

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 481st
MEETING**

Tuesday, 7 December 1965,
at 3.25 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 36:</i>	
<i>The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued):</i>	
<i>(a) Reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa;</i>	
<i>(b) Reports of the Secretary-General.</i>	1

Chairman: Mr. Carlet R. AUGUSTE (Haiti).

AGENDA ITEM 36

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (continued) (A/SPC/107 and Corr.1, A/SPC/L.118/Rev.1, L.119 and Add.1, L.120):

- (a) Reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (A/5692, A/5707, A/5825 and Add.1, A/5932, A/5957);
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/5850 and Add.1, A/6025 and Add.1)

1. Mr. BOYE (Chile) said that apartheid was a problem which concerned not only a continent—Africa—whose personality had developed in recent years following emergence from colonial rule, but also the entire international community, for apartheid was an attack on universal values which forced the very foundation of the United Nations. The insane experiment of nazism was still fresh in all minds; the problem under consideration was similar, although not of such magnitude. The events in Southern Rhodesia showed clearly that the danger could not be over-emphasized. The policies of apartheid had led only to suffering, persecution, the wholesale alienation of an entire people and the degeneration of social relations. It had been alleged that the problem was the domestic concern of a State. His delegation protested against that assertion. The principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of a State should not be used to conceal the most terrible atrocities or to permit the degradation of the human person.

2. Men of all faiths, races and conditions were agreed on the need to put an end to that policy and Chile joined them in condemning it in the strongest terms. His country had inherited a democratic tradition which it sought constantly to develop. The Chilean Constitution gave full recognition to the essential political rights and the Chilean people had chosen a path which would enable it to achieve a true social revolution

without destroying the freedom it had won. Chile was, moreover, a young country which fervently wished to build a better world for the poorest people, those who until recently had been the victims of a social system that was now obsolete. The younger generation regarded apartheid as a vestige of a regressive and senile ideology. As a Latin American country, Chile formed part of a multiracial continent whose spiritual and political outlook was pluralistic. The problems which it faced were numerous and sometimes difficult, but it had faith in the possibilities offered by Latin American integration. Nations could no longer survive in isolation in a world which was steadily becoming more united. In view of the irresistible movement towards integration and the formation of ever-larger communities, there was surely reason to be concerned at a policy which attacked the essential values of the Africa that had arisen in the second half of the twentieth century. What should be done to deal with that situation? How could all the South Africans, both white and non-white, be freed from tyranny and oppression?

3. Those questions were becoming more urgent and more dramatic from year to year and they showed that the problem was more complex than many realized. For example, the principle of total sanctions had been endorsed by the General Assembly in several resolutions, but its only result had been to strengthen the South African racist minority in its policies.

4. It was undeniable that the application of total sanctions would require an unprecedented international effort. Such a mobilization of the international community seemed difficult to achieve, but that was no reason why any State should reject the possibility of such action, even if the latter would be prejudicial to its legitimate interests. Such a gesture on the part of the international community would provide the world with proof that the United Nations was useful and that it was striving, slowly perhaps, but sincerely, to build a better and more worthy world. It would show the emergence in the Organization of a new spirit and new prospects.

5. Within the framework of practical measures to combat the policies of apartheid or their effects, his delegation had sponsored a draft resolution calling for the establishment of a United Nations trust fund for providing assistance to persons persecuted by the South African Government for their opposition to the policies of apartheid. The purpose of the draft was not merely to comply with a humanitarian principle, but to indicate that the United Nations would never abandon its struggle against racial discrimination.

6. His delegation wished to thank the Secretary-General for his efforts to establish an educational

and training programme for the purpose of arranging for education and training abroad for South Africans, in accordance with Security Council resolution 191 (1964).

7. In conclusion, he addressed an appeal to the leaders of the Republic of South Africa. He believed that a last effort should be made to make them understand that, if no peaceful solution was found, the way would be opened to chaos and violence which would benefit no one. He also addressed an appeal to the other Member States and particularly to those which had not been able to resist the temptation to take over the role of supplier to South Africa from States which had applied economic sanctions against that country. Some Member States were experiencing serious, and in some case immediately insurmountable difficulties in ending their trade with South Africa. Nevertheless, they must appreciate the gravity of their position which might well cause the failure of all the efforts of the United Nations and possibly endanger the very existence of the Organization.

8. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) thanked the Special Committee on The Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa for the constructive report it had prepared and for the vigilance it had shown. The situation was disturbing in view of the failure of the Pretoria régime to respond to the appeals and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Kuwait endorsed the Committee's conclusions and recommendations and had decided to implement fully the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly which sought to put an end to apartheid. In particular, it had severed all economic and trade relations with South Africa and would not resume them as long as South Africa maintained its policies of apartheid.

9. Having a humanitarian tradition, his country had always protested against any form of discrimination based on race, colour or religion and it condemned any policy aiming to establish a society based on rule by a so-called chosen race a society of masters and of slaves. The reports of the Special Committee and the discussion in the Special Political Committee had revealed the odious nature of the policies of apartheid and had emphasized the responsibilities devolving upon every Member State. The situation was as follows: on the one hand, a racist Government was obstinately maintaining an attitude of defiance of the United Nations; on the other hand, one group of Powers persisted, notwithstanding the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, in lending assistance to South Africa which enabled that country to strengthen its policies of apartheid. In spite of that conspiracy, a people determined to uphold its dignity was continuing the struggle with the support of those who believed in justice and human dignity. In that dilemma, the United Nations, which represented the conscience of mankind and had been seized of the problem for almost twenty years, was in duty bound to take action. It had renewed its appeals and resolutions calling on South Africa to renounce apartheid and calling on Member States to use persuasion and to apply economic sanctions and an embargo on arms shipments to South Africa; but to no avail. The results had been negative;

worse still, the prestige and authority of the United Nations had been seriously compromised. It was necessary to seek the reasons for that failure and to determine responsibility. It seemed that the application of sanctions involved the interests of certain great Powers and there was no need to seek elsewhere the reasons for the inability of the United Nations to put an end to the policies of apartheid of the Republic of South Africa.

10. However, it had been possible, during the last two years, to define and clarify certain factors in the situation. The principle of an arms embargo and economic sanctions had been endorsed. The Organization's right to act had been confirmed and the unanimity achieved with regard to the problem was itself an encouraging factor. His delegation believed that the problem had emerged from its limited geographic context and had now become a responsibility of the international community as a whole. It was a matter involving the conscience of humanity.

11. Since, however, the problem of apartheid remained unsolved, the alternatives were clear: either recourse should be had to persuasion—but the latter would be futile if the Security Council's punitive measures were not scrupulously applied by all Members and, particularly by South Africa's trading partners—or else a dreadful period of violence would ensue.

12. Kuwait favoured the first solution and its Government would continue to co-operate to that end with the United Nations. He expressed the hope that each Member State would duly carry out its responsibilities and help the South African people to recover their freedom and independence in justice and dignity. There could be no possible compromise in the matter. Action should be taken in a legal spirit before it was too late, for the judgement of history would be merciless.

13. Mr. RATSIMAMAO (Madagascar) deplored the fact that South Africa, isolated on the outer rim of the continent, was continuing to defy the international community. Its persistent refusal to abandon the odious practices of apartheid was attributable to the attitude of certain States with which it had traditional ties. Knowing that those States preferred to confine themselves to half-measures and gestures instead of complying strictly with the recommendations of the Security Council and the General Assembly, it was continuing to disregard the most elementary moral principles. Hence, the problem could not be solved by a few States or even by a majority of the States Members of the United Nations; a solution was possible only if all countries joined in implementing the recommendations of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Another appeal must therefore be made to all States to reconsider their behaviour with regard to South Africa in the light of that country's policies. It could not be denied that the actions of certain States had merely encouraged South Africa to persist in its errors; that was a basic aspect of the problem, for the failure of some countries to comply with the United Nations recommendations was nullifying the effects of the sacrifices made by others.

14. In recent years, the peoples of Africa had gone from appeals to expressions of disapproval and from expressions of disapproval to outright condemnation of South Africa; he was troubled by the thought that that condemnation might have to be expressed in actions whose consequences would be universally regretted. His delegation called upon all those who were not yet convinced that South African racism was an international threat to examine carefully the statements which had been made in the Committee and in other international bodies; they would then be able to appreciate fully the steadfast determination of Africans to wipe out apartheid by whatever means were necessary. The peoples of Africa could not be blamed for that attitude, for a State Member of the United Nations could not be permitted indefinitely to scorn the Organization's most sacred principles with impunity, nor could it be permitted to violate the Charter constantly and then take refuge behind the same Charter in an effort to justify its behaviour. Africans were determined to join efforts in exerting pressure on apartheid and its practitioners, and South Africa would be making a mistake if it disregarded the unanimous will of the independent African States. His delegation appealed to all States to join with the African States in an effort to put an end to the situation in southern Africa; if that situation was permitted to continue, it was to be feared that that racism would engender another and that a bloody conflict would be the result.

15. His delegation would support any specific proposal for putting an end to a situation which had already lasted too long.

16. Mr. VINCI (Italy) said that the debate now drawing to an end had shown that the Members of the United Nations were virtually unanimous in firmly condemning all forms of racial discrimination and, consequently, the odious policy of apartheid practised by the South African Government. A similar concordance of views had already been apparent in 1963 and had been reflected in the nearly unanimous adoption of General Assembly resolution 1978 (XVIII). In view of the South African Government's persistence in its policies, it had been evident that at the present session the condemnation would be even more categorical; it could be said that, with one exception, the entire world was ranged on the side of defence of the human person and human dignity. His Government firmly condemned the policies pursued by the Government of the Republic of South Africa; the Italian people condemned and deplored all forms of racial discrimination, since they were contrary to the principles of the Italian Constitution, of the Charter and of civilization. The Italian Government had therefore taken part in the effort to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination through the work of its experts and representatives who had helped to draft the Declaration adopted by the Assembly in 1963 (resolution 1904 (XVIII)) and the draft Convention which was to be submitted to the General Assembly for approval.^{1/} At the present session, once again, the Italian representative in the Third Committee had emphasized the need for international measures to

strengthen the provisions of the draft Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

17. The General Assembly was once again called upon to consider what action the United Nations could take to eliminate by peaceful means an evil which threatened to plunge the world into a racial conflict of terrifying proportions. It had been said that the primary cause of the present situation in South Africa must be sought in a psychological complex arising from illogical and groundless fears which were aggravated by an absurd theory that had created in the minds of the European population of South Africa a distorted picture of the true facts and led it to see itself as an isolated outpost in danger of being overwhelmed by enemy forces. An effort must be made to remove the cause of the fears underlying the antagonism between the white and the African inhabitants—in other words, to create a climate in which whites and Africans would be able to live side by side in the same territory, trusting each other and working together to create a new society based on equality of rights and obligations. The white population must be given reassurance that the end of apartheid would not mean its annihilation or expulsion but that it would retain the right to citizenship and equality in South Africa and would enjoy a status based not on a system of privilege but on personal capacity. His delegation was aware that that task presented enormous difficulties, and it regretted that the idea put forward by the Danish delegation two years earlier (380th meeting) had been abandoned perhaps too quickly. In making those suggestions, his delegation was not attempting to put off the problem or seeking a pretext for dissociating itself from the proposal advanced by a majority of the other delegations; it was convinced that ideas which were right were certain to triumph despite all obstacles, and his Government had taken every opportunity to urge the South African Government to adopt a policy in keeping with the moral principles in which Italy believed. His delegation felt, however, that all countries in a position to do so should make an effort to assist in creating in South Africa a new political climate which would make it possible for the various racial groups to live side by side in peace and freedom.

18. His delegation wished to deny categorically the Press reports to the effect that the Italian Government had given permission for certain Italian firms to provide military assistance to the Republic of South Africa. His Government had suspended all military shipments to South Africa even before the Security Council had taken a stand on the matter. The Italian authorities had subsequently applied the Council's resolutions to the letter, withholding licences for the sale of arms and military equipment to South Africa and prohibiting the shipment of materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition. It was thus apparent that the allegations made in the establishment of an aircraft industry in South Africa were without foundation. All that had actually happened was that an Italian firm had furnished a small number of civilian training aircraft which were of a type not covered by the Security Council resolutions and could not strengthen South Africa's military potential. Moreover, it was his Government's firm

^{1/} Subsequently adopted as General Assembly resolution 2106 (XX).

intention to impose even tighter controls on exports to South Africa which were covered by the Security Council resolutions.

19. In view of the foregoing, his delegation did not believe that the paragraphs in the draft resolution condemning the actions of States whose collaboration was encouraging the South African Government to persist in its racial policies could be interpreted as applying to Italy.

20. With regard to the assertions in the report of the Special Committee concerning increased trade between Italy and South Africa in the last few years, he wished to point out that the system of complete economic freedom prevailing in Italy made it impossible for the Italian Government to insist that private firms should do business or refrain from doing business with any particular country. Such firms were free to carry on trade with countries whose political régimes were based on ideologies not shared by the Italian Government or by a majority of Italian citizens and even with States which Italy did not recognize.

21. His Government would give sympathetic consideration to the proposal in the report of the Special Committee for the establishment of a trust fund for humanitarian purposes; it had also received with interest the Secretary-General's request for voluntary contributions with a view to setting up a programme of vocational and technical training for the people of South Africa. Such measures could alleviate much suffering and lay the foundation for better things to come.

22. His delegation would vote for draft resolution A/SPC/L.119 and Add.1. It had certain reservations with regard to draft resolution A/SPC/L.118 Rev.1, especially operative paragraph 7, since it had always had doubts about the application of universal economic sanctions against South Africa. Under the Charter, it was the Security Council rather than the General Assembly which was responsible for taking action in cases of a threat to peace. Hence, the paragraph should be amended to take account of Article 11 of the Charter. His delegation also had reservations about operative paragraph 1, inasmuch as it had abstained from the vote at the time of the adoption of resolution 1761 (XVII). It therefore requested a separate vote on operative paragraphs 1 and 7 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.118/Rev.1. It reserved its position on the draft resolution as a whole.

23. Mr. JUARBE Y JUARBE (Cuba) said that interest in the question of apartheid was evident from the fact that many delegations had taken part in the debate. It was unfortunate, however, that France had not spoken, for that would have helped to complete the general picture of international opinion on the situation apartheid had created.

24. The Special Committee's report (A/5959) showed that apartheid was becoming a more and more established policy and that South Africa was persisting in its defiant attitude. Living conditions for the 13 million in slavery were growing worse by the day and racism was spreading not only in the Republic of South Africa, but also in the territory of South West Africa, which the Republic was striving to absorb. Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence,

encouraged by South African economic, political and military support, had further aggravated the situation.

25. In the face of these facts, what was the attitude of Members of the United Nations? Three different points of view had become apparent in the Committee's debates. First, some States thought that persuasion should be used to induce the South African Government to change its policy. But South Africa's behaviour up to that time had only too clearly shown that such efforts were useless. A second group of States was considering the possibility of applying sanctions in a fairly near future, but recommended that the logistics of sanctions should be studied first. That was the dilatory position of, for example, the United Kingdom, the country chiefly responsible for the problem of apartheid. A third group of countries advocated immediate adoption of severe sanctions, and even, in view of the expansion of South Africa's armed forces, military preparations.

26. What was the essence of the problem of apartheid? In order to justify the fact that his country was not immediately applying sanctions against South Africa, the United Kingdom representative had stated (472nd meeting) that the very great number of economic ties between the United Kingdom and the Republic of South Africa had made the two countries interdependent. He had added that the present economic situation in Great Britain must be taken into account. Sanctions would have caused economic losses, increased unemployment and reacted unfavourably on the balance of payments. Japan had likewise invoked (472nd meeting) the importance of foreign trade to its national economy. It was of course easy to understand that the application of economic sanctions against South Africa would have had repercussions. However, the United Kingdom was chiefly responsible for apartheid and if it could not pay the price of eliminating that inhuman policy, what other country could or should pay it? Could the great Powers not repair the damage they had done? To refuse that sacrifice was to ignore the problem of apartheid. Was it right to wait for the elimination of that odious practice until the United Kingdom had solved its payments difficulties and Japan had overcome its trade problems and was no longer dependent on exports? Who suffered the consequences of that delay? It was certainly not the United States, the United Kingdom, France or Japan; it was rather the South African people themselves who were paying the price of their own enslavement. The studies of apartheid the United Nations had made in South West Africa and the Portuguese colonies showed that it was not in fact a racial or political problem. Apartheid's roots were primarily economic; they grew from an international conspiracy, but the league of the monopolies and economic interests of certain Powers which were concerned only with the exploitation of many African peoples. That in fact was what was at the bottom of the United Kingdom and Japanese representatives' statements. Final responsibility for the situation lay with the free enterprise system, where economic interests came before everything else. What, then, was the use of the United Nations if some company in one of those countries could defy it? Of what use was the United Nations if a country voted for a resolution, but could not apply it because of the free enterprise system? That problem was

perhaps even more serious than the policy of racial discrimination. The essential question was primarily economic. It was unthinkable that South African slavery could not be eliminated because of economic interests. It was even more unthinkable that the exploiter himself should be exempt from all responsibility by virtue of laws which freed him from any duty towards 13 million slaves. Nobody denied the imminence of catastrophe, not even the United Kingdom, which had spoken of it with as much misgiving as the Togolese delegation. There was therefore no longer any doubt that apartheid was a threat to international peace and security.

27. The Special Committee had studied the problem and the Cuban delegation appreciated the Committee's work. It thought the Committee should continue its work and supported its recommendations. Any sacrifice was heavy for the small developing countries to bear, but some of them, unlike certain great Powers, had shown that they were ready to pay the price of liberation of 13 million slaves. The President of Cuba himself stated in a letter to the Chairman of the Special Committee (see A/5825, annex I) that the Cuban Government supported resolution 182 (1963). Cuba had no relations with South Africa and was prepared to support any steps aimed at putting an end to apartheid. The Security Council might also consider the question and apply sanctions against the Republic of South Africa.

28. The United Nations should also back up all the collective efforts of the Organization of African Unity.

29. Cuba's attitude to the South African problem was unyielding. The Cuban people would do what was needed to avert a catastrophe on the African continent and would stand by the African peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence.

30. Mr. COLERIDGE-TAYLOR (Sierra Leone) noted that the situation in South Africa had become worse; repression and racial discrimination had been intensified. There were two sides to the question of apartheid. Internally, it resulted in racial segregation in South Africa, laws on the Bantus and laws establishing reservations, arbitrary imprisonment and a whole series of measures directed against the native population. Internationally, it was expressed in a racist policy in South West Africa as well as in Angola, Mozambique and Rhodesia. The whole of Southern Africa thus posed a threat to international peace and security.

31. In the circumstances, it was the Special Political Committee's duty to recommend steps which would avert any catastrophe. Those steps should be based on Chapter VII of the Charter; only severe economic sanctions would produce results.

32. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.118/Rev.1, said that they proposed further revisions of their text in order to take the opinions of all the members of the Committee into account. As it stood, the draft resolution would obviously be supported by a very big majority of the members. But it would be useful if revisions which did not change the substance

resulted in the same unanimity as there had been in condemning apartheid.

33. The sponsors felt that operative paragraph 1, which reaffirmed an important point, might without too much difficulty be transferred to the end of the preamble and slightly amended to read: "Recalling its resolution 1761 (XVII)..." The remaining operative paragraphs would be renumbered accordingly.

34. Some delegations had suggested that the word "Condemns" in paragraph 8 (new paragraph 7) should be replaced by "Deplores" out of courtesy to the States whose actions the sponsors condemned. That would not prevent the sponsors from reaffirming their view that those actions deserved severe condemnation.

35. In a spirit of compromise the sponsors were also prepared to replace the words "Requests the specialized agencies..." in paragraph 11 (new paragraph 10) by "Invites the specialized agencies..."

36. It was not usual to agree to separate votes on parts of a draft resolution which in itself formed a whole. However, the sponsors were anxious to obtain the maximum number of votes and show the Republic of South Africa how isolated it was. They would therefore agree to separate votes on certain passages. It was to be hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously and thus constitute the most categorical condemnation of the Republic of South Africa ever made.

37. Mr. VINCI (Italy) said that, in view of the changes the sponsors had made in the text, he would not press for a separate vote on the paragraph which had become the last paragraph of the preamble. He did, however, request a separate vote on operative paragraph 7 (new paragraph 6). The wording of that paragraph alluded to the Security Council and to the passages in the Charter concerning the Security Council's competence. The Committee should confine itself to the Charter provisions which concerned the General Assembly.

38. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom) also requested a separate vote on paragraph 7 (new paragraph 6) as well as on paragraphs 2, 8 and 11 (new paragraphs 1, 7 and 10).

39. Mr. CHAI (Secretary of the Committee) said that it would cost \$8,000 to carry out the provisions of paragraph 10 (new paragraph 9) of draft resolution A/SPC/L.118/Rev.1. The information services could take \$3,000 of that sum from credits already voted for 1966. The remaining \$5,000 would be obtained by transfers within the budget. There would consequently be no supplementary costs.

40. The provisions of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.119 and Add.1 would not entail any supplementary expenses, while the provisions of paragraph 5 could be implemented from the general credits already requested for 1966.

41. In view of the late hour, the CHAIRMAN proposed that explanations of vote should be given after the voting.

It was so decided.

42. At the request of Mr. MENDOUGA (Cameroon), the vote was taken by roll-call.

43. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.118/Rev.1 as amended.

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

In favour: India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Suda, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary.

Against: Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia.

Abstaining: Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United States of America, Venezuela, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece.

The paragraph was adopted by 75 votes to 3, with 17 abstentions.

44. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.118/Rev.1 as amended.

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

In favour: Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia.

Against: Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, France.

Abstaining: Greece, Iceland, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil, China, Colombia, Finland.

The paragraph was adopted by 70 votes to 12, with 13 abstentions.

45. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.118/Rev.1, as amended.

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

In favour: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, 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.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, United States of America, Venezuela.

The paragraph was adopted by 72 votes to 4, with 19 abstentions.

46. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.118/Rev.1, as amended.

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

In favour: Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of).

Against: Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia.

Abstaining: Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Canada.

The paragraph was adopted by 75 votes to 3, with 17 abstentions.

47. The CHAIRMAN put the whole of draft resolution A/SPC/L.118/Rev.1, as amended, to the vote.

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, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierre Leone, Somalia, 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, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorrussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait.

Against: Portugal.

Abstaining: Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 78 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.

Mr. Inglés (Philippines), Vice-chairman, took the Chair.

48. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) proposed that, as the Committee had little time left, explanations of vote

regarding the text that had just been adopted should be given to the General Assembly in plenary session.

49. Miss KONIE (Zambia) and Mr. MOUANZA (Congo (Brazzaville)) seconded that proposal.

50. Mr. COLERIDGE-TAYLOR (Sierra Leone) saw no objection, if the representatives who had asked to speak did not themselves raise any objection.

51. The CHAIRMAN announced that, in the absence of any objection, he would consider the Guinean proposal adopted.

It was so decided.

52. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation needed time to decide upon its final position with regard to draft resolution A/SPC/L.119 and Add.1. He therefore appealed to the other sponsors of the draft not to press for a vote on it at the present meeting.

53. After a discussion in which Mr. KANO (Nigeria), Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea), Mr. SANGHO (Mali), Mr. DOTSEY (Togo), Mr. HORAN (Ireland), the CHAIRMAN, Mr. MENDOUGA (Cameroon) and Mr. HASSANE (Niger) took part, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should devote the last part of the last meeting of the current week to a vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.119 and Add.1.

It was so decided.

54. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.120 were of the opinion that the South African Government's bad faith had been sufficiently demonstrated, that the door should be left open to a dialogue with that Government, and that the conversations with South Africa's friends that had taken place in the Committee had to a certain extent been fruitful. The sponsors had accordingly decided to withdraw their draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.