

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

UN LIBRARY
OCT 29 1979



THIRD COMMITTEE
22nd meeting
held on
Thursday, 18 October 1979
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION UN/SA COLLECTION
*Official Records**

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 22nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SOBY (Egypt)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 73: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME FOR THE DECADE FOR ACTION TO
COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/34/SR.22
22 October 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 73: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME FOR THE DECADE FOR ACTION TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (A/34/411, A/34/3/Add.22, A/34/357, A/34/389 and Corr.1; A/C.3/34/2; A/C.3/34/L.9-14) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited members to consider the proposals before the Committee and drew attention to the statement on financial implications in document A/C.3/34/L.14.
2. Mr. NSAH LAI (United Republic of Cameroon) requested a suspension of the meeting to enable the sponsors of the draft proposal in document A/C.3/34/L.10 to consider the amendments to that text.

The meeting was suspended at 11.10 a.m. and resumed at 11.40 a.m.

3. Mrs. MORRISON (Lesotho), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft proposal in document A/C.3/34/L.10, said in connexion with the amendments in document A/C.3/34/L.12 that the sponsors could accept the amendments to paragraph 2 if the word "formulated" was changed to "recommended". They could accept the amendments to paragraph 5 if the word "etc." was added at the end of the paragraph. They rejected the amendments to paragraphs 7 and 11 but accepted the amendments to paragraphs 14 and 17 (b). They could accept the amendment to paragraph 18 if the word "consultation" was changed to "co-operation" and the words "Special Committee of 24" were changed to "Special Committee on the situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples". They rejected the amendment to paragraph 23 and accepted the amendments to paragraphs 24 and 25.
4. As to the Guinean amendment in document A/C.3/34/L.13 to paragraph 25 of the draft proposal, they could accept it if the new phrase was added after the word "newspapers".
5. Miss OBAFEMI (Nigeria) said that her delegation would withdraw its amendments to paragraphs 7 and 11 of the draft proposal in document A/C.3/34/L.10 but wished to maintain its amendment to paragraph 23.
6. Mrs. da LUZ (Cape Verde), Mrs. FLOREZ (Cuba), Mr. OBADI (Democratic Yemen), Mr. HOFANE (Djibouti), Mr. DABO (Guinea), Mr. HASA (Jordan), Mr. MUCORLOR (Liberia), and Mrs. NGUYEN BINH THANH (Viet Nam) announced that their delegations wished to become sponsors of the draft proposal in document A/C.3/34/L.10.
7. Miss COOPERSMITH (United States of America) said that her Government had participated in the adoption of General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII) proclaiming the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and remained committed to the fundamental purpose of that resolution, the "total and unconditional elimination of racism and racial discrimination". However, General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) set forth a concept which was so deeply offensive

(Miss Coopersmith, United States)

to the Government and people of the United States and which so fundamentally undermined the purpose of General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII) that the United States had withdrawn from the Decade and its activities. Therefore, her delegation would not participate in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.3/34/L.9. It did so with a profound sense of regret. The United States was a multiracial society and it had had to deal with the problem of racism and racial discrimination throughout its history. In spite of the considerable progress it had achieved, it knew that even more remained to be done. Its experience could well have been of benefit to others, and it certainly could have gained from the experiences of other nations.

8. The fact that her delegation was not participating in the activities of the Decade or in the votes on related resolutions should not be interpreted as indicating any weakening in its commitment to strive for the elimination of racism and racial discrimination; that remained a fundamental domestic and international goal of her Government. Evidence of racism and racial discrimination still persisted: no country was immune. Clearly those abhorrent practices were more vicious and more dehumanizing in some countries than in others, and that must be taken fully into account. Apartheid had no legitimacy in the counsels of human societies. As the United Nations strove to achieve the total and unconditional elimination of racism and racial discrimination, it should not allow itself to be diverted from its goals and let the common cause become a subterfuge for something else. Her Government would be prepared to work with all nations in trying to find a way in which the United States could associate itself once again with the Decade and its activities.

9. Mr. MELAMED (Israel) said that, notwithstanding the importance of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, his delegation would once again have to dissociate itself from the draft proposals relating to it. Economic and Social Council resolution 1979/3, reproduced in document A/C.3/34/L.9, had been opposed by many delegations when it had originally been put to the vote. His delegation would have voted against it in the Economic and Social Council, for reasons explained at the time by the observer for Israel. The draft proposal in document A/C.3/34/L.10 raised issues that were based on false allegations and distortions of the truth and constituted yet another attempt to reintroduce the equation of Zionism with racism. In those circumstances, his delegation would vote against both of those draft proposals.

10. It was regrettable that a programme that should have been universally acclaimed and implemented had been transformed into a controversial issue by those who were interested in the struggle against racism and racial discrimination only to the extent that they could exploit it for their propaganda purposes.

11. His delegation would abstain in the vote on the Nigerian amendment in document A/C.3/34/L.12 to paragraph 23 of the draft proposal in document A/C.3/34/L.10 if it was put to the vote because the proposed study relating to the Middle East was superfluous and entirely unacceptable.

/...

12. Mr. DABO (Guinea) said that his delegation accepted the suggestion put forward by the representative of Lesotho on behalf of the sponsors of the draft proposal in document A/C.3/34/L.10 that the addition to paragraph 25 proposed by his delegation in the amendment in document A/C.3/34/L.13 should be inserted after the word "newspapers".

13. Mr. NYIRONGO (Zambia) suggested that commas should be inserted before and after the additional wording proposed by Guinea, so that the beginning of the first sentence of that paragraph would read: "Under the auspices of UNESCO, a round table of editors of newspapers, concerned in informing public opinion about the evils of racism and racial discrimination, with wide circulation from the various geographical regions should be convened".

14. The CHAIRMAN said that, since he heard no objection, he took it that the suggestion put forward by the representative of Zambia was acceptable to the sponsors of the draft proposal in document A/C.3/34/L.10.

15. He invited the Committee to vote on the proposals under consideration, on the understanding that the texts of documents A/C.3/34/L.9 and A/C.3/34/L.10 were to be regarded as one draft resolution. He announced that the representative of Ireland had requested that all the votes taken should be recorded votes. The Committee would first consider the amendments in document A/C.3/34/L.11.

16. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Secretary of the Committee) drew the Committee's attention to document A/C.3/34/L.14 setting forth the financial implications of the proposals which were now before the Committee.

17. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether it would be possible to comment on that document, which delegations had only just received.

18. The CHAIRMAN said that that would not be possible, because the Committee was now in the process of voting on the proposals. He pointed out that he had earlier requested comments on all of the documents now before the Committee, including document A/C.3/34/L.14.

19. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand) asked whether there would be a separate vote on each paragraph of the Nigerian amendments in document A/C.3/34/L.12 to the draft proposal in document A/C.3/34/L.10. He had in mind in particular the amendment to paragraph 23.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that the vote on the amendment to paragraph 23 would come in the proper sequence. The Committee would begin by voting on the amendments in document A/C.3/34/L.11 to the draft resolution in document A/C.3/34/L.9 and then proceed to the amendments in document A/C.3/34/L.12 to the draft proposal in document A/C.3/34/L.10.

21. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) said that it had been her delegation's understanding that delegations would have the opportunity to express their views on the amendments to the draft resolution submitted by the Economic and Social Council in document A/C.3/34/L.9. She had also understood that the Committee would begin by considering the amendments to the draft proposal in document A/C.3/34/L.10 and then proceed to

(Mrs. Semichi, Algeria)

consider the amendments to the Council's draft resolution. If that was not the case, her delegation would like to comment at that point on the amendments in document A/C.3/34/L.11 to the draft resolution in document A/C.3/34/L.9.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that the voting had begun and that comments on the documents would no longer be acceptable. He could now accept only explanations of vote before the vote. He again reminded the Committee that he had earlier in the meeting requested delegations to comment on the various documents.

23. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) said that she could not accept the procedure being followed by the Chairman. Delegations must be given an opportunity to express their views on the amendments in document A/C.3/34/L.11 and the oral amendment proposed by Thailand at the previous meeting.

24. The CHAIRMAN repeated that the Committee was now in the process of voting and could no longer accept comments on the documents.

25. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the amendments in documents A/C.3/34/L.11 and A/C.3/34/L.12 were of no concern to the Nordic delegations and they would therefore take no position on them but would abstain in the vote.

26. Mrs. MORRISON (Lesotho) said that her delegation had no serious objection to the amendments in document A/C.3/34/L.11 but had some difficulty in accepting the contents of the report on the International Seminar on Children under Apartheid (A/34/512) referred to in subparagraph (iii) of the second of those amendments. Her delegation would therefore not participate in the vote on any of the amendments in document A/C.3/34/L.11. Her delegation would also not participate in the vote on the other amendments in document A/C.3/34/L.12 because, with particular regard to the proposed amendment to paragraph 23 of document A/C.3/34/L.10, her delegation was not sure what arrangements already existed and what should be recommended to the Commission on the Status of Women.

27. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to consider the amendments in document A/C.3/34/L.11. He took it that, if he heard no objection, the Committee wished to adopt the first amendment, which proposed the addition of a new preambular paragraph.

28. It was so decided.

29. Mr. BA (Mali) said with regard to the second amendment in document A/C.3/34/L.11 that his delegation wished the words "national liberation movements" to be deleted from the subparagraph (i) of the amendment.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that as the Committee was in the process of voting, amendments could no longer be accepted. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the second amendment in document A/C.3/34/L.11 which would add three new paragraphs after paragraph 6 of the draft resolution in document A/C.3/34/L.9.

31. It was so decided.

/...

32. The CHAIRMAN said that he should, strictly speaking, have requested the Committee to consider the Thai amendment, referring to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.3/34/L.9, before considering the second amendment in document A/C.3/34/L.11, which referred to new paragraphs to be inserted after paragraph 6 of that draft resolution. He requested the Committee to consider the Thai amendment, which called for the insertion of a comma in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution after the words "alien domination".
33. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had reservations with regard to the amendment but would not object to its adoption.
34. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) said that her delegation objected to the Thai amendment.
35. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the representative of Thailand wished to press his amendment.
36. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand) said that his delegation's amendment was very modest but was essential in order to make the draft resolution acceptable to his delegation.
37. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the representative of Algeria insisted on her objection to the amendment.
38. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) said that her delegation might have been in a position to accept the amendment if the representative of Thailand had been given an opportunity to explain his reasons for proposing it. In the absence of such an explanation, she would insist on her delegation's objection to the amendment.
39. The CHAIRMAN said that as he had earlier requested delegations to express their views on all documents and proposals before the Committee, the representative of Algeria could have requested an explanation from the representative of Thailand before the voting process had begun.
40. Mrs. MORRISON (Lesotho) said that her delegation could not accept the Thai amendment if the word "and" remained immediately following the proposed comma.
41. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Thailand if he still wished to press his amendment, considering the objections raised by several delegations.
42. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand) requested the right to explain his delegation's reasons for proposing the amendment, which he felt would assist the Committee in avoiding a vote on the amendment.
43. Mrs. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) requested that the representative of Thailand be allowed to explain his reasons for proposing the amendment.
44. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was in the process of voting and could not at that stage hear comments on the substance of the proposals.

45. Mr. MUCORLOR (Liberia) said that good English style would require that the word "and" be deleted after the proposed comma; it was not possible to have both the comma and the word "and".
46. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand) said that his delegation would insist on its amendment.
47. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on Thailand's oral amendment.
48. At the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on the Thai amendment.

In favour: Argentina, Chile, Fiji, Guinea, Indonesia, Israel, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago.

Against: Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

49. The amendment was rejected by 38 votes to 17, with 61 abstentions.*
50. Mr. PARDO (Colombia) and Mrs. MELŮICKÁ (Czechoslovakia) said that the voting machine had failed to record their negative votes.
51. Mrs. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) said that her delegation had not participated in the vote, since it had heard no explanation from the representative of Thailand concerning his amendment.
52. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would continue voting on the remaining proposals at its next meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

* See para. 50 below.