

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1343rd  
MEETING**

Monday, 15 November 1965,  
at 3.10 p.m.



**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

Agenda item 12:

Reports of the Economic and Social Council (A/5803, chaps. VIII (sects. I, II and V), IX and X (sects. I, IV, V and VII); A/6003, chaps. XII (sects. I, III and IV), XIII and XIV (sects. I, III and V)) (continued). . . . . 305

Chairman: Mr. Francisco CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Reports of the Economic and Social Council (A/5803, chaps. VIII (sects. I, II and V), IX and X (sects. I, IV, V and VII); A/6003, chaps. XII (sects. I, III and IV), XIII and XIV (sects. I, III and V)) (continued) (A/C.3/L.1282/Rev.1, L. 1285, L.1287)

1. Mrs. MANTZOULINOS (Greece) said, in explanation of her vote on the draft resolution on town twinning adopted by the Committee at the previous meeting, that although town twinning was indeed a useful form of international co-operation, it was more often than not a spontaneous activity, and therefore United Nations assistance was not indispensable. In order to avoid overburdening the Secretariat, which already had many other important matters to deal with, her delegation had voted for the deletion of the words "though his offices" in operative paragraph 4 and had abstained in the vote on the resolution as a whole.

2. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had before it a draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1282/Rev.1) calling for an international seminar on apartheid to be held in 1966, to which Nigeria had proposed an amendment (A/C.3/L.1287). The Committee also had before it a statement on the financial implications of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1285) submitted by the Secretary-General. He asked whether the members of the Committee were ready to vote on the draft resolution and the relevant amendment.

3. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that she did not object to the draft amendment but thought that its scope should be broadened to include the policies of Southern Rhodesia, which were of concern to the whole world and were at the time under consideration by the Security Council.

4. The possibilities for financing the seminar were indicated in the statement on the financial implications, the alternatives being to eliminate the seminar on the civic and political education of women or to draw on the allocation for the fellowship programme. In the

view of the USSR delegation, seminars were extremely useful, since they reached a large number of people; it would therefore be preferable to draw on the fellowship allocation. That action would make it possible to retain the seminar on the political rights of women, which had already been approved in principle by the Economic and Social Council (resolution 1062 (XXXIX)) on the recommendation of the Commission on the Status of Women.

5. Mrs. DELLA GHERARDESCA (Italy) said she wondered whether the intention was to draw either on the fellowship allocation or on the allocation for seminars, as envisaged by the USSR representative, or on both those items, as paragraph 6 of document A/C.3/L.1285 seemed to imply.

6. Mr. COMBAL (France) said that his delegation had always been in favour of holding seminars and symposia on human rights as an effective means of promoting human rights and fundamental freedoms, of defining concepts, of stating important problems in general and universal terms and studying them in a serene atmosphere, and of informing the public. The 1962 Seminar on Freedom of Information, held at New Delhi and the Seminar on Human Rights in Developing Countries, held at Kabul in 1964, had been particularly fruitful. His delegation had, frequently expressed its views on the policy of racial discrimination and on régimes which advocated segregation. His only regret was that the proposed subject on the seminar was limited to the policy of apartheid.

7. With regard to the financing of such a meeting, financial provision had been made in part V (Technical programmes), section 14 (Human rights advisory services), of the regular budget as adopted by the Fifth Committee. Since the seminar on the status of women had been approved in principle, that decision ought to stand. It would also be advisable not to draw too heavily on the appropriations for the other proposed seminars. Although his delegation certainly did not underestimate the importance of fellowships as a means of promoting human rights and freedoms, it none the less considered that the required funds should be drawn from that item.

8. Mr. M'BAYE (Guinea) recalled that his delegation was a co-sponsor of the draft resolution. As Chairman of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, he considered, in fact, that apartheid was one of the most serious problems facing the conscience of mankind. If any question deserved priority, it was the policy of apartheid, which was a permanent violation of the basic freedoms and fundamental rights of every human being.

9. Mr. DAS (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretary-General had already received invitations from various Governments regarding three of the four seminars planned as part of the advisory services in the field of human rights. Since no country had offered to act as host for the fourth seminar, viz., the one dealing with the civic and political education of women, the new seminar could be financed at the expense of the latter rather than of the other three seminars. If the funds had to be found within the appropriations under section 14, the Secretary-General could draw on the amount allocated to the fourth seminar, or approximately \$40,000. Since that amount only partially covered the estimated expenditure, the rest, namely \$23,540, would have to be drawn from the fellowship appropriations.

10. If, on the other hand, it was felt that the allocations for seminars should be drawn on as little as possible, the contrary solution could be adopted by drawing \$40,000 from the fellowships appropriations and \$23,540 from the seminar appropriations.

11. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) agreed with the USSR and French representative that the subject of the seminar should not be confined to the policy of apartheid alone even though it did deserve to be given high priority because it comprised some particularly odious violations of human rights.

12. It would, however, be paradoxical to hold a seminar on that topic to the detriment of the seminar on the civic and political education of women, when the Third Committee had in fact at its previous meeting adopted a resolution on improving the status of women and their emancipation (A/C.3/L.1284/Rev.1). She thought that the seminar on apartheid could perhaps be postponed until the International Year for Human Rights at the latest, namely, 1968. The best plan would be to set no date, to study future possibilities and to eliminate none of the present projects.

13. The representative of the Secretary-General had said that no country had offered to act as host for the fourth seminar, the one dealing with the civic and political education of women. The United Kingdom, however, amongst others, was in negotiation with the Secretariat over its prospect of its acting as host to a seminar. So far as she was aware no request to hold a seminar on the subject of women's rights had even been mooted to the United Kingdom by the Secretariat.

14. Mr. TSAO (China) said that he endorsed the idea of a seminar on apartheid but did not think that the financial arrangements should be allowed to encroach unduly upon the budget estimates for fellowships. The participation of thirty-five countries in that seminar was contemplated (see A/C.3/L.1285, para. 3). If, however, it was to be an international seminar, all Member States should be able to take part in it. He would like to know on what criteria the choice of participants would be based and said that the principle of geographical distribution should be respected.

15. Mr. M'BAYE (Guinea), referring to the remarks of the United Kingdom representative, said that, at a time when Southern Rhodesia was threatened by the same evils as South Africa, there should be no hesi-

tation in giving priority to the topic of apartheid. The policy of apartheid, which was a flagrant violation of human rights, was incompatible with peace and security, both of which were indispensable conditions for the full development of human values.

16. Miss WILLIS (United States of America) said that she agreed with the United Kingdom representative regarding the elimination of the seminar on the status of women. She hoped, however, that the seminar on apartheid could also be held. Since the Economic and Social Council had already approved the programme of advisory services in the field of human rights for 1966, she proposed that no changes should be made in the existing plans and that the funds should be sought outside section 14. In other words, private subsidies or voluntary contributions should be relied on, or the seminar should be financed with the aid of funds drawn from other technical assistance appropriations.

17. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the United States representative had made a formal proposal and, if so, from what section of the budget the funds should be drawn.

18. Miss WILLIS (United States of America) suggested that the present paragraph of the operative part of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1282/Rev.1) could be revised to read as followed:

"Requests the Secretary-General to organize an international seminar on apartheid in 1966 and authorizes him to use such funds as may be necessary for the purpose, making appropriate readjustments within the budgetary allocations approved for part V (Technical programmes) of the United Nations budget, or using any voluntary or private contributions, or such other technical assistance funds as may be available."

19. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the first question to be decided was whether the seminar on apartheid should be held or not. If so, there was no point in counting on funds which did not exist or requesting the Secretary-General to study proposals which would without any doubt be rejected by the Fifth Committee. The fact was that there were no other funds available, since the budget had already been drawn up, and the sums allocated for advisory services could not be reconsidered. If the Third Committee were to proceed thus, it could be accused of taking decisions in a casual manner, counting on resources which were non-existent. If it was really desired that the seminar should take place—and the representative of Guinea had rightly pointed out how important it was—it should be specified which of the allocations under part V, section 14, were to be used for the purpose.

20. The Soviet Union delegation shared the view of the French delegation: it would be better to reduce allocations for fellowships.

21. The CHAIRMAN concluded that it was the definite wish of the Third Committee that a seminar on apartheid should be organized.

22. Since there was no question of increasing the budgetary allocation for advisory services in the field of human rights, the \$220,000 allocated under section

14 would have to be divided up between the four seminars proposed, plus the seminar on apartheid, and fellowships. Hence the proposed new seminar would have to be financed by reducing the allocations both for the other seminars and for fellowships. He asked the Rapporteur to include the Committee's wishes in his report.

23. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) thought it an awkward choice to make between the seminar on the status of women and the seminar on apartheid. The best solution might perhaps be to refrain from fixing a specific date for the seminar on apartheid. He enquired whether, if the date were left open for any time up to and including 1968, the Secretary-General's representative could say whether it might be possible to find means within the existing budgets to hold the seminar without disrupting any other seminar already on the programme.

24. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that many delegations had expressed the wish that the seminar should be held in 1966.

25. Mr. DAS (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretary-General had already accepted three invitations for 1967 and was considering a fourth seminar on the civic education of women. Hence there was no likelihood of an opening, and it would mean again considering dipping into the funds earmarked for fellowships. So far only one invitation had been sent to the Secretary-General for 1968, so that the seminar on apartheid could undoubtedly be arranged then.

26. Mr. BECK (Hungary) said that his delegation entirely approved the points made by the Chairman.

27. Mrs. VEDER (Netherlands) approved the principle of a seminar on apartheid, since in her opinion seminars were an excellent means of disseminating constructive ideas. Moreover, apartheid was a problem of capital importance. At the same time, since apartheid was a most undesirable solution to the problem of the multi-racial society, the topic as proposed was somewhat negative. The seminar should also study the positive aspects of the same problem. If the participants confined themselves to condemning apartheid the results would be meagre; there would merely be a repetition of what had been said time and time again in the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations. Her delegation, therefore, advocated widening the scope of the seminar. It might be possible, for example, to insert after the words "international seminar on apartheid" in the operative part of the resolution the words "and the multi-racial society". By juxtaposing and contrasting the two topics, the constructive concept of a multi-racial society integrated on the political, economic, social and cultural plane would be properly emphasized.

28. As a practical point, the Netherlands delegation wondered how the Secretary-General would select a limited number of participants for such an international seminar. If the Third Committee decided on the principle of arranging a seminar, it should also give directives as to the selection of the participants. That aspect of the question had been examined to some extent in connexion with the international Seminar on the Multi-national Society held in Yugoslavia in 1965, and it had given excellent results. It might be useful

to follow the same precedent and to add to the draft resolution a paragraph to that effect.

29. Mr. HUMPHREY (Director of the Division of Human Rights) pointed out that at the time of organizing the Seminar on the Multi-national Society in Yugoslavia the problem had been solved by setting up an ad hoc committee comprising all the countries members of the sessional committee on the Economic and Social Council, with instructions to submit to the Secretary-General a list of countries to be invited. The same procedure might be followed in connexion with the seminar on apartheid. But that would not be necessary if the Nigerian amendment were adopted, since in that case the Secretary-General would consult the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa as to the choice of participants.

30. Miss WILLIS (United States of America) formally proposed the insertion in the Nigerian amendment (A/C.3/L.1287), following the words "in consultation with" the words "the Commission on Human Rights". She further proposed that the words "or by using such technical assistance funds as may be available" should be added at the end of the operative paragraph of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1282/Rev.1).

31. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) endorsed the two amendments proposed by the United States delegation, particularly the second. Apartheid should be given a high priority; at the same time, fellowships were also very important, and the fellowship programme should not be sacrificed. On the other hand, the seminars on the status of women and on the civic and political education of women might be held in 1967 or 1968; and if the Committee did not reach agreement, the Tanzanian delegation would submit a formal proposal to the General Assembly to that end.

32. Mr. KIRWAN (Ireland) supported the amendment submitted by the United States, along with the suggestions made by the representatives of Tanzania and the Netherlands. The idea put forward by the Netherlands delegation aimed at widening the scope of the seminar to include the multi-racial society could be related to the ninth and tenth paragraphs of the preamble to the draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination adopted by the Committee, which mentioned apartheid and reaffirmed the determination of the United Nations to promote understanding between races in order "to build an international community free from all forms of racial segregation and racial discrimination". The Irish delegation therefore supported the idea of the Netherlands.

33. Mr. M'BAYE (Guinea) pointed out in connexion with the Netherlands suggestion that since apartheid was a system based on the separation of races, any stand taken against apartheid was automatically a declaration in favour of the multi-racial society. Hence it seemed unnecessary to mention both ideas, since the one flowed naturally from the other. The Netherlands delegation might therefore perhaps see fit to withdraw its proposal.

34. Mr. COMBAL (France) observed that the \$220,000 approved by the Fifth Committee seemed to be the

maximum amount that would be available to cover activities under the programme of advisory services in the field of human rights for 1966; he therefore found it difficult to see what practical significance the United States amendment had, unless the United States delegation was attempting to introduce a special procedure which would upset the methods of work established many years earlier for the utilization and distribution of funds appropriated for the programme of advisory services in the field of human rights. Under the traditional procedure, the Technical Assistance Committee made recommendations to the Economic and Social Council on the utilization of funds appropriated under part V of the budget, which were then voted by the General Assembly; in the present instance, all the stages of that procedure had been completed, since the Fifth Committee had approved the appropriations requested of it for 1966.

35. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran), referring to the United States sub-amendment to the Nigerian amendment (A/C.3/L.1287), which called for the Secretary-General to consult the Commission on Human Rights as well, said that his delegation would support that proposal provided that the consultation would not complicate the Secretary-General's work; in order to form an opinion in that regard, he would like to know the date of the next session of the Commission on Human Rights.

36. With regard to the financial implications of the seminar on apartheid, he would support the United States amendment but wondered whether it was necessary, in order to avoid having to eliminate other seminars, to charge that expenditure entirely against the appropriation for fellowships; he would like to know whether it was possible to combine the seminars on the status of women and on the civic and political education of women, and thus to achieve savings without unduly curtailing the fellowship programme.

37. Mr. DAS (Secretary of the Committee) said, in reply to the Iranian representative's first question, that the next session of the Commission on Human Rights would be held at Headquarters from 8 March to 4 April 1966.

38. With regard to the second point raised by the Iranian representative, the organizational arrangements which the Secretary-General made for seminars depended on the invitations sent to him by the Governments of the host countries.

39. Mr. RIOS (Panama) said that if the proposed seminar was postponed until 1968, it would surely be possible to find the necessary funds by then.

40. Mr. A. A. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that his delegation agreed to the United States proposal that the Commission on Human Rights should be consulted on the matter of organizing the seminar on apartheid.

41. The reason his delegation had proposed in its amendment (A/C.3/L.1287) that the Special Committee should be mentioned in the resolution was not that it wished to restrict the seminar's terms of reference to the consideration of apartheid in South Africa but simply that the Special Committee, which was particularly familiar with the question of apartheid, could provide valuable assistance.

42. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that, since the difficulties encountered in organizing the proposed seminar were financial in nature, the Committee had to choose among the various activities that had been suggested. His delegation felt that it would give secondary consideration to the seminar for which the Secretary-General had not received an invitation from any Government. While he did not wish to minimize its importance, he regarded the seminar on the civic and political education of women as less urgent than the one which was to deal with apartheid; civic and political rights had already been accorded to women in many countries, whereas, in view of the gravity of the situation in Southern Rhodesia, a study of apartheid was becoming increasingly essential. The fellowship programme was also of less urgency.

43. If the developed countries, which had no hesitation in spending very large sums for military purposes, could not be induced to make a contribution for the purpose of holding the seminar on apartheid, a choice would obviously have to be made by giving priority to the most important questions. In that connexion, he appealed to the female members of the Committee to forgo the seminar on the civic and political education of women for the time being and to fight for the cause of women, who suffered discrimination as a result of the policy of apartheid. It would also be advisable to transfer to the seminar on apartheid some of the funds earmarked for the fellowship programme.

44. Mrs. MANTZOULINOS (Greece), replying to the Saudi Arabian representative's appeal, said that her delegation was prepared to give up the seminar on the civic and political education of women; since it had been the first to support the idea of holding that seminar, however, it would not agree to its abandonment unless the other female representatives did the same.

45. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), replying to observations by Mrs. DELLA GHERARDESCA (Italy), said that since Iran had already acted as host for a seminar on the status of women, it would be preferable for the next seminar on that subject to be held in a country situated in a different region; it was therefore best that his Government should not send an invitation to the Secretary-General.

46. Mr. INCE (Trinidad and Tobago) observed that the Committee's difficulties arose from the fact that it did not wish to give up either the activities previously envisaged or the seminar on apartheid; unfortunately, the lack of funds made it necessary to establish priorities and to concentrate on what was most urgent. Apartheid, which was one of the most agonizing issues of the twentieth century, was made even more urgent by the crisis in Southern Rhodesia and called for immediate action. Although some felt that in any case no positive action could be taken during the seminar, the same was true of the other seminars proposed for 1966; the seminars on the status of women and on the civic and political rights of women were, under the existing circumstances, much less important than the seminar on apartheid. His delegation would also like to hear the views of the female members of the Committee on that subject.

47. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Committee could not minimize the importance of improving the status of women, particularly after it had adopted a resolution on the subject. At the same time, the seminar on apartheid was also extremely important and could not be postponed. She therefore felt that the best course would be to take a decision on the suggestions made by the Chairman.

48. Mr. M'BAYE (Guinea) announced that the delegation of Uganda had asked to be included among the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1282/Rev.1).

49. The sponsors would be prepared to accept the Nigerian amendment in the following wording:

"Requests the Secretary-General to organize in 1966, in consultation with the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and the Commission on Human Rights, an international seminar . . .".

50. He would observe, in connexion with the Netherlands representative's observation, that the question of the multi-racial society could be considered at the seminar on apartheid as a separate agenda item.

51. His delegation felt that it should be left to the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for financing the seminar so that it could be held in 1966.

52. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) associated himself with the Guinean representative's observations.

53. His delegation, in the conviction that the question of apartheid was a matter of great urgency and must be given priority over all other questions, proposed that the seminars on the status of women should be postponed until 1968. If that proposal proved unacceptable, his delegation would submit an amendment to add to the operative part of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1282/Rev.1) a new paragraph in which the General Assembly would further request the Secretary-General to give priority to the organization of the international seminar on apartheid in 1966 and, to that end, to set a ceiling of \$76,460 on expenditure on the seminars on the status of women which had been planned for 1966 and for which appropriations had been made in section 14 of the United Nations budget for 1966.

54. If the Committee accepted the Secretary-General's estimate of the cost of the seminar on apartheid, which came to \$63,540, and approved the organization of the seminar on human rights in developing countries and the seminar on participation in local administration as a means of promoting human rights, to be held at Dakar and Budapest respectively, which would cost \$35,000 each, and the fellowship programme for which an amount of \$80,000 was provided, then of the \$220,000 in credits approved by the Fifth Committee for activities under the human rights advisory services programme for 1966, only \$76,460 would be left for the seminars on the status of women. His delegation's sole concern was to ensure that the Dakar and Budapest seminars and the seminar on apartheid could take place and that no cut was made in the fellowship programme.

55. With regard to the Netherlands proposal, he too felt that any discussion of apartheid necessarily involved examining the question of the question of the multi-racial society. It was therefore unnecessary to make a distinction which would render the paragraph in question more difficult to interpret.

56. His delegation appealed to the Committee to approve unanimously the postponement of the seminar whose preparation and organization were not yet far advanced; if that proved to be impossible, his delegation would formally submit its amendment.

57. Miss LUMA (Cameroon) said that her delegation was wholly in favour of holding the international seminar on apartheid and that, in view of the seriousness of the situation in Southern Rhodesia, that seminar should be given priority. Because she considered that question extremely urgent, she felt that the Committee should agree to give up the seminar on the civic and political education of women for the time being.

58. Mrs. VEDER (Netherlands) explained that her delegation had merely made a suggestion to see how the Committee would receive it; she thanked the Irish delegation for its support.

59. After listening to the arguments put forward by the Guinean delegation, she would not submit her amendment formally, for she was sure that her delegation's view had been understood and that the wording proposed by the Guinean delegation would cover what she had in mind.

60. Miss ADDISON (Ghana) said that her delegation would have difficulty in voting to postpone the seminar on the civic and political education of women after having voted in favour of the draft resolution on improving the status of women and their emancipation. Perhaps it was still possible to hope that a Government would issue an invitation to the Secretary-General for that seminar.

61. Some speakers had maintained that, if all the seminars were kept in the programme, the appropriations for the fellowship programme would have to be cut; if necessary her delegation could accept that idea, for in its opinion it might be possible for the funds diverted to the seminar on apartheid to be restored to the fellowship programme later on. Her delegation agreed to that way out only because it would greatly regret any reconsideration by the Committee on a decision on which it had voted.

62. Mr. COMBAL (France) observed that the Committee was agreed on requesting the Secretary-General to organize an international seminar on apartheid in 1966 as a matter of priority, and in recognizing that the cost of that seminar would have to be charged against the appropriations already made under part V, section 14, of the United Nations regular budget.

63. He thought the wording proposed by the Tanzanian representative was too rigid and might have the effect of inducing the Secretary-General to charge the funds needed for the seminar in question solely against the appropriations for other seminars, whereas the fellowship programme, being continuous and more flexible, would suffer less from a temporary reduction in funds. Furthermore he would regret any failure

to meet the wishes of the Commission on the Status of Women regarding the organization of seminars on questions concerning women.

64. Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) agreed with the French representative; he would deplore any arrangement under which the organization of the seminar on apartheid would interfere with the seminars already planned.

65. Mr. A. A. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that, although his delegation acknowledged the importance of measures designed to advance the status of women—an aim which his Government was pursuing in every possible way—it agreed in principle to the Tanzanian amendment in view of the urgency attaching to the problem of apartheid. As the representative of Trinidad and Tobago had pointed out, the time to give that problem all possible publicity was now or never, whereas the programmes relating to women were of a continuous nature and their execution could be temporarily slowed down if necessary.

66. Mr. TEKLE (Ethiopia) welcomed the withdrawal of the Netherlands representative's amendment; there had been no need for such an amendment, for no one could express opposition to apartheid without at the same time taking a stand on the idea of the multi-racial society.

67. His delegation would like the seminar on apartheid to be given a high priority; that did not mean that it underestimated the importance of questions relating to women.

68. Mrs. RAMAHOLIMIHASO (Madagascar) said that, having regard to the existing political situation, she welcomed the draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.3/L.1282/Rev.1) and hoped that a seminar on apartheid could be held in 1966. However, if any part of the programme of advisory services had to be sacrificed, that should not be allowed to affect the four seminars provided for in document A/C.3/L.1285. Some delegation had argued that only the first three seminars had reached an advanced stage of preparation and, more particularly, that no country had offered to act as host to the fourth seminar. However, the United Kingdom representative had just made a definite proposal on those lines.

69. It would be deplorable to postpone seminars which were in a sense the culmination of the previous session of the Commission on the Status of Women, especially after the Committee had unanimously adopted a resolution on the emancipation of women. The importance which her delegation attached to the organization of the seminars relating to women was all the greater in that in Madagascar, as in all developing countries, women's participation was essential to national development. She therefore supported the Chairman's suggestion that the funds needed for the seminar on apartheid should be found from those which would normally be spent on fellowships.

70. Mr. K. C. PANT (India) said that his delegation, whose position on apartheid was well known, would be happy to support the draft resolution under consideration. It was glad that the sponsors had accepted the United States representative's amendment, which made the draft a matter of human rights rather than a purely political matter.

71. His delegation agreed with those delegation which thought it important not to reverse the decision to hold the four seminars, especially after the Third Committee had unanimously adopted a resolution on the emancipation of women. However, he felt that a practical solution lay in going ahead with the seminars approved some time back by the Economic and Social Council and which were in an advanced stage of preparation. That would release some funds for the proposed seminar on apartheid. The balance of funds required would have to come out of the fellowship allocation. With regard to the fellowship programme, it might be better for the Committee merely to express a wish that the seminar on apartheid should be given priority, leaving the Secretary-General to allocate the funds among the various programmes. He would like the Secretariat to state how the funds would be allocated to the programmes so as to give the Committee some idea of what economies might result from the elimination of the fourth seminar.

72. The Netherlands suggestion might be taken up by the Commission on Human Rights when it drew up its agenda.

73. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) whole-heartedly supported the draft resolution before the Committee. He was fully convinced that apartheid must be abolished in order to maintain the balance and peace of the world and prevent a whole section of Africa from following the pattern of that policy.

74. The Mauritanian delegation supported the Nigerian amendment and found the Tanzanian proposal of interest.

75. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that, far from denying the urgency of the problem of apartheid, he thought that the seminar on the subject should be held before July 1966 so that the General Assembly at its twenty-first session would have the seminar's conclusions at its disposal when making its recommendations to the Special Political Committee.

76. It must not, however, be forgotten that, while discrimination against women was less obvious than racial discrimination, it still existed. It would therefore be regrettable if the proposed seminars were to be abandoned, not to mention the fact that that would result in useless expenditure, since preparations for three of them were already in an advanced stage.

77. He agreed with the representative of France that the Tanzanian proposal was too rigid. The Committee should be content with the adoption of an order of priority and leave it to the Secretary-General to allocate the funds.

78. The Iranian delegation supported the draft resolution, as modified by the amendments its sponsors had accepted.

79. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that her delegation would vote for the draft resolution, but did not agree with the Tanzanian proposal to abandon some seminars. It would be better to reduce the number of fellowships.

80. Miss TABBARA (Lebanon) also thought that the best solution would be to reduce the number of fellowships in order to make it possible to organize a seminar on apartheid.

81. Lebanon unreservedly approved the draft resolution. However, it sincerely hoped that the four seminars mentioned in document A/C.3/L.1285 would be held as arranged and therefore supported the Chairman's suggestions, which reconciled the differing points of view without interfering with the established priorities.

82. Mrs. BEN-ITO (Israel) said that steps to improve the status of women were very important, not only for women themselves, but also in view of the part women played in any society, for the whole population.

83. The main question was women's education, and especially civic and political education, for little purpose would be served if women had the same rights as men but did not know how to use them. For that reason it was essential that the seminar on the civic and political education of women should be held. The Israel delegation recognized the need for the seminar on apartheid but would deeply regret its being held only at the cost of the seminar on the civic and political education of women.

84. As several delegations had suggested, the Committee should leave it to the Secretary-General to allocate the funds among the various activities, but should let him know what order of priority it would prefer.

85. Mrs. STEVENSON (Liberia) hoped that, if lack of money made it necessary to reduce the number of annual seminars, that would not adversely affect the seminars on the status or education of women.

86. A seminar on apartheid was certainly very important, but it was to be hoped that all the seminars provided for in document A/C.3/L.1285 could be held.

87. The CHAIRMAN noted that the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1282/Rev.1) incorporating the Nigerian amendment seemed to meet with general approval. All members of the Committee wanted a seminar on apartheid to be organized as soon as possible and were ready to make some sacrifices to that end. There was, however, no unanimity on the question of which programme should be sacrificed.

88. He therefore thought that the Committee's report might state that the Committee had carefully considered the financing of the seminar on apartheid and gave it priority among the seminars to be held in 1966; that it had noted the Secretary-General's statement of the financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by Costa Rica, Guinea, the Philippines and Uganda; and that it had consequently decided, in accordance with the Economic and Social Council's decision on advisory services in the field of human rights, to ask the Secretary-General, as a matter of exception, and with the least possible harm to the fellowship programme for 1966, to hold that seminar. The Committee would thus be giving the Secretary-General some latitude.

89. He proposed that the Committee should proceed to vote on the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1282/Rev.1) as amended.

90. Mr. A. A. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that several delegations had pointed out to him that mention of the

Republic of South Africa gave a political tinge to his proposed amendment, and he was therefore prepared to delete it.

91. The CHAIRMAN said that the Third Committee should give the correct title, Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, to the Committee the Secretary-General would be asked to contact. However, in order to overcome the misgivings of some delegations, the title could be in quotation marks in the draft resolution.

92. Mr. COMBAL (France) asked for an explanation of the implications of the United States amendment, especially as it called for the use of technical assistance funds.

93. Mr. GROBY (Office of the Controller) recalled that under Economic and Social Council resolution 1008 (XXXVII) any proposal which could affect technical assistance resources should be considered by the Technical Assistance Committee. Although the General Assembly was a sovereign body, it might therefore be desirable for it to see whether it could adopt a decision of that kind without referring it to the Technical Assistance Committee.

94. Miss WILLIS (United States of America) said that the only purpose of the United States amendment had been to allow the Secretary-General to use other technical assistance funds which might be available.

95. The CHAIRMAN thought that the United States representative's suggestion might be covered by mentioning in the report that several delegations had been interested in the possibility of financing the seminar on apartheid without detriment to the programme of advisory services.

96. Miss WILLIS (United States of America) said that in view of the complexity of the problem and of the confusion which had developed in connexion with the meaning of the amendment she would withdraw it on the understanding that the Secretary-General would be free to explore the possibility of using funds other than those allocated for the human rights advisory services programme.

97. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to vote on the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1282/Rev.1), incorporating the Nigerian amendment (A/C.3/L.1287) as revised and which had been accepted by the four sponsors.

*At the request of the representative of Guinea, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Sierra Leone, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivian, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada,

Ceylong, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Cost, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama,

Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia.

*Against:* None.

*The revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1282/Rev.1), incorporating the Nigerian amendment (A/C.3/L.1287) as revised, was adopted unanimously.*

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.