

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 714th
MEETING**



Wednesday, 4 November 1970,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Abdul Samad GHAUS
(Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 34

The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) (A/8022 and Add.1, A/8109, A/8117, A/SPC/L.181, A/SPC/L.183/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.185, A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3, A/SPC/L.187-192)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with the wishes expressed by a number of representatives at the preceding meeting, the Assistant Secretary-General for Public Information was prepared to make a statement relating to draft resolution A/SPC/L.185.

2. Mr. HAMID (Assistant Secretary-General for Public Information) recalled that, during the past year, the Office of Public Information had held many consultations with the representatives of OAU on the possibility of broadcasting radio programmes to the South African people. That Organization had already stated that it was prepared to co-operate in such an effort. Since it already had a department concerned with *apartheid*, it was in the best position to undertake weekly broadcasts, once it had recruited the necessary staff.

3. However, the collaboration of OAU raised certain legal, political and technical problems. In consultation with the Office of Public Information, OAU had estimated that for the production and distribution of a weekly multilingual programme it would require financial assistance in the amount of \$50,000 annually. In the initial phase OAU could make arrangements with a national radio service in Africa, but it would be desirable for it eventually to have its own facilities at Addis Ababa, which would cost an estimated \$30,000.

4. Within the limits of its resources, the Office of Public Information would continue to provide advice to OAU and to supply programmes on *apartheid* and would cover such needs as documentation and recordings of United Nations debates to broadcasting stations which requested them. It would also continue to participate in conferences on *apartheid* and would organize a seminar on radio broadcasting at United Nations Headquarters.

5. The CHAIRMAN announced that Jamaica wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185, Czechoslovakia and Southern Yemen the sponsors of draft

resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3, Ethiopia and India the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.187, Ethiopia and Senegal the sponsors of resolution A/SPC/L.188 and Cyprus, Senegal and Southern Yemen wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.190.

6. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) introduced revised draft resolutions A/SPC/L.183/Rev.1 and A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.183/Rev.1 took account of the Belgian representative's suggestion to delete the paragraph regarding the specialized agencies, which also appeared in another draft resolution before the Committee. In order to take account of the amendments suggested at the preceding meeting regarding the proposed international conference of trade unions, draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3 contained an additional paragraph. He hoped that the Committee members would have no difficulty in accepting the two drafts as amended.

7. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) said that his delegation supported the objectives of the various draft resolutions, although some of them still raised problems which he hoped would be resolved at a later stage. His country had been in a position to join the sponsors of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.183/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3, A/SPC/L.187 and A/SPC/L.188.

8. As he had already stated at the preceding meeting, he was not satisfied with the wording of draft resolution A/SPC/L.190. If the aim was to study *apartheid* from the legal point of view, it would be preferable to refer the matter to the Sixth Committee or the International Law Commission, or else to request an advisory opinion from the International Commission of Jurists. Moreover, the first preambular paragraph should not refer exclusively to South Africa, for *apartheid* threatened to spread to other parts of the African continent. He therefore proposed that the expression "as practised in South Africa" should be replaced by "wherever it is practised or is constituting part of the legal system". In addition, in order to make clear the meaning and purpose of the draft resolution, it would be appropriate to refer to the International Covenants on Human Rights, which, like the United Nations Charter, pertained to international law, while the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was merely a solemn declaration.

9. Regarding the financial implications of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185, as stated in document A/SPC/L.192, he put forward certain reservations. The various information programmes could be covered by the regular budget of the Office of Public Information, thus reducing considerably the expenses referred to: for instance, in paragraph 7 of that document the external production of publications on *apartheid* accounted for an expenditure of \$30,000, which could be reduced if the publications were produced

internally. Furthermore, while certain African countries already had radio broadcasting facilities, it was unusual to provide for additional expenditures of such magnitude as those envisaged in paragraph 8.

10. Although Hungary had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3, he had reservations regarding the financial implications thereof circulated in document A/SPC/L.191 and particularly those referred to in its paragraphs 4 and 5. The representatives of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa could travel to and participate in consultations at their Governments' expense, and travel expenses for staff were covered by the regular budget of the United Nations. In addition, the number of substantive staff envisaged in paragraph 4 could be reduced from 3 to 1, thus enabling the United Nations to save money which could be better used to assist, for example, victims of *apartheid*. The considerations he had just raised would have great influence on his delegation's attitude towards the draft resolution.

11. Mr. CHALIKULIMA (Zambia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1, said that it had been decided, after lengthy consultations, that the words "the national movement of" in operative paragraph 1 should be deleted, since they already appeared in the first preambular paragraph.

12. Mr. AHMED (India) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.190 were preparing a revised version which he hoped would be acceptable to the representative of Hungary.

13. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico), also speaking on behalf of Colombia, noted that the Spanish translation of operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3 left much to be desired, and he requested that the words "*autoriza para ello*" be replaced by "*autoriza al efecto para*".

14. He pressed for the deletion of the phrase "to southern Africa" in operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185; otherwise, he would be compelled to request a separate vote on each paragraph.

15. He was concerned over the form of draft resolution A/SPC/L.190. Reference was made, in its third preambular paragraph, to "a crime against humanity". However, contrary to what was suggested in that paragraph, that was not a matter of opinion, but a point of law; one could speak of a crime only on the basis of a specific legal definition. For instance, the principles of international law recognized by the Nuremberg Tribunal had been affirmed by the General Assembly, in its resolution 95 (I). That same resolution also envisaged a general codification of offences against the peace and security of mankind, the drafting of which had subsequently been abandoned. Consequently, the concept of a crime against humanity as yet had no specific legal connotation.

16. As to the reference to the suggestion of President Kaunda of Zambia for the establishment of an international crimes tribunal, he recalled that the International Law

Commission, as a result of a study¹ carried out in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 260 B (III), had reached the conclusion that there were two possibilities: either to establish a criminal chamber of the International Court of Justice, which would entail amendment of the Statute of the Court, or to establish a tribunal that was independent of the Court and of the United Nations. In resolution 1187 (XII), however, the General Assembly had decided to defer consideration of the question of an international criminal jurisdiction. The question of setting up a committee to consider amendments to the Statute of the International Court of Justice was on the agenda of the Sixth Committee² and the suggestion for an international crimes tribunal might be referred to it.

17. In any case, the Special Committee was not the body most competent to determine definitively that *apartheid* was a crime against humanity and to lay down sanctions to be imposed on those who applied that policy.

18. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) acknowledged that the financial implications stated in documents A/SPC/L.191 and A/SPC/L.192 might appear high, but they were, however, only estimates, and the final budgetary provisions would probably be lower. He drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 3, of document A/SPC/L.192, referring to the periodical publication *Objective: Justice* which deserved wider distribution. Reprints could be made more cheaply elsewhere than in the United States, with the result that the publication might also be distributed more quickly in Africa and Europe. The costs of radio and television programmes referred to in paragraphs 5 and 6 might be met out of the regular budget. In fact, the problem of *apartheid* had, during the twenty-five years that the United Nations had been considering it, been included in the regular programmes of the Office of Public Information.

19. He wished to take the opportunity to congratulate the Unit on *Apartheid*, which worked in close collaboration with the Special Committee. Many articles had been supplied free or at little cost to the United Nations by well-known specialists as a contribution to the struggle against *apartheid*. Those articles were often reproduced in the press of many countries, thus reaching a very wide readership. The production costs might be considerably reduced if that work were carried out internally. With regard to translations, account was taken of the demand in different regions, and he emphasized that publications should be reproduced in the greatest number of languages and not only in the official languages of the Organization.

20. In that connexion, the collaboration of OAU could be particularly valuable, since that organization was able to ensure the translation of documents into a number of African dialects, and to distribute radio programmes to African countries.

21. The representative of Hungary had referred to an expenditure of \$30,000 for the installation of studios at OAU headquarters. That was where the programmes should be prepared and recorded. Broadcasting stations existed in Africa, but a country could not be requested to make its

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 12*, part IV.

² Agenda item 89.

radio service available to the United Nations. The Secretary-General should be authorized to undertake consultations with OAU so that broadcasts could be initiated as quickly as possible. He had been dismayed to note the small amount of information reaching Africa on the efforts of the United Nations and the international community to combat racism. In fact, if broadcasts were not begun till March 1971, the costs could be reduced.

22. Certain voluntary organizations might be able to publish material at a much lower cost than the United Nations, and to ensure a wider readership. That was the case with the British Anti-Apartheid Movement whose publications enjoyed a wide distribution both inside and outside the United Kingdom. The World Council of Churches had clearly recognized the importance of that movement by making a contribution to it, but other movements deserved aid. He hoped that Member States would not minimize the importance of the information campaign for the struggle against *apartheid*.

23. He thanked the representatives who had expressed their preliminary views on draft resolution A/SPC/L.190 and wished also to hear the opinions of as many delegations as possible on draft resolution A/SPC/L.188.

24. Turning to draft resolution A/SPC/L.183/Rev.1, he recalled that the Special Committee had been established under General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) with the mandate to keep the racial policies of the Government of South Africa under review and to report either to the Assembly or to the Security Council or to both. While a certain number of Member States had voted against the resolution for diplomatic or economic reasons, no delegation had been opposed in the General Assembly to the establishment of the Special Committee, or to its mandate. The Western countries had refused to serve on the Committee and had attempted to boycott it. Certain Member States felt that the Special Committee was not the appropriate body to deal with the problems of *apartheid*, they should make constructive proposals for more efficient machinery to replace it. Members of the Special Political Committee would note that the draft resolutions in question made no mention of General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII); hence, nothing would prevent them from supporting the work of the Special Committee.

25. Mr. PAL (Pakistan) said that he supported draft resolutions A/SPC/L.183/Rev.1 and A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1. Nevertheless, he requested the insertion in operative paragraph 1 of the latter of the words "and organizations" before the words "South Africa". He agreed to the deletion of operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3.

26. As to draft resolution A/SPC/L.190, while he did not oppose the establishment of an international crimes tribunal, he thought that that question did not fall within the competence of the Special Political Committee and should be referred to the Sixth Committee.

27. Mr. PETRI (Sweden) said that he, too, felt it difficult from the legal point of view to accept the wording of draft resolution A/SPC/L.190. However, if the wording did fall within the competence of the Special Political Committee,

his delegation proposed that the end of operative paragraph 1, after the words "for a study to be made", should be amended to read: "on the policy and practice of *apartheid* in terms of international criminal law".

28. Mr. AMONOO (Ghana), recalling that Ghana was a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.185, requested the representative of Mexico, who had proposed either the deletion of the reference to southern Africa in operative paragraph 5 of that draft or, failing that, a separate vote on the paragraph, to withdraw his proposal since it ran counter to the aims of the sponsors.

29. He hoped that the representative of Hungary, after having heard the statement by the representative of Somalia, would not cause the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/L.185 and A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3 to be deferred because of their financial implications, as stated in documents A/SPC/L.192 and A/SPC/L.191, respectively.

30. Mr. MBEKEANI (Malawi) complained that his views on *apartheid* had not been recorded in the report³ which the Special Political Committee had submitted to the General Assembly in 1969 at its twenty-fourth session. He therefore felt obliged to state his views on the present occasion.

31. The fact that his country abhorred and rejected *apartheid* did not lead it to practise the policy in reverse against its own minorities. The solution to *apartheid* was not to be found in the propagation of strongly-worded resolutions; the Committee must deal with the root cause of the illness. Conferences and international seminars merely disseminated information that was already known. He did not oppose the dissemination of information on *apartheid*, but pamphlets and news broadcasts reached only those already informed. To believe that those documents reached South Africa would be wishful thinking. The belief that the proposed radio programmes could reach listeners in South Africa could be held only by those who were not aware that reception in that country was confined to Government programmes.

32. Everyone seemed to agree that *apartheid* had its origins in the whites' fear of the blacks, the fear that they might be swamped by the blacks, who would take revenge on them if they gave up *apartheid*. It was time that the Special Committee and the General Assembly should allay the fears of the whites and convince them that Africa was the common heritage of all races and that none would be swamped by the others. His delegation would therefore welcome a resolution which had as its object to reassure the whites of South Africa and to make it clear that there was no intention whatsoever of driving them out or dispossessing them. The Special Committee must not be solely concerned with the study of the evils engendered by *apartheid* but must also study its causes and how it could be abolished. It must not listen solely to the opponents of *apartheid* but also conduct a dialogue with the South African authorities. The decisive factor in the question of *apartheid* was not the question of trade partners, but the South African Government. It was the South African

³ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 34, document A/7773.

Government that had to be approached, not by means of resolutions, but through direct diplomatic contacts. It must be persuaded to treat the indigenous South African population as equals and to recognize, for the welfare of the country, that that population should have the same political economic and social rights as the whites.

33. The Malawi delegation would inform the Chairman of the Special Committee of its views on the strategy which the Committee should adopt in order to get down to the root of the problem and to deal with it effectively during the following decade, for such a complex problem could be solved only over a long period of time. In the meantime the least sign of comprehension on the part of the Special Political Committee and the General Assembly would help to convince the whites of South Africa that their future was not necessarily tied to their policy of *apartheid*.

34. It was important that the opinions of all the delegations should be recorded in the Special Political Committee's report. Furthermore, if petitioners heard by the Special Committee expressed sharply critical views about certain delegations, those delegations should be given the opportunity to reply. Otherwise, those delegations should not be designated by name in the report.

35. Mr. CHALIKULIMA (Zambia) expressed the hope that the representative of Pakistan would withdraw the amendment he had proposed, so that a vote could be taken at the current meeting.

36. He felt bound to express his astonishment at the statement made by the representative of Malawi. What assurances could the United Nations give to the whites of South Africa who refused to accept the blacks as human beings? The statement of the representative of Malawi was an insult to the black population of South Africa. If independence was good for the whites, why should it not be good also for the blacks? He knew that the blacks of South Africa could not listen to radio broadcasts coming from abroad, but he thought such broadcasts could encourage the populations of neighbouring independent States to help the black population of South Africa. He regarded the attitude of some persons towards their own brothers and sisters as satanic. The policy of certain African countries was well known and he thought the Malawi representative would have done better to keep his opinions to himself. In any case his statement would not help the Special Political Committee in any way to carry out its task.

37. Mr. PAL (Pakistan) withdrew his amendment.

38. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) said he had listened with great interest to the statement of the representative of Somalia on the financial implications of certain draft resolutions before the Committee and had been happy to note that he thought a more detailed study should be carried out. He proposed that draft resolution A/SPC/L.185 should be put to the vote only after certain clarifications had been provided on the subject of financial implications.

39. Mr. DURAISWAMY (Ceylon) recalled, in connexion with the statement of the representative of Malawi, that he had himself spoken during the general debate of the alleged

fear of the whites and had pointed out that, even if that fear was understandable, the measures taken by the South African Government were neither justifiable nor acceptable. The Malawi representative had suggested that a solution to the problem should be sought through contacts with the South African Government. But the history of the problem showed that the South African Government had always refused to hold any discussions. It had rejected all attempts to hold conversations, negotiations or consultations, and if the Malawi representative succeeded in persuading the South African Government to have discussions with those who desired to solve the problem of *apartheid*, and that represented the majority of the States Members of the United Nations, he would be rendering an invaluable service.

40. The Malawi representative had also said that the white minority in South Africa should be reassured and persuaded that after democracy had been introduced in South Africa the whites would not be discriminated against or persecuted in any way. But such assurances had already been given in 1969 by OAU. In any case, if the Malawi representative wanted to approach the problem from a new point of view, he should put forward a draft resolution for examination by the Committee.

41. Mr. OGOLA (Uganda), exercising the right of reply, said that he was happy to note that Malawi was now taking part in the struggle against *apartheid*. There was nothing original in thinking that goodwill could influence the Government of South Africa. Others had believed that before the Malawi representative, but the facts had shown them that the only hope of success lay in the struggle for independence.

42. He hoped that the Committee would proceed to vote on the draft resolutions before it.

43. Mr. EDREMODA (Nigeria) said that his delegation had the same approach to all problems: it ascertained what the problem was and then tried to find a solution. The problem before the Committee was the evil and harmful policy of *apartheid*. It could be solved by eliminating *apartheid* completely and then by restoring to the black population of South Africa its rights to equality and justice. The stage had now been reached where ways were being sought of carrying out that solution.

44. The representative of Malawi thought that the South African whites were afraid of being swamped by the blacks. Is that fear justified? Neither the United Nations nor OAU had ever spoken of vengeance by the blacks, but only of the restoration of their rights. In Malawi, Kenya, Zambia and Nigeria, the whites were treated as equals and were not victimized or discriminated against in any way. No acts of vengeance had occurred in the former African colonies which had achieved independence, and there was no reason to think that the same would not be true of South Africa.

45. The history of South Africa held out no hope that the problem of *apartheid* could be solved by diplomatic means. *Apartheid* had its origins in a criminal philosophy which was as evil as that of nazism. The Pretoria clique was determined to keep the blacks in a state of degradation. There was no possibility of any dialogue. Thus recourse

must be had to armed struggle, so that the entire population of South Africa could accede to liberty and exercise its inalienable rights without distinction of colour or creed.

46. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) wished to comment on some of the arguments put forward by the Malawi representative. How could there be any possibility of a dialogue when during the past 25 years many unsuccessful attempts had been made to induce South Africa to negotiate and when for the past 8 years South Africa had not even sat in the Committee? Only one vote was needed to put an end to *apartheid* and that was the vote of South Africa. But first the white minority must agree that it and the black population were equal. In the meantime the struggle would go on.

47. He could not agree with the statement of the representative of Malawi that the broadcasts to southern Africa were useless. He was surprised to learn that Pretoria was jamming those broadcasts. Since according to that representative the United Nations publications on *apartheid* were not available in South Africa, that was all the more reason for allocating extra funds for radio programmes.

48. He wished to emphasize that no one intended to make South Africa a black racist State, not even those that were most concerned, who by a manifesto in 1948 had shown their desire for equality between the races.

49. He called on the representative of Malawi to present his point of view to the Committee, which might not approve it, but would undoubtedly give its close attention to it.

50. Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3 for taking into account the point of view of several delegations, including his own.

51. He then commented on documents A/SPC/L.191 and A/SPC/L.192, which gave the administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3 and A/SPC/L.185, respectively. With regard to the former, he thought that the cost of the mission, estimated in paragraph 4 at \$14,100, might be substantially reduced if the mission comprised one or at the most two people. The document also assumed that the mission would last three weeks; he wondered if it was really necessary for it to go on so long. He therefore requested the Secretariat to make a new estimate with a view to reducing expenditure.

52. His delegation shared the reservations expressed by the representatives of Somalia and Hungary concerning the financial implications given in document A/SPC/L.192. The estimates of costs given in paragraphs 4 and 5 did not seem to be justified. He also thought that the Office of Public Information should be able to increase the circulation of some publications without having to ask for new appropriations. It would appear, from paragraph 7, that the sponsors themselves thought it possible that some or all of the proposed work might be carried out utilizing internal resources at lower costs or with no requirement for additional appropriations. In any case, that expenditure should be met out of the regular budget.

53. His delegation was in favour of organizing broadcasts to southern Africa; it had understood, however, that the United Nations would only have to provide the texts and that OAU would translate them and transmit them through the radio services of African countries. There was now talk of providing OAU with new production facilities, which would call for heavy expenditure on a studio and related equipment and staff. There must be some misunderstanding concerning that question.

54. He supported the Hungarian proposal that the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.185 should be postponed, but he hoped that the other draft resolutions before the Committee would be voted on at the current meeting.

55. With reference to the statement by the representative of Malawi, he was surprised that the former could speak of dialogue and appeasement or could appeal for a spirit of conciliation and tolerance. *Apartheid* was not a new phenomenon: as the Nigerian representative had rightly said, it was a manifestation of the criminal philosophy of racial exclusivity. Everyone knew what the results of bilateral or multilateral negotiations with the Nazi racists had been. They too had intended to create "Bantustans" in Siberia, destined for Russians and other so-called "inferior" peoples. Now, as then, only a fight to the death on a united front could put an end to that shameful policy. His delegation was therefore unable to agree to such an approach, which was condemned by history. The Somali representative had been right to wonder where were the representatives of South Africa with whom the Committee might hold a dialogue.

56. Mr. MBEKEANI (Malawi), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, that he had never meant to imply that the Somali representative had at any time acted in his personal capacity and not as Chairman of the Special Committee.

57. The United Nations was a place where all Members could express their point of view freely and he therefore did not see why, as the Zambian representative had suggested, he should keep silent merely because he was not in tune with the others. As a Christian and representative of a Christian country, he was deeply sensitive to the fact that the representative of Zambia had referred to him as "satanic". Perhaps the Zambian representative—as English was not his mother-tongue—had inadvertently used the wrong word.

58. The representative of Uganda had said that it was the first time that the Malawi delegation had joined those who were fighting *apartheid*. He referred the Ugandan representative to the Malawi delegation's statements at Previous sessions which could be found in the summary records or in the Committee's report. But Malawi was fighting *apartheid* in its own way.

59. He wished to point out to the representative of the Soviet Union that he had not spoken of nazism though he was by no means ignorant of its horrors.

60. He thanked the representatives of Ceylon and Nigeria for their comments on his statement. He was quite ready to put his views in writing and submit them to the Committee,

but he was afraid that he would be unable to convince it at the current session or even in the near future.

61. Mr. S. TRAORÉ (Mali), speaking on a point of order, said that it was too late to reopen the general debate and requested that the Committee should resume its work and prepare to vote on the draft resolutions before it.

62. The CHAIRMAN shared the Malian representative's point of view and invited the Committee to resume its discussion of the draft resolutions.

63. Mr. ROMANYUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he had made his position clear during the general debate. He thanked the sponsors of the draft resolutions for the spirit of co-operation that they had shown.

64. His delegation had some reservations about the financial implications given in documents A/SPC/L.191 and A/SPC/L.192. Paragraph 4 of the former based its estimate of the cost of the mission called for in operative paragraph 2(b) of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3 on the assumption that the mission would comprise 3 members of the Special Committee, accompanied by 3 substantive staff. His delegation had understood that there would be only one or two members of the Special Committee. It was essential to reduce the expenditure under that heading. The same was true of the appropriation requested for the dissemination of information on *apartheid*, as stated in document A/SPC/L.192.

65. He supported the proposals made by the representatives of Somalia and Hungary that the expenditure incurred for the publication and dissemination of information and for the broadcasts to southern Africa should be covered by the regular budget of the Office of Public Information.

66. While it stressed the need to mobilize all available means in the fight against *apartheid*, his delegation pointed out that if the funds available were used more rationally and more economically, the expenditure could be reduced and direct aid to the people concerned correspondingly increased.

67. Mr. CHALIKULIMA (Zambia), replying to the representative of Mali, said that he in no way denied the latter's right to hold an opinion which was not that of the majority. He had used the term "satanic" deliberately and could support that opinion by specific facts; he also considered that the discrimination which the whites in South Africa made between the indigenous blacks, refusing to recognize their most fundamental rights, and the blacks coming from other countries was satanic. Zambia was the independent African country with the most white inhabitants, including South Africans. He reiterated his assurance that his country was not hostile to South Africa but only to its policy. In conclusion he regretted that the representative of Malawi had misinterpreted his words.

68. Mr. TEYMOUR (United Arab Republic) expressed the hope that the Secretariat would take account of the observations made by the representative of Somalia in his detailed commentary on the administrative and financial

implications given in documents A/SPC/L.191 and A/SPC/L.192.

69. Mr. OMRAN (Syria) pointing out that his country was a sponsor of most of the draft resolutions before the Committee, said that he welcomed the numerous amendments which had been submitted. With regard to the amendment to draft resolution A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1, accepted orally by the representative of Zambia, his delegation had accepted the deletion of the words "the national movement of" in operative paragraph 1, since the national movement was mentioned in the first preambular paragraph.

70. With regard to operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3, he pointed out that it was essential that the principle of universality should be respected at the international conference of trade unions and that, in particular, trade unions from the People's Republic of China, the German Democratic Republic, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should be allowed to participate.

71. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it the following seven draft resolutions: A/SPC/L.183/Rev.1, the administrative and financial implications of which were set out in document A/SPC/L.189; A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1, as amended by the sponsors, which had no financial implications; A/SPC/L.185, the administrative and financial implications of which were set out in document A/SPC/L.192; A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3, a report on the administrative and financial implications of which appeared in document A/SPC/L.191—the last paragraph of which, however, had been rendered inoperative by changes in the text made by the sponsors of the draft resolution; A/SPC/L.187, which had no financial implications; A/SPC/L.188, a statement on the financial implications of which was in preparation; and A/SPC/L.190, a statement on the financial implications of which was also being prepared.

72. The representative of Hungary, supported by the representative of the Soviet Union, had asked for the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.185 to be deferred pending further explanation. The sponsors of the draft had raised no objection to that request.

73. Delegations could offer explanations of vote either before or after the vote; he asked them, however, to make only one statement for the voting as a whole.

74. Mr. BEAULNE (Canada) said he wished to reaffirm the abhorrence felt by the Canadian Government and people for *apartheid*; the Canadian delegation would vote for draft resolutions A/SPC/L.183/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3 and A/SPC/L.187 on the understanding that it did not regard draft resolution A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1 as involving assistance to armed struggle.

75. The Canadian delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.185, because while it was in favour of the other measures mentioned in the draft relating to the dissemination of information, it had some reservations with regard to the provisions of operative paragraph 5.

76. The Canadian Government had reviewed its policy with regard to the embargo on arms exports to South Africa. While previously shipments of spare parts and exports of piston engines for aircraft had been permitted, the Government had now prohibited the supply of all vehicles and equipment for the use of the armed forces and paramilitary organizations of the Republic of South Africa, and the supply of any spare parts for such vehicles and equipment. Certain other types of engines and spare parts would also be prohibited if they were intended for military or paramilitary use in South Africa. Thus, Canada would now be in a position to vote in favour of General Assembly resolution 2624 (XXV) relating to Security Council resolution 282 (1970), although it had been unable to do so on 13 October 1970, when the Assembly had adopted that resolution.

77. Mrs. NAVCHAA (Mongolia) said that despite the efforts of the United Nations, the South African Government was continuing to apply and intensify its policy of *apartheid*, and was even attempting to extend it to other parts of southern Africa, while the Western countries were defying the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council by continuing to assist and encourage South Africa. What was most urgently important, therefore, was that the Western Powers should put an end to their economic and military assistance to the Pretoria régime.

78. The Mongolian delegation would support draft resolution A/SPC/L.183/Rev.1 in the hope that by expanding its membership the Special Committee would be assisted in carrying out its task. It would also vote for draft resolutions A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3, and A/SPC/L.187, in the hope that moral and material aid would alleviate the sufferings of the victims of *apartheid*. It would comment later on draft resolutions A/SPC/L.188, A/SPC/L.189 and A/SPC/L.190.

79. Mr. YIN (China) said that the Chinese delegation had taken no part in the general debate, not because it looked upon the matter with indifference but because it had felt that there was nothing to add to what had already been said. The Chinese Government's attitude to *apartheid*, in any event, was well known enough to need no further explanation. His Government was disturbed at the South African Government's present indifference to the universal condemnation of *apartheid*, but it still hoped that South Africa would heed the appeals addressed to it by the United Nations.

80. The Chinese delegation would support draft resolution A/SPC/L.185, providing for intensified efforts to disseminate information on the evils of *apartheid* in order to bring about its abolition by non-violent means. It would also support draft resolutions A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1 and A/SPC/L.187.

81. As to draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3, the Chinese delegation supported the idea of a trade union conference, for the trade unions could give substantial backing to the United Nations efforts. However, it felt that the sponsors had been too eager, in the existing text of the draft resolution, to heed the views expressed by a number of delegations which wished to ensure that the conference should be held outside the framework of the United Nations. Accordingly, the Chinese delegation wished to express some reservations in that regard.

82. Mr. FARAH (Somalia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.182, welcomed Canada's action in deciding to stop deliveries of equipment and spare parts to South Africa. He hoped other countries would follow suit.

83. The CHAIRMAN said that he would put to the vote draft resolutions A/SPC/L.183/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3 and A/SPC/L.187. Explanations of vote would be given at the following meeting.

At the request of the representative of Somalia, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/SPC/L.183/Rev.1.

Lebanon, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of the), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait.

Against: Portugal.

Abstaining: Malawi, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, France.

The draft resolution was adopted by 97 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

84. Mr. HERNDL (Secretary of the Committee) read out draft resolution A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1, as orally amended.

Draft resolution A/SPC/L.184/Rev.1, as amended, was adopted by 103 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution A/SPC/L.186/Rev.3 was adopted by 94 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/SPC/L.187 was adopted by 97 votes to 1.

85. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections he would take it that the Committee would be ready to hear explanations of vote at the following meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.