



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 3:	
Credentials of representatives to the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly (<i>continued</i>):	
(b) Report of the Credentials Committee	
First report of the Credentials Committee	259

President: Mr. Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA
(Algeria).

AGENDA ITEM 3

Credentials of representatives to the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly (*continued*):*
(b) Report of the Credentials Committee

FIRST REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS
COMMITTEE

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Uganda has asked to speak on a point of order.
2. Mr. KINENE (Uganda): My delegation, on a point of order, would like to request the immediate discussion of the report of the Credentials Committee [A/9779], as well as draft resolution A/L.731.
3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Uganda has proposed that the General Assembly should immediately consider the report of the Credentials Committee. If there is no objection, we shall proceed immediately to examine the report of the Credentials Committee and, in accordance with the point of order just raised, also consider draft resolution A/L.731, proposed under this item.
4. I call upon the Chairman of the Credentials Committee, Mr. José D. Inglés of the Philippines, to present the report of that Committee.
5. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines), Chairman of the Credentials Committee: I have the honour to submit for the consideration of the General Assembly the first report of the Credentials Committee [A/9779], dated 28 September 1974.
6. At its 64th meeting, on 27 September, the Credentials Committee had before it a memorandum from the Secretary-General, dated 26 September 1974, stating that as of that date, 100 Member States had submitted the credentials of their representatives, issued either by the Head of State or Government or by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, as provided

* Resumed from the 2233rd meeting.

by rule 27 of the rules of procedure. The names of those 100 Member States are given in paragraph 4 (a) of the report. As of 27 September 1974, nine Member States submitted credentials of their representatives in due form. The names of those nine Member States appear in paragraph 5 of the report.

7. The Credentials Committee was invited by the Chairman to examine the credentials of the representatives of the 109 Member States, after which the Committee, by a vote of 5 to 3, with 1 abstention, adopted the following resolution, which appears in paragraph 14 of the report:

"The Credentials Committee

"Accepts those credentials of representatives of Member States to the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly that have already been submitted with the exception of the credentials of the representatives of South Africa."

8. I have the honour, therefore, to present to the General Assembly the following draft resolution:

"The General Assembly

"Approves the first report of the Credentials Committee (A/9779)."

9. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who have expressed a wish to speak on the report of the Credentials Committee.

10. Miss BAGAYYA (Uganda): I take the floor in my capacity as the Chairman of the African group of States to introduce draft resolution A/L.731, which calls upon the Security Council to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of the constant violation by South Africa of the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

11. Representatives will recall that in this very Hall, on 13 November 1970, we adopted resolution 2636 (XXV) rejecting the credentials of the Vorster emissaries. The same resolution was reaffirmed by the Assembly in its resolutions 2862 (XXVI), 2948 (XXVII) and 3181 (XXVIII). In spite of the resolutions I have just quoted, the same Vorster disciples have been allowed not only to enter this Assembly, but also to participate in our deliberations.

12. On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, I should like to hail the historic decision of the Credentials Committee rejecting the credentials of the Pretoria régime. As far as we are concerned, the delegation which occupies the South African seat represents a minority. Above all, it represents an oppressive white minority and, in our view, the only legitimate representatives of South Africa would be not the representatives of that minority of less than

20 per cent of the population, but the representatives of the entire population of South Africa.

13. The régime in Pretoria is an inhuman régime. It has arrogantly continued, in flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter and various resolutions of the United Nations, to offend our collective interpretation of the democratic principles which include the right of representation. It has committed countless atrocities against the non-white majority in South Africa. The memory of Sharpeville, when the Pretoria régime mercilessly slaughtered peaceful demonstrators, and of the shooting down of mine workers of the Carletonville mines is still very fresh in our minds. And while our hearts bleed we are constantly reminded that the regime in Pretoria has not changed its ways but has in fact become the more determined to deny the great majority of the people of South Africa their basic rights and fundamental freedoms by the brutal use of force whenever their whims tell them so.

14. There have been two schools of thought on the question of South African representation. Some have argued that South Africa should be retained in this Organization with the hope that, given time, wisdom will prevail over the attitudes and actions of the authorities in Pretoria. But we say—that is, the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and the sponsors of this draft resolution believe and are convinced—that the time has come for the issue of the credentials of South Africa to be resolved by the Security Council. We further believe that the time has come for the South African régime to be ostracized.

15. To those who belong to the first school of thought, namely, those who believe in the retention and continued nursing of the Pretoria régime, I would like to refer them to the numerous pronouncements of the General Assembly on this question. In 1970, Mr. Hambro, the President of the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, had this to say:

“ . . . I reach the conclusion that a vote in favour of the amendment would mean, on the part of this Assembly, a very strong condemnation of the policies pursued by the Government of South Africa. It would also constitute a warning to that Government as solemn as any such warning could be.”¹

16. Since 1970 that warning has been delivered by every President of the General Assembly. One can say that the Hambro formula has become the standard treatment of the issue of the credentials of the Pretoria delegation.

17. In the meantime, the proponents of *apartheid* have, with their usual arrogance, brushed off the warning and continued to practice their policies of race supremacy. How long, may we ask, can the Assembly continue to be satisfied with merely warning the Pretoria régime?

18. In calling for the ostracizing of the Government of South Africa we are convinced and believe that such a step will not only isolate further the régime in Pretoria, but would also force a long overdue change in that country. In the present world of interdependence no nation, big or small, rich or poor, can afford to live in isolation.

19. The continued illegal occupation of Namibia, in complete defiance of all United Nations resolutions,

is surely grave enough to justify an immediate review of the existing relationship between this Organization and South Africa.

20. In submitting this draft resolution, we are aware that we are calling on this Assembly to take a bold decision that calls for extraordinary courage. Such a decision, no doubt, would set a precedent and perhaps frighten other trespassers. But it is a sacred duty of this Organization and indeed a mandatory obligation on us as Members of this Organization to take such a bold decision in the interests of the ideals and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. It is only by having the determination to set such a precedent that we can truly justify, and only then justify, the existence of this Organization.

21. Mr. OGBU (Nigeria): Mr. President, in a few days' time my Foreign Minister will be paying you the tribute that you deserve.

22. On this occasion, I should like to remind members that the question of validity of the credentials of the delegation sent here by the Pretoria régime has been considered by the General Assembly for almost a decade. The Assembly has, on several occasions, rejected those credentials, the last time only a few months ago at the sixth special session in April-May this year [resolution 3200 (S-VI)].

23. The question is not whether this is the delegation which has been sent here by the Pretoria régime but whether it is entitled to occupy the seat reserved in this Assembly for South Africa, a country in the southern part of Africa with a population of over 20 million, a country which has a right to be properly represented in international forums. The question is also whether the credentials of this delegation of the Pretoria régime can be accepted as valid in the light of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, which clearly lay down the obligations of a Member State.

24. The General Assembly has not only rejected the credentials of the delegations of the Pretoria régime in the past, but has declared, in resolution 3151 G (XXVIII), adopted at the last session, that “the South African régime has no right to represent the people of South Africa”. The Assembly requested the specialized agencies and other intergovernmental organizations to deny membership, or privileges of membership, to the South African régime. In resolution 3151 D (XXVIII), the Assembly asked the Special Committee on *Apartheid* to prepare a report on the violations by South Africa of the Charter, the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council so that it can consider further action. The Special Committee, of which I have the honour to be the current Chairman, completed its report last Friday and it should be before the delegations very soon.²

25. The General Assembly also adopted, at its last session, the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* [resolution 3068 (XXVIII)]. Members of this Assembly hardly need to be reminded that the Pretoria régime is the inventor and the foremost practitioner of *apartheid*, which has been repeatedly condemned by the Assembly as a crime against humanity.

26. The General Assembly can, therefore, do no less at this session than to reject the credentials of

the delegation sent by the Pretoria régime, as recommended by the Credentials Committee, and tell the representatives of that régime that they have no right to represent South Africa so long as that régime remains unrepresentative of the South African people as a whole and so long as it continues to perpetrate the crime of *apartheid*.

27. The Pretoria régime has invented the racist theory that the white people of South Africa constitute a separate nation and that the great majority of the people of that country constitute several other nations as decided by the white régime. It has declared that only the whites can be represented in the Parliament and in the Government: the great majority of the people can only aspire to the crumbs doled out to them by the white régime or seek their destiny in the patches of land given to them to set up Bantustans.

28. This régime has made it clear that it is the régime of the whites, not of all the people of South Africa. How then can this Assembly or any Member State accept it as representative of the whole of South Africa?

29. We are aware that the Pretoria régime has sent here, for the first time, some people of other racial origins as the hangers-on of the delegation.

30. As I said on another occasion, I do not want to criticize the few people who have shown weakness during the course of the hard and long struggle for freedom in South Africa and compromised with the régime. But I would like to draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that those people have no right to vote for the Parliament in South Africa. They cannot be members of the Parliament or of the Government. They cannot even spend a night near the Parliament in Cape Town or the Government offices in Pretoria without special permission from the white régime.

31. Let them go back with the realization that this Assembly and this Organization will not acquiesce in discrimination on the basis of colour of skin, but will redouble its efforts to abolish racism and racial discrimination.

32. The Pretoria régime has continued its illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.³ It has sent its forces into Southern Rhodesia and continues to commit aggression against that Territory. It has openly violated the mandatory sanctions instituted by the Security Council against the illegal minority racist régime in Salisbury.

33. How then can this Assembly or any Member State accept this régime as the spokesman of one of the "peace-loving States" which are "able and willing" to carry out the obligations contained in the United Nations Charter?

34. The question here is not so much a question of procedure, or even law, as a question of logic and morality.

35. I must confess that my delegation was somewhat surprised to learn that even at this session, the Credentials Committee was not unanimous in its recommendation and that some Member States had reservations. We are told that some Member States want to have the credentials of the Pretoria régime

accepted because they have diplomatic relations with that régime. All that my delegation can say is that it is sad enough if those States maintain diplomatic relations with the Pretoria régime, in contravention of the requests of the General Assembly. Should they in addition try to foist the representatives of that régime on this Assembly?

36. We are also told that it was wise for the Assembly to accept the representatives of the former régime of Portugal, and that the Assembly should therefore accept the delegation of the Pretoria régime. My delegation cannot understand the logic of this argument. We rejected the right of the colonial régime in Lisbon to represent Guinea-Bissau, Angola or Mozambique, and we thought that all Member States would recognize that positive changes have come about because of the struggle of the people of the colonial territories, supported by this Assembly and by many Member States, and not because some Member States resisted action against the colonial régime and showered it with friendship and material assistance in its criminal policies.

37. I am reminded of the story of an elderly Senator who was greeted at a reception with the remark that he must have seen a lot of changes during his term as a public official. He replied: "Yeah, and I've been agin' all of 'em."

38. We hope that the delegations which supported the former régime in Portugal will study the lessons of recent events and past errors and rethink their policies. I hate to say, "I told you so".

39. By rejecting the credentials of the South African régime we merely correct an anomaly: we do not stifle the voice of the people of South Africa.

40. Let the voices of the liberation movements, which are the authentic representatives of the great majority of the people of South Africa, be heard loud and clear in all international forums. Let the voice of all those South Africans who detest racism and pledge their loyalty to the purposes and principles of the United Nations be heard in these Halls. We will then be doing our duty to ensure the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the United Nations in South Africa, in the interests of all the people of South Africa, irrespective of race, colour or creed.

41. The Assembly has already administered several serious warnings to the Pretoria régime by rejecting the credentials of its delegation. It cannot merely keep repeating warnings and withholding further action if its own credibility is not to be undermined. It must take a further step at this time, in this Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination which was launched on 10 December 1973 [*resolution 2919 (XXVII)*]. It must invite the Security Council to consider the situation in the light of Articles 3 to 6 of the Charter.

42. I might recall that almost 12 years ago, in resolution 1761 (XVII) of 6 November 1962, the General Assembly requested the Security Council to take measures to secure South Africa's compliance with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on *apartheid*, and asked it, if necessary, "to consider action under Article 6 of the Charter".

43. The Security Council itself declared, in resolution 181 (1963) of 7 August 1963, that the racial policies of South Africa are "inconsistent with the principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations and contrary to its obligations as a Member of the United Nations". It repeated this declaration in resolution 182 (1963) of 4 December 1963, and resolution 191 (1964) of 18 June 1964.

44. In its last resolution on *apartheid*, resolution 311 (1972), which was adopted in Addis Ababa on 4 February 1972, the Security Council again condemned the South African régime for continuing its policies of *apartheid* "in violation of its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations" and decided, "as a matter of urgency, to examine methods of resolving the present situation arising out of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa".

45. More than two years have passed since that resolution and it is high time that the Security Council considered the matter again. My delegation believes that it is high time the Assembly invited the Security Council to meet its responsibilities under Article 6 of the Charter in the light of the repeated declarations by the General Assembly and the Security Council that the South African régime has violated its obligations under the Charter.

46. I would like to conclude by appealing to those members of the Security Council that have so far prevented action against *apartheid* to reconsider their positions in the light of the continued violations of the Charter by the South African régime and in the light of their own obligations as members of the Security Council. I urge those members, and indeed all members of this Assembly, to vote unanimously in favour of the draft resolution so ably introduced by the Foreign Minister of Uganda, as contained in document A/L.731, of which the Nigerian delegation is proud to be a sponsor.

47. Mr. HUSSEIN (Somalia): My delegation welcomes the action of the Credentials Committee in rejecting the credentials of the representatives of the Pretoria régime. Four years ago, at the twenty-fifth session [1882nd meeting] the Somali delegation took the initiative in making a direct challenge to the credentials of the delegation from South Africa. In repeating this challenge consistently since then, my delegation has not been making a symbolic protest. We have shared the conviction of many other delegations that the United Nations cannot accept, on an equal footing with other Member States, the representatives of South Africa's white minority group. This group, as we are all aware, seized power illegally and unjustly in order that the African majority might be kept in subjection through the inhuman policies of *apartheid*. Over the years the world community has witnessed that illegal and unjust seizure of power made effective through the removal of the franchise rights of the non-white population, rights that had been enshrined in the Constitution of the Union of South Africa. Once the non-white people had been made powerless to defend themselves through the normal channels of political action, the stage was set for the imposition of *apartheid* and the establishment of the police State which defends the *apartheid* structure.

48. At the United Nations we cannot accept the representatives of a minority group of 4 million, which has excluded the majority of 17 million from their legitimate role in the management of their own country's affairs and from their legitimate share in its social and economic benefits, particularly since the rationale of this policy is one of the racial superiority of one group over another.

49. The acceptance in the past of the representatives of the Pretoria régime has strained the credibility of the United Nations and undermined its fundamental principles. It is assumed that membership in the United Nations entails at the very least a commitment to fundamental human rights, to upholding the dignity and the worth of the human person, and to providing equal rights for men and women. For the future it must be considered whether the presence in the United Nations of the so-called representatives of South Africa makes a mockery of this assumption.

50. Successive Nationalist Party Governments have had ample warning of the United Nations view of their gross violations of the political, economic and social rights of the majority of the people of South Africa. They have had ample time to change their racist policies and make a commitment to social justice. Ever since the earliest days of the Organization the question of racism in South Africa has been an important concern of the United Nations and the numerous condemnatory resolutions on this question that have been adopted over the years by all its main organs attest to that concern. The specialized agencies also share the world consensus on the nature of *apartheid*. Their sharp condemnation of that policy has forced South Africa to withdraw from most of these agencies. In recent years successive Presidents of the General Assembly have interpreted the rejection of the credentials of the representatives of the Pretoria régime as tantamount to a solemn warning to the South African Government to end its racist policy.

51. All these condemnations and warnings from the international community have been ignored by South Africa. My delegation believes that, in the face of this intransigence, the General Assembly must act to preserve the credibility of the United Nations and to strengthen the validity of its principles. The rejection of the credentials of the delegation from South Africa again this year is a step in this direction. However, this action must not become a mere formality. It must be given practical force. The United Nations must make it clear that it will accept only the representatives of the majority of the people of South Africa.

52. My delegation also looks beyond the question of the credentials of the representatives of the Pretoria régime. We believe that the extraordinary nature of the situation in South Africa and the threat its existence poses to regional and international peace indicate the necessity of a review by the Security Council of the relationship between the United Nations and the Pretoria régime.

53. First of all, it is undeniable that the extent and the severity of violations of human rights in South Africa constitute a blot on our world civilization. While few States can claim to have perfectly just societies, nowhere else but in South Africa have

political injustice and a viciously dehumanizing racism been elevated into a philosophy of government.

54. The majority of Member States believes that *apartheid* falls within the category of crimes against humanity. It will be recalled that this category was described and established in international law by the Nürnberg Tribunal and it included the deportation and the enslavement of peoples, both of which are conditions suffered by non-white South Africans in the process of the forcible separation of the races.

55. The Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations [*resolution 2627 (XXV)*] which described the attitudes, achievements and failures of the world Organization, condemned *apartheid* as a crime against the conscience of mankind. More recently the judgement of the world community on *apartheid* was illustrated by the addition of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* [*resolution 3068 (XXVIII)*] to the body of international law. The United Nations has long agreed that, in dealing with *apartheid* and the consequences of that policy, the world Organization can act outside the normal restrictions placed by the Charter on intervention in matters falling within the domestic jurisdiction of Member States. The weighty judgements of the international community on *apartheid* underline the validity of this view. However, *apartheid* has not remained a domestic affair of the South African Republic. Its export to Southern Rhodesia and its imposition on the people of Namibia—for whom the United Nations has a special responsibility—have had serious repercussions with regard to peace and security and with regard to the authority both of the United Nations and of the International Court of Justice. To its customary flouting of the authority of the United Nations on the question of *apartheid*, South Africa has added contempt for the world Organization and for the International Court through its continued illegal occupation of Namibia. The occasional attempts at window-dressing undertaken by the South African administration in Namibia to cover up the violations of human rights that are normal in the Territory have shown themselves time and again to be without substance. It is clear that only the assumption of responsibility for the Territory by the United Nations will ensure that the aspirations of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence will be fulfilled.

56. The gravest challenge of all to the authority of the United Nations by South Africa lies in its flagrant violations of the only mandatory sanctions ever imposed by the Security Council—those against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. South Africa's military, social and economic collaboration with the Smith régime completes the picture of cynical disregard for international law.

57. The very real threat to regional and international peace posed by the South African situation must not be ignored. In 1964, a Group of Experts established by the Security Council reported on the danger of racial conflagration that could be foreseen as a result of South Africa's racist policies.⁴ Today, with the liberation struggle of the people of southern Africa becoming more determined and more successful, the prospect of such a conflict has been brought nearer.

In our ideologically divided world, regional conflicts open up the possibility of international conflict, with all its terrible implications. But time is running out, and the need for new and bold initiatives to forestall these dangers is urgent.

58. The Security Council alone can take action commensurate with the violations of human rights and of international law of which South Africa is guilty. The Security Council alone can give adequate substance to the condemnations and warnings which have been ignored by South Africa over the past 25 years. It is only Security Council action which can penetrate the wall of arrogance that the minority régime has built around itself.

59. My delegation trusts that the General Assembly will see clearly its duty to call on the Security Council to review with the utmost urgency the situation in South Africa and its repercussions and, in the light of its findings, to review the relationship between South Africa and the United Nations.

60. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): I shall not tax the patience of the Assembly unduly in my statement on the report of the Credentials Committee. I shall simply say how pleased we are to see this report finally this year accurately reflecting the feelings and the will not only of this Assembly but of the whole international community, and we are gratified that this year the Credentials Committee has conducted itself, as it should always do, as a faithful emanation of the General Assembly.

61. Draft resolution A/L.731 certainly requires no defence. There is still less need to explain it because it is a natural part of a process which the General Assembly has been developing for a number of years now. The innumerable condemnations, which have become undeniably universal in their character, of the policy of *apartheid* pursued by the South African Government have had no effect on that policy and have not prevailed upon that Government to alter its concept of the administration of South Africa. The rejection of the credentials of the South African delegation, which has occurred at several sessions, has remained quite Platonic and without practical effect. The General Assembly could not continue to tolerate such disregard of its clearly expressed will and the decisions it had adopted by a majority which confers upon them an importance no one can deny. The international community could not permit one of its members, which endorsed the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and which undertook to respect the principles and the philosophy of the Organization, to behave constantly and obdurately in a manner so much at variance with these very principles.

62. In order to manifest its real attachment to the principles it had professed and in order not to lose credit, the General Assembly had to take a new line that would allow it to make clear to the South African Government its resolve to continue its action until it finally prevailed upon that Government to abandon its policy of *apartheid* and to bring its actions into line with the principles of the international community.

63. The draft resolution now before the Assembly is in keeping with the principles of the Charter and also with the procedure stemming from the principles of the Charter and those of the rules of procedure,

according to the interpretation of them which has prevailed up to now. When the General Assembly adopts the draft resolution it will then be for the Security Council to face up to its own responsibilities, responsibilities entrusted to it under the Charter which are to be endorsed now by the General Assembly itself.

64. The draft resolution calls upon the Security Council to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa. That is a very broad request, which places no limitations upon the kind of decision the Security Council may take and gives the Security Council great latitude to adopt whatever measures it deems best finally to impose respect for the will of the international community.

65. Many delegations, in discussing this and other problems, have argued that the General Assembly and the Security Council itself should give the highest priority to the desire of this Organization to be universal, and to take very careful account, in all circumstances, of the principle of universality. We, too, are aware of the need for respecting the universality of our Organization, and from this rostrum and in other assemblies of this Organization we have had the opportunity to call for the principle of universality of the Organization to be applied and respected. But it is clear to us, too, that it is not a universality to be achieved at any price. It is not to be achieved even at the price of forgetfulness of respect for the principles of the Charter. It must be a universality founded upon the principles of the Charter, upon sound principles—in a word, upon the principles of humanity.

66. Before I conclude, I wish to say from this rostrum that the group of non-aligned countries gives its unreserved support to draft resolution A/L.731.

67. Mr. RAMPHAL (Guyana): Mr. President, there will be another occasion when I shall hope to speak more fully about your auspicious election to preside over this Assembly and about the services rendered by your predecessor, Mr. Benites. I accept your invitation to take the floor this morning in a representative capacity, speaking on behalf of the countries of the Caribbean community, the Member States of the Bahamas, Barbados, Grenada, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago and, of course, Guyana.

68. The issue of which we are now seized, the decision to be taken upon the report of the Credentials Committee recommending the rejection by this Assembly of the Credentials of the delegation of South Africa, is a most serious one. Assuming as I do that the Assembly will, as on past occasions, accept the report of the Credentials Committee, I shall speak primarily on the draft resolution just introduced by the Foreign Minister of Uganda.

69. Speaking from this rostrum six years ago, at the twenty-third session [1680th meeting], I said, on behalf of Guyana, that South Africa had demonstrated its moral incapacity to continue in the membership of this Organization. The intervening period has served only to strengthen that view and to render a collective response to it from the international community even more compelling than it was then. The South African régime has continued to apply its pernicious policy of *apartheid* with all the brutality at its command and, adding contumacy to immorality, has

extended its intolerable policy to the international territory of Namibia.

70. Mindful of the precepts of the Charter and conscious of the explosive character of a world racial crisis, the United Nations has over the years rejected and condemned *apartheid* and called upon the South African régime to abandon its racist policies. An outrage and an affront to the sensibilities of mankind, *apartheid* has been abhorrent to the vast majority of the world's people and has been declared by this Assembly to be a crime against humanity. On four occasions within the last four years—that is at each of its last four sessions—the Assembly itself has paid special attention to the position of South Africa in this Organization when considering the reports of the Credentials Committee. On each occasion the vote on the rejection of the credentials of the South African delegation has been regarded by this Assembly as tantamount to a vehement condemnation of the policy of the South African Government and, on each occasion, the General Assembly has issued a solemn warning to that Government.

71. The South African régime has failed to heed those warnings and has, on the contrary, continued defiantly in its persistent disregard of all the relevant decisions of the United Nations on *apartheid*. It has compounded that defiance with aggression in regard to the jurisprudence of the International Court of Justice, with its contumacious refusal to acknowledge the authority of this Organization in relation to Namibia and with its open and blatant breach of mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia.

72. In the light of this incontrovertible evidence, is there a voice in the international community that can be raised to challenge the indictment that South Africa, as a Member of this Organization, has, in the language of Article 6 of the Charter, “persistently violated the Principles contained in the . . . Charter”?

73. The time has come for decisive action on that indictment. Persuasion and appeals have been to no avail. We have had enough from the South African régime. Appeasement hereafter can only hurt the cause of internationalism. To issue another warning, no matter how solemnly, would, in the view of our delegations, be an abdication of our responsibility under the law, under the Charter of the United Nations, and would reduce the credibility of this Organization in the eyes of the peoples of the world.

74. Draft resolution A/L.731 does not seek to specify the action to be taken against South Africa. By requesting the Security Council to examine the relations between the Organization and South Africa, the draft resolution permits us, through the prescribed constitutional processes, to initiate long-overdue action under Chapter II of the Charter designed to deal appropriately with a Member State which has persistently violated the principles of the Charter and ruthlessly contravened the precepts of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

75. The draft resolution has the total and wholehearted support of our Caribbean delegations and of the peoples of our region of the world. We are proud to be among its sponsors. We urge on all Member States their unreserved affirmation of it, so that this

Assembly may reflect in a single-minded way the outraged conscience of mankind.

76. Mr. KELANI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is indeed astonishing, in this contemporary world—and particularly within this Organization that built its Charter on the principles of equity and of equality among peoples, on the right to self-determination and on the abolition of discrimination in all its forms, in particular racial discrimination—that we should find here, among the representatives of the entire world, the delegation of a Government which does not represent the population of the country it governs. I am referring, of course, to the Government of South Africa.

77. That Government represents only a small minority of non-African outsiders. It is a colonialist minority that occupied South Africa and installed itself in that country. It has established an illegal Government, thereby violating the right to self-determination of more than 15 million Africans belonging to the population of that country. The Government of the delegation here occupying the seat of South Africa, with no right whatsoever, continues to practise its policy of racial discrimination.

78. Only 10 days ago [2236th meeting] the representative of that Government sought here to strike the item on South Africa's policy of *apartheid* from the agenda of this session of the General Assembly; but despite his request, the General Assembly approved the inclusion of the item in the agenda. By rejecting the request of the delegation of the South African régime, the Assembly in categorical fashion condemned the régime in question as it has done in refusing to accept the credentials of the representatives of that régime on various occasions from 1971 to the present date.

79. The successive positions taken by the General Assembly were not taken arbitrarily. The Government of South Africa has been condemned on numerous occasions for its violations of the principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; but it has continued its violations despite all the warnings and condemnations appearing in General Assembly resolutions adopted through the years, despite the sanctions imposed on South Africa at the international level, and despite the various positions taken by the majority of the world's countries with regard to that régime.

80. That Government, however, has not given up the practice of its policy of *apartheid*. It has violated paragraph 2 of Article 1 of the Charter by depriving the people of South Africa of their right to self-determination and limiting that right to the white colonialist minority. It has also violated paragraph 3 of that same Article 1 by steadfastly continuing to apply the policy of *apartheid*, by denying its citizens their legal right to enjoy the basic freedoms, by applying racial discrimination—discrimination based on colour—thus, by such policy, violating as well the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. For all these reasons, it is high time that the General Assembly called for the application of Article 6 of the Charter. This question should be referred to the Security Council with the request that the Council review the relationship existing between the United Nations and the régime of South Africa.

81. The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic hopes that the draft resolution now before us, submitted by a large number of countries, including Syria, will be adopted by the General Assembly, so that it may serve as a lesson to all those who may attempt to violate the principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

82. Mr. PETRIC (Yugoslavia): For a number of years the racist régime of South Africa has been violating all the moral, legal and political norms of contemporary mankind, wilfully disregarding the fundamental provisions of the Charter of the United Nations as well as numerous decisions of the General Assembly and its organs.

83. It is not my intention, and I am certain that it is not necessary either to deal here in detail with the sinister policies and the repressive measures of the Nazi South African régime, as not only the States Members of the Organization but also world public opinion at large are very well aware of them. Unfortunately, we have to note that the South African racists, who are condemned most emphatically by the majority of the States Members of the United Nations, receive assistance and support from certain influential quarters and are thus able to maintain themselves in power. However, the struggle of oppressed peoples in the south of Africa is gaining strength and is achieving new success every day, and it is certain that oppressed peoples—all of them, and especially those of South Africa—will soon achieve their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence.

84. We welcome with satisfaction the decision of the Credentials Committee, which we are sure will be confirmed today in the General Assembly by a great majority, not to recognize the credentials of the régime in South Africa as this régime represents only the white minority. The decision on non-recognition of the credentials of the illegal South African régime has fully confirmed the moral and political maturity of the Organization and the date of this decision is important in the struggle against *apartheid*.

85. Numerous appeals, warnings and demands have been addressed in the United Nations to the South African reactionaries. The latter have been given a number of opportunities to discard their policy. The Pretoria régime has constantly rejected those opportunities, continuing to violate the principles and decisions of the Organization. I believe that it is high time for the Organization to pass from words to deeds and to implement as a matter of urgency all the concrete measures against the Pretoria régime that the United Nations is authorized to take under the Charter.

86. The people and Government of Yugoslavia, in keeping with their policy of support for the struggle for self-determination, freedom and independence of all peoples and countries and against all forms of oppression and foreign domination, call for urgent action by the international community. We are resolutely opposed to any further postponement of concrete measures due to procedural manoeuvres aimed at postponement and at saving the South African reactionaries.

87. As sponsors of the proposed draft resolution, we are sure that the great majority of other States

Members of the Organization will support it. We hope that the Security Council, in considering the problem of South Africa, will fully take into account the position of the General Assembly and the obligations laid upon it by the Charter in its capacity as principal organ for the safeguarding of peace and security and that it will adopt a responsible, concrete and principled decision, namely, that it will finally adopt effective measures against the Government of a Member State that has violated all the decisions taken by the United Nations so far.

88. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Cuba, but first I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

89. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I have asked to speak on a point of order because I hope it will not be very long before we vote; but before we do so I thought it would be appropriate to submit an amendment to the draft resolution before the Assembly.

90. Somebody might ask why I do not wait until the end. Because I realize that my amendment will have to be translated into the working languages. So I wanted to assure my colleague from Cuba that I had no objection to what he wanted to say and I apologize for having raised that point of order after he was announced to come to the rostrum.

91. We need clarity in our resolution. We should not leave the entire matter to the Security Council, as we know very well that one of its permanent members can exercise a veto and all the recommendations that may emanate from this Assembly will be null and void. What is the idea of passing resolutions that cannot be put into practice?

92. Of course we are giving vent to our disapproval of the way the Republic of South Africa runs its State, and I might venture to say it is a republic with a limited public, it is a republic of a minority. Some here might say that there are many dictatorships among States Members of the United Nations; what about them? This is a moot question and we should also be careful how we measure our steps and how we act, for the future. But here there is a specific recommendation with regard to *apartheid*.

93. If I were to draft this resolution, with all due respect to those who sponsored it—and I always leave the name of the country I represent aside, so that we may humbly contribute whatever we believe to be constructive suggestions—I would not have mentioned the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in the elaboration of which it was my honour to participate in the Palais de Chaillot over 25 years ago, because human rights are being violated every day. The Charter is being violated every day. But here there is a specific question of discrimination that has been discussed year in, year out since the United Nations was founded. It is not a simple human right. The worth and dignity of the human person is at stake, regardless of colour, I would say.

94. Therefore, having given this short preface to my amendment, I hope that it will now become more understandable to the General Assembly. It was judiciously worded without in any way diluting the force of the subject matter of the draft resolution. In fact, it bolsters the draft resolution, but it will not

allow us to fall into traps in the future, in the sense that any member can come to this rostrum and say that such and such a country is violating the Charter and human rights and therefore should be suspended or expelled. It is judicious in the sense that year in, year out, the members of the Assembly, even when the membership of the Organization was much less than it is today, unanimously reproached South Africa for persisting in its policy of *apartheid*.

95. Just because the skin of the majority is black that majority has no voice. This is a precedent that would never occur in any country without repercussions and bloodshed. It is a wonder that the people of South Africa have been docile. We do not want to see bloodshed here; we do not want to witness bloodshed here while we are complacent as to what should or should not be done.

96. The following is the amendment which should be added as operative paragraph 2:

“Urges the Government of South Africa, pending any decision that might be taken by the Security Council pursuant to the recommendation of the preceding paragraph and taking into account that South Africa is representative of the white minority without its Government having ascertained the will of the black majority, to take forthwith drastic action to rectify this anomalous situation”.

97. This is the last chance for South Africa to rectify that anomalous situation pending a decision by the Security Council, so that the veto may not be unjustly used—and then we would be the laughing stock of the world community: by sending a resolution to the Security Council that might become like a tennis ball, sent to the Security Council and then back from the Security Council to the Assembly. This would not redound to the honour of the Organization.

98. Mr. President, thank you for allowing me to submit this text and, again, I apologize to my good colleague, the representative of Cuba, and the other representatives who had put their names on the list. But I thought that it was imperative that I should read the text, lest, if I submitted it later, someone might say that it was too late then for consideration.

99. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): For years the General Assembly has discussed the situation in South Africa and, in particular, the flagrant violations of the United Nations Charter, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and of the decisions taken by this Assembly itself. The violations which occur in that territory are carried out by a régime which represents a colonialist and racist minority, which not only does not represent the African population on which it has imposed an opprobrious régime of exploitation and racial segregation, but, under the Constitution of South Africa, and according to its own political philosophy, has never claimed to represent that African majority population.

100. This General Assembly repeatedly and firmly has expressed its opposition to this policy and has more than once urged the South African régime to put an end to it, and has on more than one occasion given that régime an opportunity to alter its policy, and to bring it into accord with the opinion of the

overwhelming majority of the international community.

101. In past years my delegation expressed its views on the reports submitted to us by the Credentials Committee, and we pointed out to the Assembly that the Committee, in the consideration of this agenda item, should reflect the majority feeling and opinion of the Members of this Organization. It is therefore with great satisfaction that we have received the report submitted to us this year by the Committee, recommending that we reject the credentials of the South African régime.

102. It is fitting to point out that with this recommendation the Committee is adhering strictly to its terms of reference and complying with its duty as a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly. In the past, we have heard here objections to the decisions of the Assembly rejecting the credentials of South Africa, on the basis of a restrictive interpretation of the terms of reference of the Credentials Committee. That is why we emphasize the fact that the Committee is a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly and, accordingly, must apply what the rules of procedure establish for it, but it must also be guided by the directives, policies and guidelines given to the Credentials Committee by the Assembly in its capacity as the sovereign body. Indeed, on 14 December 1973, just when we were celebrating the proclamation of the historical Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the General Assembly, by a vote of 88 to 7, took the following decision:

“Declares that the South African régime has no right to represent the people of South Africa and that the liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity are the authentic representatives of the overwhelming majority of the South African people.” [Resolution 3151 G (XXVIII).]

103. It is the view of my delegation that the General Assembly, when it adopted this text, had already decided that it would not accept a situation in which the seat of the South African people continued to be usurped by a minority régime which neither represented that people nor even claimed to represent it, and that as long as the present situation prevailed in that territory, the seat should be occupied by the representatives of the liberation movements recognized by the OAU which the General Assembly declares “are the authentic representatives of the overwhelming majority of the South African people”.

104. Since the Credentials Committee had before it credentials which had not been issued by those whom the General Assembly already recognized as the representatives of that people but were issued by those whom the General Assembly had already declared had no right to represent that people, the Credentials Committee had no choice, in discharging its obligations as a subsidiary organ of this Assembly, but to reject the credentials of the South African régime, since this Assembly already decided last year that that régime had no right to represent that Member of the United Nations.

105. My delegation therefore trusts that this Assembly will, by an overwhelming majority, consistent

with the resolution previously mentioned and the long history of repudiation of *apartheid* and rejection of the discriminatory practices imposed by the white racist minority against the 17 million Africans in that territory, decisively endorse the report of the Credentials Committee. It is all the more important to do so this year because we are clearly witnessing a broadening of the anti-colonialist trend sweeping the world in accord with the viewpoints and feelings of the vast majority of us.

106. It was with deep feeling and great joy that this General Assembly only a few days ago received the representatives of the new Government of Portugal and applauded whole-heartedly the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal, Mr. Mario Soares [2239th meeting], when in a historic declaration from this rostrum on behalf of his Government and people he condemned the policy of *apartheid*.

107. It was also with deep feeling that this Assembly received the representatives of the new Member State, Guinea-Bissau, a symbol of the long struggle of the African people against colonial domination and racial oppression. Both events, the fall of fascism in Portugal and the admission to membership in the United Nations of Guinea-Bissau, were unequivocal expressions of the fact that colonialism and racism can no longer continue to be imposed on the world and that the efforts of this Organization and the repeated deliberations that have taken place in this Assembly Hall for years are in accord with the march of history. It is only fitting that this Assembly should take decisions, so that in the long run we may see how these aspirations of the majority of mankind are turned into the reality we welcome today.

108. Similarly, my delegation considers that the time has come for this Assembly and the Organization as a whole to adopt more forceful measures, more final decisions, in order to bring to an end the situation that exists in southern Africa. Accordingly, we associate ourselves with the African States and other Members of this Assembly by subscribing to draft resolution A/L.731, of which Cuba also wishes to be considered a sponsor and which “calls upon the Security Council to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of the constant violation by South Africa of the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.”

109. We all know that the question of violations of those rights in South Africa is perhaps one of the oldest items on the agenda of this Assembly. The Assembly started dealing with this item almost at the inception of the Organization and it has been considering it from year to year. Every review, every deliberation, every resolution addressed by this Assembly to the Government of South Africa transmitting to it the opinion of the vast majority of its Members, was an opportunity given by the General Assembly to the racist régime to alter the existing situation.

110. If this Organization has done nothing else, it has given opportunities to the racist régime to change its policy. If there is anything more the United Nations can do it is to adopt the practical measures available to the Security Council under the Charter to compel that régime to respect international legislation in this matter, to recognize the rights of the African

population and to put an end to a policy and a situation which not only have constituted and continue to constitute a negation of the rights of the African people of South Africa, but represent a constant and permanent scorning, a systematic defiance and a continual rejection of international public opinion and of the criteria which have been reaffirmed by this Assembly from year to year.

111. Therefore we do not believe that the business on the agenda at this time should be once more to begin a dialogue with those who have closed the doors on a dialogue for decades, but rather to require the Security Council to adopt the urgent, necessary and practical measures that the international community has been demanding for years.

112. Mr. GROZEV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from Russian*): As Chairman of the group of socialist countries of Eastern Europe, I should like to state that we fully support the conclusions and recommendations of the Credentials Committee [A/9779] recommending non-recognition of the credentials of the delegation of South Africa as representatives of the racist régime of Pretoria. This is not the first time the General Assembly has rejected the credentials of this régime and there is a serious basis for this. The régime of the racist minority in South Africa is continuing to commit the most flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and its principles and to pursue a policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination that has been rejected by all mankind.

113. The United Nations has adopted numerous decisions requiring the Government of South Africa to cease this policy and also to grant the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and true and genuine independence. The Pretoria régime, however, continues to disregard flagrantly the will and the decisions of the Organization. It is precisely for this reason that the racist régime of Pretoria cannot be, and has no right to claim that it is, representative of the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the population of that country. On the basis of these considerations, the delegations of the countries of Eastern Europe support draft resolution A/L.731 and express the conviction that it will be adopted by the General Assembly.

114. Mr. SHEVEL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, speaking for the first time at this session of the General Assembly I should like, on behalf of the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR, to say that we associate ourselves with the many words of welcome that have already been addressed to you. Our delegation wishes to express its special satisfaction at the fact that it is you, a son of the heroic people of Algeria, a people that has made such a great contribution to the struggle for the freedom and independence of colonial peoples, who have been elected President of this session. We wish you every success.

115. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supports the draft resolution, which proposes that the Security Council review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of the constant violation by South Africa of the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human

Rights. We believe that this proposal is well-founded, just and timely.

116. The policy of *apartheid* pursued by the racist Government of South Africa has been the subject of constant concern and anxiety to world public opinion and all progressive forces. It has also been the focus of attention in many international forums and, first and foremost, in the United Nations itself. From the earliest days of its existence the United Nations has had to deal with this problem. Over the years a large number of resolutions have been adopted containing appeals to the Government of South Africa to cease the universally condemned policy of *apartheid*. Nevertheless, in spite of the appeals by the United Nations, that racist régime has stubbornly continued to press its criminal policy of *apartheid*, subjecting millions of Africans to the most cruel forms of suffering, enslavement, humiliation and oppression.

117. The racist régime of South Africa is anti-humanitarian and inhuman. A handful of white settlers have been ruthlessly exploiting, repressing and subjecting to racial oppression, millions of the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa. Therefore, the decision adopted at the last session of the General Assembly was well-founded and entirely correct when it said as other speakers have done that the South African régime has no right to represent the people of South Africa; and that the genuine representatives of the overwhelming majority of the people of South Africa are the liberation movements recognized by the OAU.

118. It is quite obvious that the fundamental role in the struggle for the liquidation of racism and *apartheid* belongs to the oppressed peoples of South Africa and its liberation movements. It is the lofty duty of the United Nations to do everything it can to assist in this struggle. Therefore it is only natural for the United Nations, in its resolutions on *apartheid* adopted at previous sessions of the General Assembly, to have called upon Governments, international and national organizations to undertake more effective action against the Government of South Africa.

119. The Ukrainian SSR actively supports the struggle of colonial and oppressed peoples for freedom and independence and, being a member of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, has consistently favoured the entire elimination of remaining colonial régimes and is in favour of the final eradication of all manifestations of racism and *apartheid*.

120. On the basis of this approach we whole-heartedly support the proposal that the Security Council should review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa. The adoption of the draft resolution containing this proposal would, in our view, be a concrete step which would reflect the determination of the United Nations to make every effort to do its duty towards the peoples which are languishing under the power of the racists. This step, without any doubt, would promote an intensification of the struggle on the part of the progressive forces of mankind against the racist régime of South Africa and against the inhuman policy of *apartheid*.

121. In conformity with its international duty the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.731. Furthermore, our delega-

tion whole-heartedly supports the recommendation of the Credentials Committee not to recognize the credentials of the delegation of the illegal racist régime of South Africa.

122. Mr. JAIPAL (India): The question before us today is one concerning the representation of the Member State of South Africa and not whether South Africa should continue to be a State Member of the United Nations. The credentials that we have received are from the Pretoria régime and in respect of its representatives. These representatives may, of course, represent themselves but clearly they do not represent the people of South Africa, 80 per cent of whom do not have the right to vote and are subjected to the self-righteous and cynical doctrine of *apartheid* as the basis of administration.

123. In its resolution 3151 G (XXVIII), the General Assembly had pronounced itself on the illegitimacy of the Pretoria régime. It follows from that decision surely that we should now reject the credentials of that régime to represent South Africa.

124. It is absurd to suggest, as some have done, that there are no criteria for dealing with the question of credentials, and that we are required only to make sure, like a bunch of clerks, that the credentials have been signed by the Head of State or Government or the Foreign Minister. We are dealing with a political question and no criteria are needed for taking a decision. Draft resolution A/L.731, of which India is a sponsor, calls upon the Security Council to review the relationship between the United Nations and the Pretoria régime in South Africa. In the course of such a review the Security Council should take into account the anomalous situation in Namibia. This Territory is under United Nations administrative control but the Pretoria régime has prevented the United Nations from exercising its functions. Namibia continues to be under the illegal occupation of the Pretoria régime and this fact alone warrants the severest action against that régime in terms of the Charter.

125. The Pretoria régime has been given a long enough rope and more than enough time to mend its ways. It has not done so, and there is no sign whatever that it will do so in the near future. The Saudi Arabian amendment is of course well meant but I am afraid that it will be unheeded by the Pretoria régime. In these circumstances we hope that all Members here will readily acknowledge the hopelessness of the situation and support the draft resolution before us as it is timely, adequate, necessary and in conformity with the United Nations Charter.

126. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation has had countless opportunities, both in the Special Political Committee and the General Assembly, to state its condemnation of the policy of *apartheid* and of South Africa's conduct in many other cases—of which the most flagrant is that of Namibia. I shall confine myself to recalling what was said by us in 1970 during the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations:

“My delegation feels that it is not necessary to dwell on the fact that the United Nations and the specialized agencies have proven beyond question that the policy of *apartheid* is an evil which affects

all those who participate in its implementation and application. It has had unfavourable consequences for all the inhabitants of South Africa and not only for those of African origin, consequences such as the establishment of a police State and the creation of economic development which is improper and unbalanced and which is contemptuous of the principles of development which the rest of the world is trying to achieve. Development in South Africa is based on the pitiless exploitation of the majority, which is deprived of any opportunity to enjoy the benefits of its work which it gives to the State to which it belongs.”

On that same occasion, we stated further that:

“There is also no doubt that the policy of *apartheid* has continued to develop and that the many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly have turned out to be useless. The so-called *apartheid* laws in South Africa for the last decade have become ever more repressive. One of the well-known newspapers in the United States, *The Christian Science Monitor*, recently published the cost of human suffering signified by the imposition of the policy of *apartheid* . . . In the period from the middle of 1968 to the middle of 1969 almost half a million people were imprisoned, in other words, one out of forty persons, which signifies that in any single day in South Africa there were more than 88,000 persons in prison, of which more than 95 per cent were African. That means that most of those cases of imprisonment were as the result of violations of the law of *apartheid*. During that same period eighty-four persons were executed in Africa, which represents almost half the executions which took place throughout the entire world.”⁵

127. And yet, despite our unswerving position, we were compelled to abstain last year at the twenty-seventh session [2141st meeting] when a vote was taken on an amendment to the report of the Credentials Committee. This year, much to our regret, and for legal reasons which my delegation views as highly respectable, we shall be obliged to adopt an analogous position with respect to the report of the Credentials Committee.

128. However, we believe that there is another procedure for achieving the purpose common to us all. This other procedure is the one contained in draft resolution A/L.731—for which we shall not only vote but to which, if acceptable to the sponsors, my delegation would like to propose an amendment, to strengthen it and to make it even more effective in achieving the desired aim. In this connexion I should like to say a few words by way of explanation. When reference was made to a specific suggestion put forward by Mexico in 1969, my delegation, in 1970, stated, in the same statement, that

“There are other means provided for by the Charter the application of which would no doubt be more beneficial to the Organization. My delegation believes that they would result in more pressure on South Africa in order to hasten the day when an end can be put to a policy which has been universally condemned.”⁵

129. What were those means? On that occasion, we explained our thinking in the following terms:

"Last year, in dealing with the item entitled 'Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity: Manifesto on Southern Africa' [agenda item 106], my delegation put forward a few ideas which were founded on the Charter and seemed to it to be most advisable in order to enable the Organization to act against the policy of *apartheid*. Since I deem them advisable and relevant, let me repeat them now. Paragraph 22 of the Manifesto on Southern Africa⁶ says:

"The South African Government cannot be allowed both to reject the very concept of mankind's unity and to benefit by the strength given through friendly international relations".

"This quotation and the Manifesto itself, in the same paragraph, lead us to a conclusion which my delegation believes unavoidable, namely, that, to quote the Manifesto:

"South Africa should be excluded from the United Nations Agencies, and even from the United Nations itself".

"My delegation persists in believing that the time has come to extend the ostracism applied to South Africa by other specialized organizations to the United Nations itself, and we believe that this should take place within this twenty-fifth anniversary session. It is a patent contradiction that we should continue to preach equality among all human beings, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, accept as a Member State with full power to exercise its rights the Republic of South Africa whose national policy is based upon constant and persistent violation of the principle of equality on which our Organization is founded. The delegation of Mexico believes that it is indispensable to implement the terms of the Manifesto on Southern Africa and to apply ostracism within the United Nations until the Government of South Africa accepts the principle which all except they accept, the equality of all men."

130. What would be this procedure? That was also explained at that time as follows:

"The Charter provides in Article 5 for the suspension of a Member State against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council. This suspension, without depriving such a State of any of its obligations, does deprive it of the exercise of the rights and privileges inherent in its membership of the United Nations."

131. The conditions provided for in that Article are fully met in the case of South Africa. Indeed,

"The Republic of South Africa has been the subject of coercive action by the Security Council, as can be seen in the Council's resolutions 181 (1963) and 282 (1970). South Africa has also been the subject of preventive action by the Security Council as is established in resolution 182 (1963), paragraphs 6 and 7. My delegation believes that there can be no obstacle to the Assembly using the world 'powers' which is established in Article 11, and requesting the Security Council to consider a recommendation which, based on Article 5 of the Charter, would suspend the Republic of South Africa from the exercise of the rights and privileges inherent in its membership of the Organization."

132. In the light of what I have just said—and what, I reiterate, we have been saying since 1970—and to repeat what we stated in 1969, my delegation welcomes with deep satisfaction draft resolution A/L.731, and would like to suggest the following amendments.

133. The only operative paragraph of the present draft resolution should become paragraph 1. After the word "review" the word "urgently" should be added. The beginning of the paragraph would then read: "Calls upon the Security Council to review urgently the relationship . . .". Then a paragraph 2 should be added, which would read as follows:

"Invites the Security Council, in carrying out the review, to consider the desirability of recommending to the General Assembly, in conformity with Article 5 of the Charter, the immediate suspension of South Africa from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership of the United Nations."

134. As I said at the beginning, my delegation is convinced that that would be the most effective way of fulfilling, in conformity with the Charter, the purpose which, I am certain, we all share.

135. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call upon the representative of Senegal on a proposal for the closure of the debate.

136. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the head of my delegation, who will speak three days from now, will express to you the feelings of my delegation and my country about the honour that the General Assembly has conferred upon you in electing you to the post of President of the twenty-ninth session. For the moment I shall limit myself to speaking on the point upon which I have asked for the floor.

137. This debate has lasted rather too long, and we should like to crave the indulgence of the delegations whose foreign ministers were to have spoken this morning. However, we consider it was necessary for such a debate to take place. We believe that at present everything that had to be said on this problem has been said, that there is nothing further to add, and that the General Assembly has formed its opinion. That is why we ask that, under the provisions of rule 75 of the rules of procedure, the debate be closed. We call for the immediate closure of the debate and for a vote to be taken before the adjournment of this meeting on the report of the Credentials Committee and on draft resolution A/L.731, which has been introduced on behalf of the African group.

138. In regard to the draft resolution I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to two points. We have heard an amendment presented by the representative of Saudi Arabia [*para. 96 above*]. I would urge Mr. Baroodi to withdraw that amendment, which does not meet with our acceptance. If he maintains his amendment, we shall, regretfully, have to vote against it; but I hope that we shall not have to go that far and that the representative of Saudi Arabia will spare us the unfortunate and regrettable obligation of having to oppose him.

139. Secondly, with regard to the suggestion of the representative of Mexico—for, if my understanding is correct, I believe he has introduced not a formal amendment but a suggestion—I must confess that

we have thought of that. The first draft resolution that the African group agreed on contained everything that he has mentioned. We asked the Security Council to meet on an emergency basis to consider the application of the provisions of Article 5 of the Charter; but after mature reflection we considered it was more appropriate, and more courteous vis-à-vis the members of the Security Council, not to bind their hands and to leave the Security Council, in its wisdom, free to take whatever decision it might deem appropriate concerning the presence of South Africa in the United Nations.

140. We have representatives of the African group in the Security Council. We have friends in the Security Council. We have faith in them. We even have faith in those who have not always displayed friendship towards us. We hope that the Security Council, in its wisdom, will take the fullest possible account of the decisions that will be taken by the General Assembly according to its vote to which, Mr. President, I request that you now ask the Assembly to proceed.

141. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly has before it a proposal for the closure of the debate pursuant to rule 75 of the rules of procedure. In accordance with that rule, two speakers may speak against the proposal of the representative of Senegal. I would remind speakers that the statements made must be within the strict context of the proposal for closure of the debate. I call now on the representative of South Africa.

142. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa): This is obviously an attempt to prevent the South African delegation from participating in this debate. We are strongly opposed to this motion. We consider it as a denial of a right to which we are entitled. If, however, this motion should be carried, we respectfully request that our name be placed on the speakers' list for an explanation of vote before the vote.

143. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): As there is no other delegation wishing to speak against the motion for closure of the debate made by the delegation of Senegal, that motion will be put to the vote immediately.

The motion for closure of the debate was adopted by 103 votes to 21, with 10 abstentions.

144. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before calling on the representative of South Africa, pursuant to rule 88, for an explanation of his vote, I call on the representative of Senegal on a point of order.

145. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): I wish to come back to the idea I developed a few minutes ago, namely that the debate has lasted a bit too long, and I am under the impression that the representative of South Africa intends to draw out the pleasure a little longer. That, however, is not our intention. It is our wish that when the meeting is resumed this afternoon, the Foreign Ministers who have inscribed their names for the general debate will be able to make their statements, and accordingly we wish to see the debate on the first report of the Credentials Committee concluded before this meeting ends. Therefore, on the basis of the provisions of rule 72 of the rules of procedure, I request the Pres-

ident to call upon the Assembly to limit the time devoted to an explanation of vote to one minute, and to see that that time-limit is respected.

146. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Senegal has called for the application of rule 72, which provides that two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against a proposal. I would point out particularly that the representative of Senegal has requested a time-limit of one minute. It is therefore desirable that we hear the opinions of speakers who may wish to speak for or against the proposal.

147. Mr. OGBU (Nigeria): It is now 1.45 p.m. according to my watch and some of us have various things to do. Therefore, may I express the view of my delegation in full support of the proposal by the representative of Senegal.

148. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): I merely wish to support the proposal of the representative of Senegal.

149. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Two speakers have now spoken in support of the proposal by the representative of Senegal. No representatives have indicated a wish to speak against the proposal. I therefore take it that there is a consensus in favour of the proposal of the representative of Senegal concerning limiting the time for an explanation of vote.

150. The proposal of Senegal is very explicit with regard to the duration of the statements for the explanations of vote that are to be given before the vote. It is on that specific point that I have consulted the Assembly. Two speakers have spoken in favour, namely, Nigeria and Tunisia. I have consulted the Assembly and no delegation . . .

151. I call upon the representative of the United Kingdom.

152. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): I desire to say only one or two things, and I shall, with the permission of the Assembly, be brief.

153. We have indeed sat here for a long time. We have indeed listened to some long speeches, and the representative of Nigeria, with respect to him, was not the shortest of all the orators that we have heard this morning.

154. As I understand the proposal that is being made by the representative of Senegal it is that all speakers in explanation of vote, whether they are to speak before the vote or after the vote, should be limited to a period of 60 seconds. I would only describe that proposal as a total denial of something that my country happens to believe in rather strongly, and that is the right of people, if they are to be condemned, to have their say, and therefore I strongly oppose the proposal which the representative of Senegal has put forward before this Assembly. It would seem, with full respect . . .

155. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Point of order.

156. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): May I try to answer the representative for he has had at least three goes this morning?

157. It does seem to me quite a simple proposal. It is this: many of us in this room today and various nations represented here today have views about the issues that are before the Assembly. There are at least two important amendments. I am speaking as a representative from one of the countries which may, in the Security Council, have to consider this issue to which we have obviously given a great deal of thought. Like the representatives of Nigeria, Cuba, Mexico and Bulgaria, I would find it difficult, on behalf of my country, to put forward what I hope would be a sensible and coherent point of view in a time-limit of 60 seconds, and therefore I oppose this proposal.

158. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Senegal on a point of order.

159. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): I rose to a point of order at the very moment when the preceding speaker was on the rostrum for I wanted to remind him that the discussion is now confined to my motion and not to the general debate. If the representative of the United Kingdom is not yet convinced of the feelings of the Assembly as regards *apartheid*, very well then, I think there is nothing further to be said. There is none so deaf as he who will not hear.

160. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of South Africa.

161. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa): I shall be very brief. What a travesty we have witnessed here today! What a ploy to deny a country its right to address this Assembly! I object strenuously to this shameful action. I fully support the views expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

162. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly has before it a proposal by Senegal in conformity with rule 72 of the rules of procedure. Two speakers—Tunisia and Nigeria—have spoken in support of the proposal. Two other speakers, also within the framework of rule 72—that is to say, the representatives of the United Kingdom and South Africa—have spoken against the proposal. I shall now consult the Assembly on that proposal.

163. I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

164. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): It is very obvious that this Assembly is becoming ultra-emotional, and it is not right that we should take a decision when we are in such a state. Anything which may set a precedent will be regretted.

165. In view of the fact that I yield to my good brother and colleague from Senegal by withdrawing my amendment to the draft resolution, although I thought it had its place there—incidentally, Sir, you will announce what I have done with that amendment; I am not talking about it—I do plead with him, in view of the fact that such a procedure might constitute a dangerous precedent, to be—just as I was when I yielded—generous and ask the President to call upon the representatives to be as concise in explanation of their votes as it is humanly possible to be and I am sure he is not going to refuse me my appeal to him. If he does, I will not be angry with him but I will know how to approach him next time.

166. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call upon the representative of Senegal on a point of order.

167. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Since the representative of Saudi Arabia has been so courteous to me, it is perfectly logical that I should be courteous to him. I shall therefore make a minor change in my earlier proposal. Although I do think that the representative of South Africa does not need more than a minute to confirm to the Assembly that he maintains his policy of *apartheid*, because that is all that he will have to say, I propose that we allow speakers five minutes to speak, with a clear understanding that if speakers could speak for a shorter time the Assembly would be most grateful to them.

168. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): It is my impression that the appeals and the polite gestures which have been exchanged here might spare us the necessity of taking a vote. Accordingly, I call on the representative of South Africa to make a brief explanation of vote before proceeding to vote on the report of the Credentials Committee.

169. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa): South Africa's views on the credentials issue are well-known and documented. They can be briefly summarized as follows. South Africa's credentials in due form, that is, signed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, were submitted on 16 September 1974 to the Secretary-General, who, according to his subsequent report to the Credentials Committee, found them to be in order. They were issued in the same form as they have been issued since this Organization came into existence, and almost as long by the same Government. On the foregoing basis, there can be no question that South Africa's credentials are in order and should be accepted as such.

170. The act of rejecting a country's credentials illegally and without factual justification damages the reputation of this Organization, establishes precedents which jeopardize the rights of all Members in the future—since every country is *sui generis* in some respects—and derogates from the principles of universality. It is also the antithesis of the concept of this Organization as one of peace, conciliation, co-operation and negotiation.

171. Turning now to draft resolution A/L.731, my delegation strongly opposes it. We do not believe that the course of action proposed in that draft represents the manner in which this Organization should seek to resolve disputes and differences of opinion. This draft resolution threatens to lead to confrontation and is therefore self-defeating and counter-productive. We are in an era of *détente*. We have seen the dramatic results to which a deliberate policy of discussion and communication in East-West relations can lead. Why is the same approach not applied to South Africa?

172. The step envisaged in the draft resolution is a move backwards, and we regret that African countries should be responsible for it. We are ourselves an African State. We wish to live in harmony and to co-operate with other African States. We complement one another. We have much to offer one another. We have much to gain politically, socially and economi-

cally from communicating with one another. We should replace sterile confrontation with productive co-operation. We, for our part, are ready to seek and to explore opportunities for coming to an understanding with Africa. We believe that policies of communication and co-operation are essential for Africa if that continent is to inherit the greatness which should be its destiny.

173. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We have just heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote on the draft resolution approving the first report of the Credentials Committee.

174. The General Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution submitted orally by the Chairman of that Committee. I understand that the Mexican amendment was merely a suggestion to the sponsors and was not presented formally. After the vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Chairman of the Credentials Committee, the General Assembly will vote on draft resolution A/L.731, which has now been issued in a revised version to bring the list of sponsors up to date [A/L.731/Rev.1]. The representative of Saudi Arabia has informed me that his amendment has now become a draft resolution.⁷ We shall, therefore, vote on the draft resolution A/L.731/Rev.1 before we vote on the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia.

175. A recorded vote has been requested on the draft resolution submitted orally by the Chairman of the Credentials Committee.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho,⁸ Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Dominican Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, Malawi, Mexico, New Zealand, Paraguay, Spain, Venezuela.

The draft resolution was adopted by 98 votes to 23, with 14 abstentions (resolution 3206 (XXIX)).

176. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

177. Mr. de GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): It is in my capacity as representative of the country which is at present President of the European Community that I would wish to explain the vote that has been cast by its nine member States.

178. The position that we have taken is based on legal considerations alone. We note that in the absence of any other provisions, the powers of the Committee responsible for the verification of the credentials of representatives of Member States are limited by the rules of procedure of the General Assembly to *de facto* verifications completely unrelated to the policies of the Governments concerned. In those circumstances, with the Committee having failed to accept the credentials of a delegation for reasons unconnected with the rules of procedure of the Assembly, we have no other choice but to vote against the draft resolution. We consider, indeed, that an organization which does not respect its own fundamental law becomes, by the same token, an organization that is vulnerable, and its members themselves run the risk of becoming the victims of that weakness.

179. The countries of the European Community understand and respect the feelings which, in the course of the past session and this year again during the work of the Credentials Committee, and during this meeting, have been expressed by numerous representatives, those of Africa in particular, and have led them to denounce the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. We understand them and we respect them, especially since the European Governments—on numerous occasions and in the clearest possible way, some of them most recently in this very Hall—have indicated strong disapproval of the policy which is called *apartheid*.

180. It is, I think, unnecessary for us to point out again how much a policy which, under the guise of separate development divides men on the basis of the colour of their skins, is at variance with our duty universally to respect "human rights" and "fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion", which the Charter imposes upon Member States.

181. Must we once again denounce 'not only the absurdity of such a system but also the tensions and injustices that it creates in South Africa? Need we, in particular, deplore here the refusal and the denial of civil rights to more than 17 million Africans? All of this is far removed from our conception of relations between human beings and from the democratic traditions of the nine countries of the European Community for it to be necessary to dwell on the matter.

182. We are convinced that no one in this Assembly will misunderstand the meaning of our vote.

183. Mr. SINGH (Nepal): We have voted in favour of the draft resolution keeping in mind the view expressed by Mr. Hambro,¹ President of the twenty-

fifth session of the General Assembly on the report of the Credentials Committee. We believe that the rejection of the credentials of South Africa is an expression of the vehement condemnation of the racist and oppressive policy of the Pretoria régime.

184. Mr. GONZÁLEZ ARIAS (Paraguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Rule 27 of the rules of procedure clearly lays down the manner in which credentials have to be presented. There is no need for me to dwell on that. Equally well known is the view expressed during the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly by the Legal Counsel of the Organization on the matter of credentials.⁹

185. In conformity with the afore-mentioned provision and the opinion of the Legal Counsel of the United Nations, it is by no means the responsibility of the Credentials Committee to consider whether or not the Government issuing the credentials is the legitimate representative of the people of a Member State. If that thesis were accepted, we would be violating the very clear provision referred to earlier.

186. On the basis of what has been provided, and faithful to its rule of respect for the provisions of law, the delegation of Paraguay abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. Had we voted in favour, we would have violated our traditional legal position, which is in conformity with the law; and had we voted against, we would have voted against our own credentials as well and against those of many whose credentials are in order.

187. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation, in keeping with its position on the report of the Credentials Committee, has voted against the draft resolution. Our vote is based on the same reasons as in previous years, namely that the Committee must strictly adhere to the powers granted to it by rule 27 of its rules of procedure. Our vote in no way implies solidarity with or tolerance, overt or covert, of racist policies, to which my country, by tradition and principle, has always stated its opposition.

188. Mr. RAE (Canada): I wish to explain the vote of the Canadian delegation on the substantive propositions which have been placed before the General Assembly this morning.

189. The Canadian delegation voted against the draft resolution approving the first report of the Credentials Committee. Our negative vote related exclusively to that part of the Committee's report which singles out for rejection the credentials of the delegation of South Africa. This vote in no way derogates from the abhorrence with which Canada regards the racist policies of the Government of South Africa. However, the issue before the Credentials Committee and before this Assembly when we took up the Committee's report was not whether the policies followed by the Government of South Africa were acceptable but whether the credentials of the South African delegation were in keeping with the terms of rule 27 of this Assembly's rules of procedure. Since we understand that the credentials are so in order, the Canadian delegation opposed the proposition that they be rejected.

190. The question of South Africa's participation in our work has been examined at length in the state-

ments of the representatives who have spoken on the second matter brought before us today—draft resolution A/L.731/Rev.1. We believe that the increasing universality of this Organization—a trend which Canada has strongly supported—is one of its greatest strengths. We do not accept that our attitude towards the racial policies of the South African Government should lead us to contemplate limiting or curtailing the right of that Government's delegation to participate in the work of the United Nations. It remains Canada's view that our best chance of achieving modification of the South African Government's policies in the direction of accordance with the goals of the Charter lies in participation, in discussion and in dialogue. Lines of communication must be kept open if ideas are to be exchanged, attitudes modified and policies revised. Only thus can the full force of international opinion be developed and brought to bear on problems of concern to all of us, wherever they may occur.

191. It is against this background and with these considerations in mind that the Canadian delegation will support draft resolution A/L.731/Rev.1. We are vigorously opposed, as that text declares, to the policy of *apartheid* practised by the Government of South Africa. We are deeply concerned that the Government of South Africa has not heeded the repeated injunctions of the General Assembly to modify that policy. But our vote for the draft resolution calling upon the Security Council to review this unhappy situation in no way detracts from the firmly held Canadian view that any step to isolate the South African Government from participation in, and direct exposure to, the opinions of this Assembly would only reduce our chances of success in modifying policies to which we are resolutely opposed. Our vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.731/Rev.1 in no way derogates from this position consistently adopted by Canada, since the draft resolution does not prejudice the outcome of the review which the Security Council is asked to undertake.

192. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran): As in today's debate substantive procedural as well as legal aspects of the policy of *apartheid* pursued by the South African Government were not clarified enough, my delegation has considered it necessary to explain its vote.

193. As the consistent pattern of voting of my delegation in this Assembly and its subsidiary bodies as well as in other international organizations within the United Nations system clearly demonstrates, we have always categorically condemned the shameful *apartheid* and colonial policies of the South African Government. And we have contributed regularly to the United Nations and OAU funds for the support of the victims of *apartheid* and colonialism in southern Africa.

194. We have voted in favour of the draft resolution approving the first report of the Credentials Committee in conformity with the policy followed by our delegation at previous sessions of the General Assembly. However, as we have made abundantly clear in previous years, we do not think that the Credentials Committee is the proper organ of the United Nations to discuss the substantive aspect of the representation of Member States; we think that Committee should deal solely with the question of credentials

as far as the administrative and procedural aspects of the question are concerned. Therefore, had the previous pattern of voting been followed, my delegation would have voted the same way as in previous years.

195. As far as draft resolution A/L.731/Rev.1 is concerned, we will abstain in the vote on it because we were not given the opportunity of dispatching the text to our Government in advance.

196. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): May I say at the outset that, as the representative of a member of the European Community, I should like to associate my delegation and my country with the remarks made by the representative of France. I should, however, like to explain why my delegation voted against the rejection of the credentials of the delegation of South Africa and why we will abstain on the draft resolution which refers the matter to the Security Council.

197. As has often been made very clear before, it is the view of the United Kingdom that the consideration of credentials is a technical and a legal matter. The sole issue, as we understand it, under the Charter and the rules of procedure is whether or not credentials are accepted as documents in order. There has been no suggestion in the present case that the credentials of the delegation of South Africa were not in order.

198. I do not need this afternoon to repeat at length my Government's views on the racial policies of the South African Government. The United Kingdom's attitude is quite clear. We condemn them clearly and unequivocally. We have made our views known and felt to the Government of South Africa. The Government of South Africa has ignored many resolutions of the General Assembly calling upon them to change their policies. They continue to ignore those resolutions at their peril. But that is not a matter which we are entitled to have regard to when we are dealing with the credentials of representatives. We are not entitled to reject those credentials unless a proper objection to them on technical grounds is made and is held to be well founded. No such objection has been made at all in this present case and therefore, in our view, there can clearly be no reason to reject them.

199. This is not, however, just a matter of procedure and technicality. It is a serious matter for the United Nations and for the functioning of the Organization. If it is intended to prevent the South African delegation from taking part in the proceedings of the Assembly or to suspend it or even to expel it, then a very precise procedure is laid down by the Charter. Those ends cannot be achieved through the rejection of credentials.

200. May I say in this respect that the United Kingdom is not opposed to the reference to the Security Council which is contained in the draft resolution [A/L.732] by Saudi Arabia. Indeed, the attitude of my country is set out in broad and in general terms in the draft resolution. We fully share his views that, pending the decision by the Security Council, the Government of South Africa should forthwith take drastic action to rectify the anomalous situation which exists in its country. But we do believe that we in the United

Nations must be governed by the Charter and that we must be governed by the rules of procedure which we have drawn up for ourselves.

201. Last week a representative came to this rostrum and said that he valued friendships in this Assembly a great deal, but that he valued the rules of procedure and the Charter more. We value them a great deal for, if we now choose to disregard them because emotions are aroused by policies which we find objectionable, we will cease to be the disciplined Organization that the international community has a right to expect us to be. This issue, as I say, is therefore a legal one and a constitutional one.

202. In the view of my delegation it is essential that we respect the right of any Member of this Organization to present its views and to take part in the proceedings of the Organization and it does not matter whether we agree or whether we disagree with those views. The United Nations depends on, indeed it exists for, the free exchange of views, some of which we will find ourselves passionately and deeply opposed to. Universality of membership is an important principle and it is one to which the United Kingdom attaches very great importance.

203. Mr. ROSALES (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): El Salvador voted in favour of the draft resolution approving the report of the Credentials Committee because the manner in which it was put to the vote made it necessary to cast an affirmative vote. The contrary would entail a legal *contresens* and would mean the non-recognition of the credentials of almost all of the representatives to this Assembly, our own included. Moreover, my Government has always been against the policy of *apartheid*.

204. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I am sad; I am very sad indeed! I feel like weeping! But not because this Assembly has once again, by an overwhelming majority, rejected the credentials of the representatives of the racist minority of Vorster, on the recommendation of the Credentials Committee, but, rather, because a great many of my African brothers are still in prison in South Africa and undergoing humiliation and torture and are being denied basic human rights while they are being oppressed in the most Fascist, inhuman and unchristian manner.

205. I am sad because they are not here behind the sign of "South Africa" in the seats that their oppressors are shamelessly occupying. I pray and hope that in the very near future my African brothers, true leaders and genuine representatives of their people—and not stooges and stool pigeons—will occupy their rightful seats, no doubt after changing the sign as well to that of "Azania".

206. I also hope and pray that by next session this Assembly will be somehow enriched by the participation of the true representatives of Angola, the Comoros, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, Zimbabwe and other areas of occupied Africa. I hope that sanity and justice will soon prevail in southern Africa; otherwise they will just have to be made to prevail by all right-thinking people of the world.

207. In the meantime, although not myself a Christian but only educated by Christian missionaries during my tender years, I pray for the Christian souls of the white racist minority of southern Africa and of their

allies who, blatantly, support their *apartheid* policy by deeds while expressing noble sentiments in words in this Assembly. Let us appeal to them not to disgrace and make a scandal of the name of Christ, who, I am told, was not a white man but a black man. May He enlighten them and may He forgive the white racists their despicable sins.

208. My delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted by an overwhelming majority as a matter of conscience and as the essential necessity of the life of a normal civilized human being, which seems to be non-existent in some quarters, especially among the white-minority, racist régime of Vorster.

209. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before voting on draft resolution A/L.731/Rev.1 I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

210. Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): The New Zealand delegation agrees that in maintaining the repellent policy of *apartheid* South Africa has committed a serious violation of the human rights provisions of the Charter.

211. For some years the Assembly has rejected the credentials of the South African delegation, and this has been construed by successive Presidents as a solemn warning to South Africa to abandon its discriminatory racial policies. That warning has not been heeded.

212. My delegation agrees that the time has come for some action by the Assembly beyond the rejection of the credentials of the South African delegation, about which we have had, in any case, certain legal reservations. The draft resolution appears to my delegation an appropriate step for the Assembly to take at this time. It is appropriate that the Security Council should examine the situation in the light of South Africa's continued violation of the Charter. The draft resolution does not seek to urge upon the Council any particular course of action. It is right that it should not do so but should leave the Council free to consider all aspects of the matter and all possibilities. The draft resolution therefore has New Zealand's full support.

213. The Security Council will no doubt examine the question with the greatest care. New Zealand, for its part, will follow with close attention the Council's deliberations on an issue of great concern to Africa and indeed to all Members of this Organization.

214. Mr. KARHILO (Finland): On behalf of the Nordic delegations—Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Finland—I should like briefly to state that we shall all vote in favour of the draft resolution. We shall do so because we welcome all efforts by the United Nations aimed at convincing the Government of the Republic of South Africa to abandon its policy of *apartheid*, a policy which the Nordic countries have consistently condemned and rejected. We see in this draft resolution yet another means by which the question of South Africa and its policies in all their aspects can be reviewed in a constructive manner.

215. I should, however, like to recall that the Nordic Governments have always firmly upheld the principle of universality of the membership of the United Nations and that we shall continue to do so.

216. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): The votes my delegation has cast and will cast at this meeting have been the subject of serious consideration and close attention to the debate. As far as our vote on the draft resolution approving the first report of the Credentials Committee is concerned, it reflected our views, held consistently, on the nature of this body and the scope of its work, which we conceive to be of a strictly legal character. In voting in favour of draft resolution A/L.731/Rev.1, Austria will join a large majority of Members of this Assembly which transcends the boundaries of groupings, regions and continents. Our vote on this draft resolution is based first and foremost on our continued and firm support of the policies of this Organization on the régime of *apartheid* established in South Africa.

217. This Assembly, the Security Council and many other organs of this Organization have repeatedly reminded the South African Government that its policies and actions were in blatant violation of the Charter and its obligations as a Member of the United Nations. The Austrian Government firmly rejects the policy of *apartheid*, as it rejects any policy based on human inequality, on grounds of race, religion, political beliefs or other similar motives. We deeply deplore that all efforts undertaken by the United Nations over the decades have been ignored by the Government of South Africa.

218. In adhering to these principles, and in voting in favour of the draft resolution proposed by such an impressive group of Members, we want to make it clear, however, that we do not wish in any way to prejudice with our votes the action and the steps the Security Council may take when considering the question. Acting in the Security Council and other organs of the Organization, Austria will continue to approach this question with the deep sense of responsibility which respect for the Charter and the desire for the attainment of the objectives of this Organization—one of which is the objective of universality—require from all Members.

219. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/L.731/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania,

Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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 Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: South Africa.

Abstaining: France, Iran, Israel, Malawi, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions (resolution 3207 (XXIX)).

220. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): A number of delegations have expressed the wish to explain their votes after the voting. I shall now give them the floor.

221. Mr. SCALI (United States of America): My delegation finds the policy of *apartheid* an illegal and obnoxious violation of fundamental human rights. It is as contrary to that for which my Government stands as it is to that for which the United Nations stands. We understand why many seek this opportunity to assert their moral outrage at this heinous policy. For our part, however, we do not believe that the question of credentials was an appropriate one for that purpose. The purpose of evaluating the authenticity of the credentials submitted to the Secretary-General is clearly to ensure that the individuals representing States in this body have been authorized to do so by the Government of the country they are here to represent. The policies of those Governments are not a legitimate consideration in that context. There are other times and other contexts in which they may be, but what is unquestionably true is that here they are not.

222. No one can reasonably argue with the facts that South Africa is a Member of the United Nations; that the Government which has sent representatives to this Assembly is indeed the Government in power in that country; that an appropriate official of that country signed the necessary credentials documents; and that they were submitted in a proper, timely way.

223. Since we do not regard this as the appropriate item for expressing the Assembly's views on the policy of *apartheid* or on the representative nature of the Government of South Africa—or other Members which do not elect governments by universal free elections—our vote against this report does not diminish our opposition to these unfortunate practices.

224. My delegation abstained on the draft resolution referring this matter to the Security Council. The preambular paragraphs contained statements of undeniable and tragic accuracy. As I said, the policy of *apartheid*, we believe, is illegal, immoral and fundamentally repugnant. It is the obligation of the United Nations to be concerned and to seek to take steps to eliminate such outrages. We are not convinced, however, that the Security Council is the appropriate forum for discussing such issues. For this reason we did not believe it appropriate to cast a positive vote. Since others wished to discuss this question in the Security Council, and we favour, wherever legally

possible, the right of all Members to state their views in the forum of their choice, we did not believe it appropriate for us to cast a negative vote. Since we were neither in a position to vote in favour nor of a mind to oppose, we abstained. Of course, our abstention is without prejudice to the position my Government will take in the Security Council when this matter is discussed there.

225. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands): I should like the record to confirm that the Netherlands delegation voted against the draft resolution approving the report of the Credentials Committee for the reasons clearly explained by the representative of France, who spoke on behalf of the European Community. In other words, while the Netherlands, as is well known, strongly rejects the policy of *apartheid*, we feel that credentials must be considered on their own legal and formal merits.

226. The Netherlands delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/L.731/Rev.1 because we agree that the proposed review by the Security Council is proper, timely and in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

227. Mr. von WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/L.731/Rev.1. We strongly condemn the policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination as well as the refusal of the South African Government to comply with the relevant decisions of the Organization. Only recently [2239th meeting] my Foreign Minister, Mr. Genscher, reaffirmed our attitude from this rostrum. We therefore sympathize with the request that the Security Council review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa, as it has done already on several occasions. However, I feel obliged to state that we continue to have some legal doubts regarding the first preambular paragraph. Since they have already been expressed by the representative of France when he spoke on behalf of the nine members of the European Community on the draft resolution approving the report of the Credentials Committee, I shall refrain from repeating them here in detail.

228. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before putting to the vote the draft resolution proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia [A/L.732], I call upon the representative of Senegal on a point of order.

229. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): It is late, and I believe we should now be beginning our afternoon meeting. The draft resolution distributed to us, sponsored by the representative of Saudi Arabia [A/L.732], has not been studied by the majority of members of this Assembly. Moreover, the draft resolution takes as its reference the resolution entitled "Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa", which has just been adopted. For that reason, basing myself on the provisions of rule 78 of the rules of procedure, I would request the President to postpone consideration of this question until more information is available.

230. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): It is late, and the representative of Senegal has raised a relevant point—that is, that members of the Assembly have not had time to study in depth draft resolution A/L.732

that I originally submitted as an amendment but, in consultation with representatives of some African States, decided to resubmit as a separate draft resolution.

231. I shall now say something that I believe will please everyone, in view of the very heavy agenda before us.

232. First, I would make it clear that I am not withdrawing my draft resolution. The purpose of submitting it was precisely to give a last warning to our colleagues from South Africa. We urge them to take drastic action—I would note that the word “measures” is not used—and to take such action forthwith, before the Security Council pronounces itself on this matter. I am not a betting man, but if I were, I would bet that there will be a veto in the Security Council. I hope I am wrong, but I wanted to submit this draft resolution so that South Africa would have advance warning. And I would ask the African States to remember that this is an advance warning. Do you really think that Baroody would do anything to exacerbate matters? I repeat that this is an advance warning to South Africa before the Security Council meets. That will make it clear to everyone concerned that we have done everything in our power, and if South Africa does not conform to the will of the majority—a will that has been evidenced by the 125 votes just cast in favour of draft resolution A/L.731/Rev.1—then we shall have to wash our hands of the matter.

233. I shall not go into the substance of the Credentials Committee's report. I have stated my position on this question four or five times in the past. I would only repeat that I am not withdrawing my draft resolution but, in view of the fact that it is late and that what we have said here is to be regarded as a last warning to South Africa, I am suspending the submission of that draft resolution to a date later in the session. I shall resubmit the text if I feel that a vote on it by the General Assembly would, as it were, make assurance doubly sure; that is, that it would ensure that South Africa had got the message.

234. The Prime Minister of Australia is to address the Assembly this afternoon, and we should show him all the courtesy that is due him, as well as to his Government and people. Hence, on the understanding that my draft resolution will be studied in depth by members of the Assembly, I declare it suspended for the time being, reserving my right to request that it be acted upon at any time I deem fit.

235. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I believe that the proposal of the representative of Senegal and that of the representative of Saudi Arabia, while not identical, are very similar. The Assembly therefore does not have to take a decision on the draft resolution A/L.732 immediately, and perhaps not in the very near future.

The meeting rose at 3.05 p.m.

NOTES

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1901st meeting, para. 286.

² Subsequently circulated as document A/9622.

³ *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970)*, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.

⁴ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Nineteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1964*, document S/5658, annex.

⁵ See A/SPC/PV.693, pp. 38-40 to 47. For a summary of this statement, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Special Political Committee, Summary Records of Meetings*, 693rd meeting, paras. 30 to 35.

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

⁷ Subsequently circulated as document A/L.732.

⁸ The delegation of Lesotho subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

⁹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 3, document A/8160.