



Chairman: Mr. Cornelius C. CREMIN (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEMS 37 AND 12

The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*continued*) (A/8403, A/8422 and Corr.1, A/8467, A/8468, A/SPC/145, A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.207, A/SPC/L.208, A/SPC/L.209, A/SPC/L.210):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8422 and Corr.1);
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/8467, A/8468);
- (c) Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter XVII (section C)) (A/8403)

1. Mr. BERNSTROM (Sweden), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1, explained that, with the exception of operative paragraph 4, the revised draft was identical with that of the original text (A/SPC/L.206): the words "under a special budgetary provision to be made for this purpose" had been deleted because some delegations had objected to allocating funds from the regular United Nations budget to pay for activities of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. The sponsors had felt that the draft would be more likely to receive the unanimous support it deserved if the clause in question were removed. The costs of the missions in question would be very modest, and no extra funds would be required.

2. He took the opportunity to appeal for increased contributions to the Trust Fund from all donors and to express the hope that more countries would take part in the Trust Fund.

3. Mr. DE SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil) announced that his Government would pledge \$5,000 to the Trust Fund for 1972.

4. The CHAIRMAN suggested that draft resolution A/SPC/L.206/Rev.1 should be put to the vote, since the financial implications had been explained.

5. Mr. COTTON (New Zealand) thanked the representative of Sweden for his clarification of the financial implications of the draft resolution. Since that was a point on which he had to report to his Government, he asked that the draft resolution should not be put to the vote immediately.

6. Mr. TANKOUA (Cameroon) suggested that the words "*en vertu de*" in the third preambular paragraph of the French text of the draft resolution should be replaced by the words "*du fait de*", since it was incongruous to speak of "*vertu*" in connexion with the repressive and discrimi-

natory laws of South Africa. His country would like to be included among the sponsors of the draft resolution, provided that his amendment was adopted.

7. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) and Mr. ORTIZ (Ecuador) suggested appropriate drafting changes in the French and Spanish texts, respectively.

8. The CHAIRMAN noted that the English text needed no revision and said the necessary changes in the French and Spanish texts would be made by the Secretariat.

9. Mr. DE SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil), Mr. MURCAS (Colombia), Mr. KANE (Mauritania) Mr. MOUSSA (Tunisia), Miss DINCER (Turkey), and Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) wished their countries to be included among the sponsors of the draft resolution.

10. The CHAIRMAN announced that Guinea, Indonesia and Iran also wished to be included among the sponsors of the draft resolution.

11. Mr. OGBU (Nigeria) said that before introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.208, he wished to draw the Committee's attention to a press release of the Office of Public Information issued the preceding evening by a spokesman for the Secretary-General, according to which the latter shared the grave concern expressed by the General Assembly in resolution 2764 (XXVI) over the continued prosecution and harassment of opponents of *apartheid* in South Africa and over the reports of maltreatment of detainees which had led to the deaths of several persons. His delegation was deeply moved that the Secretary-General, at a time when he was in hospital, should show concern for the situation of detainees in South Africa. He asked the Chairman to convey the thanks of his delegation to the Secretary-General.

12. Concerning draft resolution A/SPC/L.208 on the arms embargo, he said that the system of *apartheid* in South Africa had been condemned by the whole of mankind as a crime against humanity. The United Nations had always advocated a peaceful solution of the problem, but the racist régime had succeeded in carrying out its policies of *apartheid* through the use of naked force and the criminal exploitation of the African majority made possible by the military build-up in South Africa. Any increase in South Africa's military capacity was reflected in the increased oppression of Africans under the policies of *apartheid*. The sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.208 had therefore considered it appropriate to call once more for the scrupulous observance of the arms embargo by all States. Member States should have no difficulty supporting the draft since it appeared that they were all sincerely opposed

to the policies of *apartheid* and genuinely desired a change in those policies.

13. The sponsors of the draft under consideration had found it necessary to reaffirm General Assembly resolution 2624 (XXV) calling on all Member States to take immediate steps to implement fully the provisions of Security Council resolution 282 (1970) because some Member States, including at least two permanent members of the Security Council, had failed to honour their obligations under the Charter. One effect of the violation of the arms embargo by the United Kingdom, France and a few other States was that arms intended for South Africa were actually reaching the Portuguese colonialists in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). Furthermore, by supplying arms to South Africa, the United Kingdom was indirectly arming the rebellious clique of Ian Smith in Rhodesia. British and French arms, among others, had been used by South Africa to attack Zambia as recently as October 1971 and enabled the South African Government to threaten other independent African States. He hoped the United Kingdom and France would consider the effect the sale of arms to South Africa would have on their relations with friendly African States. They might also wish to consider their standing in international affairs in the light of their activities and relations with the racist South African Government.

14. He drew particular attention to operative paragraph 2 of the draft, which specified that the arms embargo made no distinction between arms for external defence and arms for internal repression. Furthermore, as the Special Committee's report had pointed out (see A/8422 and Corr.1, para. 265 *d*), there could be no justification for continuing military co-operation with South Africa on the basis of alleged commitments under agreements or understandings reached before the imposition of the arms embargo. Any such agreements were contrary to the spirit of the Charter and relevant United Nations resolutions and were therefore legally inoperative.

15. He took the opportunity to pay tribute to the overwhelming majority of States that had scrupulously observed the arms embargo, and commended the Canadian Government, in particular, on its progressive decision, taken since the end of the twenty-fifth session, to adhere to the provisions of the arms embargo.

16. He hoped that the Committee would unanimously endorse draft resolution A/SPC/L.208 in recognition of those human beings who were being tortured in South African prisons and the thousands of helpless children in the Bantustans who died each day of hunger, thirst and deprivation.

17. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution just introduced by the representative of Nigeria. The enforcement of the arms embargo was crucial to the success of any attempt to solve the problems of *apartheid*. The embargo constituted the one step taken by the Security Council to exert its influence over the situation, and it was a sad commentary on the attitude of some Member States that it should be blatantly flouted on totally unacceptable grounds. The relevant Security Council resolutions made no distinction between various types of

arms but called for a blanket embargo. States which attempted to evade their responsibilities by relying on their own interpretations of those resolutions were really rejecting everything the Security Council was striving to achieve. For that reason, operative paragraph 2 of the draft under consideration was of special significance.

18. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) said that although his delegation supported the draft resolution under discussion, it would have preferred a more strongly worded text which made it clear that the arms embargo included all forms of military co-operation with South Africa. He hoped that all Member States would come to understand that a double-faced policy was of no use. Either a Government condemned *apartheid* and refused to lend any support to the South African régime or it looked after its own interests, ignoring the predicament of the African people and contributing nothing to the cause of peace.

19. Mr. GANDA (Sierra Leone), referring to operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.208, said that it was not very difficult for national and international organizations merely to denounce all military collaboration with South Africa. To do that no "maximum effort" was needed. He therefore suggested that the phrase containing those words should be amended to read "exert maximum efforts to prevent all military collaboration".

20. Mr. TANKOUA (Cameroon) suggested that the particular phrase in operative paragraph 5 should read "exert maximum efforts to denounce and prevent all military collaboration".

21. Mr. GANDA (Sierra Leone) thanked the representative of Cameroon for his suggestion with which he agreed, since it might well be impossible for national and international organizations to "prevent" collaboration.

22. The CHAIRMAN suggested that it should be left to the sponsors of the draft resolution to decide how the text of operative paragraph 5 should read.

23. Mr. SINUMVAYAVUGWA (Burundi), Mr. MURGAS (Colombia), Mr. J. VARGA (Hungary), Mr. TREKI (Libyan Arab Republic), and Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) said that their delegations would like their countries to be included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.208.

24. The CHAIRMAN announced that Egypt, Gambia and Mongolia wished to be included among the sponsors of the draft resolution.

25. Mr. SINUMVAYAVUGWA (Burundi), Mr. MURGAS (Colombia) and Mr. SEKONE (Upper Volta) wished their countries to be included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.209.

26. The CHAIRMAN announced that also Gambia wished to be included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.209.

27. Mr. AHMAD (India) said that the Afro-Asian group of countries and the Special Committee on *Apartheid* were still discussing the draft resolutions and asked if it would be possible to extend the dead-line for submission of draft

resolutions by a further 24 hours. Agreement had been reached by the co-sponsors on draft resolution A/SPC/L.209 and he would introduce it on the following day.

28. The CHAIRMAN emphasized that the texts of draft resolutions should be handed in as early as possible. If he heard no objection he would assume that the Committee agreed to the suggestion made by the representative of India for a 24-hour extension of the dead-line.

It was so decided.

29. Mr. TANKOUA (Cameroon), Mr. JAISEY (Ghana), Mr. KUSUMASMORO (Indonesia) and Mr. TREKI (Libyan Arab Republic) said that their countries would like to be included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.210.

30. The CHAIRMAN announced that also Gambia, Guinea, Nepal, Sudan and Uganda had expressed the wish

to be included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.210.

Organization of the Committee's work

31. The CHAIRMAN, following a procedural discussion, suggested that the Committee should take up the remaining items on its agenda in the following order: first, items 38 and 12, next, item 40, and finally item 39.

32. Mr. MAHJOUBI (Morocco) said that he wished to reserve his delegation's position on the question of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, under agenda item 38. For the past three years the problem had been discussed from three angles: financial and humanitarian, substantive, and the renewal of the mandate. He asked that the debate should continue until the substantive angle of the problem had been thoroughly discussed.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.