan and to Kampuchea where the people were being prevented from exercising their right to self-determination by foreign military intervention and occupation. That was why his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.11 where the question of self-determination was not considered globally. The vehement rhetoric of the sponsors of that draft resolution would contribute nothing to peaceful and evolutionary change in the South Africa nor would it hasten the settlement of the Namibian problem. Moreover, he categorically rejected the statement that NATO members were encouraging the maintenance of the

/...

apartheid system and contributing to the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia. He also rejected the analysis made of the Middle East conflict: it contained nothing which could advance the cause of peace in the troubled region.

60. Mr. FURLAND (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Economic Community, noted with satisfaction that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10 had been adopted unanimously, and that, even in its amended form, it referred without any possible doubt to situations other than those with which draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.11 was concerned. Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10, particularly the third, fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5, dealt mainly with situations in which the right of sovereign States to self-determination had been violated by foreign military intervention and occupation.

61. Mrs. PETERS (Bahamas) said that she had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.11 because her Government adhered to the principle whereby all peoples of the world, particularly the black majority of southern Africa, had the right to self-determination. Nevertheless, she deplored the fact that the text was not well balanced and that certain parts lacked objectivity and fairness. While the text, as a whole, represented significant progress compared with those which had been adopted at previous sessions, her delegation nonetheless had some reservations concerning certain operative paragraphs, particularly paragraph 2.

62. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) took note of the fact that the meetings which the Committee had devoted to agenda items 74, 81 and 82 had produced positive results and he thanked the sponsors of the draft resolutions adopted in that connexion for having really sought to take into account the opinions of all the delegations.

63. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.3/36/L.3, L.9 and L.11 and had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10. It recognized the reality of the problems dealt with therein, and their significance for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, for the implementation of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid and the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. The provisions of those draft resolutions were all equally important; at the same time, he wished to emphasize the special significance of those which aimed at eliminating racism and colonialism as soon as possible and at supporting the peoples who were fighting for their national liberation and independence. In the connexion he drew attention to operative paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 and 10 of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.3.

He noted that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.9 reminded States that it was their duty under international law, to fight resolutely against apartheid. Unlike certain delegations, he felt that the text of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.11 was perfectly balanced and, moreover, very well drafted - the legitimacy of operative paragraphs 1 and 2 could not be questioned, for everyone knew that the colonialists did not relinquish their privileges of their own free will. He also drew attention to the importance of paragraphs 9, 11, 18 and 19, in particular. Turning to draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10, he noted that the text was the product of lengthy consultations in which his delegation had participated. The reference to the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination was more than just a question of form for, in adopting the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the United Nations had established the principle of the exercise of and respect for the right of peoples to self-determination which was mentioned in the United Nations Charter. At the same time, the draft resolution did not cover all aspects of the problem; it should have contained other warnings against the imperialists and hegemonists who continued to deny various peoples their right to self-determination, independence, freedom and social progress, who kept certain regions in southern Africa and in other parts of the world under colonial domination, who continued to occupy land which belonged by right to the Palestinians, who interfered openly in the internal affairs of States, who sought to repress the liberation movements of the oppressed peoples, who committed acts of aggression against sovereign States by raising and arming counter-revolutionary bands such as the so-called "Afghan rebels" and the Pol Pot traitors.

64. The CHAIRMAN reminded the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that he must confine himself to explaining his vote.

65. Mr. FERGUSON (Australia), referring to draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.8, said that his delegation had great respect for the competence and integrity of the members of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, who were fully aware of their responsibility under the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination with regard to the receipt and examination of reports of States Parties. He noted with satisfaction that a text on recourse procedures had been included in the draft resolution. At the same time, he reminded the Committee that the Convention aimed clearly at all forms of racial discrimination; the draft resolution in question did not exactly reflect the concerns of the Convention since it dealt mainly with apartheid. If that trend were to gain strength, it might undermine the consensus which Member States had always achieved on draft resolutions on that item and, in the long run, divert the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination from the universal humanitarian concerns with which it was meant to deal and to political goals which more befitted other organs of the United

Nations; in other words, it might prevent the Committee from acting as a body of independent experts. At the present session, the Third Committee had already found it necessary to vote on the draft resolution concerning the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. He expressed the hope that, in future, draft resolutions on the item would not create a deeper rift among members of the Committee.

66. His Government preferred meetings of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to be held at Headquarters; any Member State which offered to host the Committee should defray all the supplementary expenditure involved in holding a meeting away from Headquarters.

67. He was pleased that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10 had been adopted without a vote. While the Committee had achieved a consensus on a declaration of principle demonstrating its commitment to the provisions of the Charters, it was nevertheless true that certain sovereign States, (Kampuchea and Afghanistan), were at present under foreign occupation.

68. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Australia to confine himself to explaining his vote.

69. Mr. FERGUSON (Australia) said that he had noted against draft resolution A/3/36/L.11 because he thought the text was not balanced and too strongly worded. Nor could he subscribe to a selective condemnation of certain United Nations Member States and certain blocs or to a call to armed struggle within the framework of the United Nations, whose primary task was to seek a pacific settlement of international disputes.

70. Mrs. NGUYEN BINH THANH (Viet Nam) said that her country had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10 and noted with satisfaction that it made reference to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. She hoped that the actual instances of denial of the right of self-determination occurring in many parts of the world (foreign military intervention and occupation and the deliberate destabilization of certain small, independent and sovereign countries which had chosen their own path of development) would come to light and receive the attention they deserved from the international community. In joining the consensus on the draft, Viet Nam wished to voice its conviction that despite all the manoeuvres of the imperialist and reactionary forces, the cause of peoples fighting for their right of self-determination would triumph.

71. Mr. RANGACHARI (India) said that the fact that his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10 did not mean that it had in any way modified the position that it had taken at the thirty-sixth and thirty-

seventh sessions of the Commission on Human Rights when it had voted against the resolutions referred to in paragraph 5.

72. Mrs. FRANCO (Portugal) said that she had abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/C.3/36/L.3 and L.11 because the text contained certain provisions which country could not support. Everyone knew that Portugal and the Portuguese people were implacably opposed to all forms of racial discrimination, including apartheid. In the first case (A/C.3/36/L.3), however, the guidelines of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination had to be defined in the light of the objectives set forth in General Assembly resolution 3057 (XVIII), which had been adopted by the entire international community. It was unfortunate that elements not relevant to those objectives had been introduced in the new text, with all the consequences that might have for the success of the action envisaged. In the second case (A/C.3/36/L.11), isolating South Africa did not appear to be the best way to solve the Namibian problem and the question of apartheid. In spite of the seriousness of the situation, it was still possible to achieve a peaceful settlement and efforts to that end should be pursued. That was why Portugal condemned the diatribes delivered recently by the front-line States, particularly, Mozambique and Angola, which could only make matters worse.

73. Mr. TE (Democratic Kampuchea) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10 because it applied to the situation of Kampuchea and Afghanistan, victims of Vietnamese and Soviet aggression.

74. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia) said that he was sorry the text of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10 as adopted, beginning with its title, did not meet expectations. The proposal came under agenda item 81, which had been clearly worded after careful thought and with precise intentions. It involved not only the right of self-determination but also the rapid granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. That was an extremely important point, which did not appear in the title. The adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.11 on the same subject could not justify such a serious omission. In view of the importance which everyone attached to the independence of colonies, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10 might have been expected to take due account of the observations made by the representative of Algeria regarding the title. Yet they did nothing of the kind; the wording of resolutions must correspond precisely to the agenda items to which they referred if they were to be adopted and implemented by all Member States. He nevertheless took note of that positive reaction of sponsors to his own suggestions, in particular the one concerning reference to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, an extremely important element which should illuminate the whole draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.10. Despite his reservations, Ethiopia had supported the draft, but without modifying the position it had taken

/...

elsewhere, in particular with regard to resolutions on the same subject adopted at the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights.

75. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the adoption of draft resolutions A/C.3/36/L.3, L.7, L.8, L.9 and L.11 was evidence of the concern felt by the international community over the vestiges of colonialism and the persistence of racism and of its corollary, discrimination. He was pleased with the tenor of those resolutions, and in particular, the provisions in draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.3, which showed that the international community was determined to abolish racism and racial discrimination once and for all, to ensure the speedy implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to implement the programme to combat racism. The African Group should also be commended for having prepared a text (A/C.3/36/L.11) which left no room for misinterpretation. The vote which had just taken place showed who were the true champions of self-determination and those who were satisfied with hollow rhetoric.

76. Mr. AL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that everyone was familiar with the lies uttered by the Zionist entity even while the Israeli armed forces were extending their occupation to the territory of four Arab countries, including an entire sector of southern Lebanon. The international community had strongly condemned Israel's policy and all military operations directed against the Lebanese people and the Palestinians expelled in 1948 and in 1967. The objective of the Israeli entity was to prevent the Arabs from recovering the lands from which they had been forcibly expelled and to exterminate an entire people. Israel was now trying to extend its control over southern Lebanon, its aim since the First World War. As early as the Paris Conference, Zionists had announced their famous plan setting the boundaries of the future territory of Israel to include Palestine, southern Lebanon, southern Syria and most of present-day Jordan. Plans for southern Lebanon were in existence as far back as 1956. The objective of the Zionists was unlimited territorial, demographic and economic expansion. Syrian troops had entered Lebanon only at the request of that country and with the approval of the Arab League, which renewed their mandate every six months. They had come there to perform a humanitarian duty. Syria and the other Arab countries must try to put an end to the civil war and to the slaughter which was costing the lives of thousands of innocent persons. They were doing their utmost to help Lebanon to bring about a reconciliation between the parties, which was the main objective of the people, but while the Arab countries strove for the unity of Lebanon, the Israeli entity was trying to divide it. The fragmentation of the country would enable it to realize its own dream of establishing sectarian groups, on the model of Israeli communities, closed to all but Jews. That was why Israeli operations the refugee camps had escalated

the Syrian troops to restore peace. The security of Lebanon was tied to the security of Syria, threatened daily by the Israeli entity, which the United States was helping in every way possible. It was not in the least surprising that Syria should find itself in that situation because it had rejected the spirit of capitulation of the Camp David agreements, which had bargained away Arab rights.

77. The CHAIRMAN announced that consideration of items 74, 81 and 82 was completed.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.

/...