



CONTENTS

Agenda item 57:

Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of *apartheid*, in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories (*concluded*):

(a) Measures for effectively combating racial discrimination and the policies of *apartheid* and segregation in southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General;

(b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on the treatment of political prisoners in South Africa: report of the Secretary-General

Consideration of draft resolutions (*concluded*)

Page

367

Chairman: Mrs. Turkia OULD DADDAH
(Mauritania).

AGENDA ITEM 57

Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of *apartheid*, in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories (*concluded*) (A/7603, chap. IX, sect. A; A/7660, A/7762, A/7787, A/C.3/619, A/C.3/L.1659, E/CN.4/950, E/CN.4/984 and Add.1-19):

(a) Measures for effectively combating racial discrimination and the policies of *apartheid* and segregation in southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General;

(b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on the treatment of political prisoners in South Africa: report of the Secretary-General

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(*concluded*)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited representatives to explain their votes on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1740, adopted by the Committee at the preceding meeting.

2. Mrs. FLORES (Cuba) explained that she had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1740, because it embodied the basic aspirations of the African peoples in relation to the racist colonial complex which still survived in southern Africa. Nevertheless, she had serious reservations about the practical value of operative paragraphs 6, 9, 10 and 11, since in her view the oppressed peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia could not achieve independence except by armed struggle—the only argument which exploiters understood; that being so, what was needed was not inoperative mechanisms like the United Nations

Council for Namibia, but the tangible solidarity and support of the international community.

3. Mr. BARTTFELD (Argentina) stated that, although he condemned most strongly all forms of racial discrimination, he had been obliged to abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1740 because of his misgivings and reservations concerning certain paragraphs in both the preamble and the operative part. Moreover, a text very similar to the one which had been adopted was under consideration by the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights, and he believed that it would have been advisable for the Committee to await their conclusions on the subject before taking its own decision.

4. Mrs. CABRERA (Mexico) said that she had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1740 because she considered it undesirable to combine in one text a variety of subjects which were within the competence of different Committees of the General Assembly. While it was true that colonial problems raised questions pertaining to respect for human rights, it was equally true that the essential purpose of combating colonial domination was to gain political rights. In the draft resolution, as adopted, there was a blurring of dividing-lines and objectives and an overlapping of unconnected ideas, all of which would prevent it from contributing effectively to the cause which it sought to advance.

5. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that if he had been present during the voting on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1740 he would have supported it, since he did not believe that violations of human rights, wherever they occurred, could be regarded as matters within the domestic jurisdiction of any country; rather, they were the concern of all States, Members and non-members of the United Nations, which were competent to adopt measures for having them examined and remedied. Just as he regretted the negative attitude maintained by South Africa in regard to the serious situation for which it was responsible, he deplored the fact that a number of States continued to maintain close diplomatic and trade relations with Pretoria and Salisbury, thus helping to prolong the existence of systems and régimes that had been condemned by all the organs of the United Nations.

6. Mr. COLL (Venezuela) explained that he had abstained on the draft resolution because in many respects the text did not, in his view, confine itself strictly to the items considered by the Committee but covered matters within the competence of other bodies.

7. Mrs. BEGMATOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that she had voted for draft resolution A/C.3/L.1740, even though she considered the requests made in

operative paragraphs 10 and 11 to be unpractical; in that connexion, the goal should be complete independence for Namibia. Furthermore, she had supported the text, as adopted, on the understanding that paragraph 13 (former paragraph 12) would have no financial implications. She nevertheless believed that the draft resolution was a document of importance to the struggle against the shameful phenomenon of racial discrimination.

8. Miss DUBRA (Uruguay) explained that, although her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, it had been obliged to vote against paragraphs 5 and 6 because it believed that the authority to condemn States or Governments and to decide in what circumstances the use of armed force would be justified belonged exclusively to the Security Council. Moreover, Uruguay did not believe in violence as a solution for political problems, much less as a means of achieving respect for human rights.

9. Mrs. DAES (Greece) said that her vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1740 was an expression of her resolute rejection of racial discrimination of any kind, particularly of *apartheid*, and of her fellow-feeling with the victims of such practices. The denial of fundamental human rights, and especially of the right of self-determination, engendered feelings of bitterness and distrust which hindered economic and social development and constituted a threat to international peace. Nevertheless, she had been obliged to abstain on operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 15 (former paragraph 14) because she considered it essential to respect the fields of competence of the various organs of the United Nations and to keep the areas of responsibility of ones like the Third Committee, which were concerned with humanitarian matters, separate from those of ones which dealt with political questions. If that was not done, the resulting duplications and confusion would benefit only those who did not want the United Nations to succeed in its efforts to bring about respect for human rights.

10. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that she had voted in favour of the draft resolution, despite the reservations she had concerning paragraphs 5 and 6 for reasons similar to those stated by the representatives of Argentina, Mexico and Uruguay. If she had been present during the voting on the text recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1417 (XLVI), concerning measures to be taken against nazism and racial intolerance, she would have voted for the deletion of the word "neo-nazi", which had been put to the vote separately, and in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

11. Miss ABAYI (Gabon) said that she had abstained on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1740 because, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Gabon had explained in the General Assembly at its 1772nd plenary meeting on 30 September 1969, her Government was not prepared to continue endorsing condemnatory resolutions which had no effect whatever.

12. Mr. POWER (Ireland) said he had abstained on the draft resolution because he had felt that it would be better to postpone consideration of certain points in the text until it was known what conclusions the Economic and Social Council had reached on the same subject, on the basis of the reports of the Commission on Human Rights and the

Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts established under Commission resolutions 2 (XXIII) and 2 (XXIV), and what decision the Council had taken on the draft resolution¹ mentioned in its resolution 1424 (XLVI), which contained many provisions similar to those of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1740, adopted by the Committee at the preceding meeting.

13. Mr. WAHLUND (Sweden), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway, explained that the Nordic countries had had to abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1740, even though they agreed with its basic objectives, because it created both substantive and procedural problems for them. For example, they did not consider that it was for the General Assembly to call upon Member States to apply sanctions, or to use force as was done in paragraph 6; what it had to do was to ensure the effectiveness of the sanctions decided upon by the Security Council. In regard to the provisions dealing with the application of the Geneva Conventions of 1949, he drew attention to the fact that the protection of combatants in non-international conflicts who were captured had already been the subject of a resolution adopted by the XXIst International Red Cross Conference at Istanbul in September 1969 and of General Assembly resolution 2506 B (XXIV), adopted on 21 November 1969 on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, with the support of the Nordic countries.

14. Apart from that, the Economic and Social Council had had before it at its forty-sixth session a draft resolution¹ very similar to the text contained in document A/C.3/L.1740 and had decided, in its resolution 1424 (XLVI), to send it back to the Commission on Human Rights for further consideration. For reasons of orderliness, the Nordic delegations did not consider it proper to adopt proposals which were already being considered by the expert body concerned. Furthermore, it was their feeling that the impact of a resolution by the General Assembly on a question like that would be enhanced when it came as the result of thorough consideration and of close co-operation with specialized bodies and subordinate organs of the United Nations. Consequently, it was important that the Assembly should have the findings and recommendations of those organs before taking its decision.

15. Finally, the Nordic delegations supported the request to the Secretary-General for a study of the possibility of enlarging the scope of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, although they expected that the relevant report to the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session would in the usual way be dealt with in the Special Political Committee.

16. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue from the preceding meeting its consideration of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly in Economic and Social Council resolution 1415 (XLVI).

17. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said he firmly rejected the argument that it would be improper for the Committee to concern itself with certain

¹ E/AC.7/L.560.

points in the draft resolution before it, and in particular with the proposed establishment of a unit of the United Nations radio in Africa to produce and broadcast radio programmes to the peoples of southern Africa, because recommendations had already been made on those matters by the Special Political Committee. The two Committees were of equal standing as organs of the General Assembly, and it was for each of them to consider the items allocated to it by the General Committee and submit its recommendations on them without being influenced by whatever decisions the other might adopt. Frequently, both dealt with the same question from different standpoints, and it might happen that they would adopt apparently contradictory positions. In such cases, it was solely for the General Assembly in plenary meeting to resolve the presumed contradiction, on the basis of its over-all view of the matter and by applying the appropriate rules of procedure. In no case was it proper for a committee to adapt its decisions to those taken by another or to fail to arrive at its own conclusions on the subject.

18. He did not, therefore, believe that there was anything to prevent the Committee from considering paragraph 11 of the draft resolution recommended in Economic and Social Council resolution 1415 (XLVI), concerning the establishment of a unit of the United Nations radio in Africa, and he was prepared to vote in favour of it.

19. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) agreed with the Tanzanian representative that the fact that one United Nations organ was discussing a particular matter did not prevent another from also dealing with it. However, he would point out that on 21 November 1969 the General Assembly had adopted the draft resolution of the Special Political Committee dealing precisely with the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (2506 B (XXIV)). Moreover, it would be odd for the Third Committee to approve the establishment of a unit of the United Nations radio when other bodies had decided that the question required further study. There were some very important points, such as the cost, which must be fully cleared up, since the funds to be used in setting up the unit could perhaps be invested with more positive results in other fields. Likewise, a clear indication should be given of the authority under which the unit would be placed—presumably the Office of Public Information. The possibility that the South African authorities might jam the transmission of the radio programmes must also be considered.

20. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said the fact that the General Assembly in plenary meeting had adopted a decision on the subject being studied by the Committee did not prevent the latter from taking a further decision on it.

21. With regard to the possibility of jamming, he observed that it might also be caused by the authorities in Southern Rhodesia, in which case the responsibility would rest entirely with the United Kingdom, which had not taken the necessary steps to re-establish constitutional legality in that territory.

22. Mr. JHA (India) said that the idea of setting up a unit of the United Nations radio in Africa had already been

discussed at length by the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council. There were therefore no grounds for asserting that the subject had not been studied. With regard to the possibility of jamming of the broadcasts, appropriate measures would of course be taken if the occasion arose.

23. Operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution the adoption of which was recommended to the General Assembly by the Economic and Social Council was not incompatible with the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee (resolution 2506 B (XXIV)), since the paragraph did not mention any specific date for the establishment of the radio unit.

24. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) said that, according to what the Director of the Radio and Visual Services Division of the Office of Public Information had told him, the establishment of the unit of the United Nations radio in Africa would not be a practical possibility until the second half of 1970. He wished to repeat that co-ordination of the work of Committees was carried out either by the Committees themselves or by the General Assembly in plenary meeting, and that the Secretary-General would be in a difficult position if he was asked, in resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, to carry out tasks that were mutually incompatible.

25. Mrs. HAUSER (United States of America) said that, in her view, the Committee should not take decisions which would be incompatible with those already adopted by the General Assembly. She suggested that the words “in conformity with the decisions adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 2506 B (XXIV)” should be added at the end of operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution the adoption of which was recommended by the Economic and Social Council. In addition, since the budget for human rights activities was very limited, a careful study should be made of the financial implications of the paragraph, bearing in mind in particular the fact that the Radio and Visual Services Division already transmitted programmes to southern Africa.

26. Mr. JHA (India) suggested that in operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution the words “on an experimental basis” should be inserted after the words “set up”, and the words “bearing in mind as far as possible the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2506 B (XXIV)” should be added at the end of the paragraph.

27. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) said that there was nothing in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly to prevent reconsideration of any subject by the Assembly or by one of its Main Committees after a resolution had been adopted on it.

28. Mr. ALI (Somalia) said that the task of reconciling differences between resolutions adopted on the same subject by different United Nations organs was entirely one for the General Assembly in plenary meeting.

29. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) said that, at the preceding meeting, the Tanzanian representative had accused his delegation of attempting to evade a confronta-

tion. He now proposed to promote one. Operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution the adoption of which was recommended by the Economic and Social Council gave an unfair and inadequate description of his Government's position. Some delegations appeared to think that any problem was susceptible of rapid and easy solution. That was not so, however, in the case of the problem of Southern Rhodesia, and he did not believe that the delegations in question really claimed that his Government should lightly undertake the invasion of that country, which would only cause more suffering to the persons whose human rights it was sought to protect. The Security Council had ordered a system of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, which the United Kingdom was actively enforcing, nationally and internationally, and the process of applying those sanctions would be long and laborious before it bore fruit. Paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1740, speaking of "automatically" ameliorating conditions, was an example of that kind of thinking. The only automatic consequences of war were destruction and suffering. The idea that an automatic solution to the problem of Southern Rhodesia could be achieved should be abandoned, since it prevented some Governments from giving due importance to observing the sanction system because of their belief that there was a more rapid and effective method.

30. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the United Kingdom had not displayed any reluctance to use force in Guyana, Aden, Kenya, Anguilla or even, in 1956, the United Arab Republic, and the situation in Southern Rhodesia was the result of the United Kingdom's passivity and its refusal to fulfil its responsibilities in a colonial Territory.

31. Mr. BARRY (Guinea) said that the question was not, as had been said, one of starting another war in Africa, since from the beginning of the colonial era up to the present there had been only a single war in the African continent, manifested in diverse forms; that war was the struggle of the peoples to recover their dignity and freedom.

32. Mr. CHIPESO (Zambia) said it was regrettable that the region which was now Southern Rhodesia had fallen into the hands of Great Britain at the time when the European Powers had been competing for possession of the African continent. If it had fallen into the hands of any other Power, it might by now have regained its freedom. Southern Rhodesia had become the symbol of the subjugation and repression of 4.5 million Africans. Neighbouring countries, such as Zambia, were very aware of that situation and of the intolerable sufferings of the Zimbabwe people. He noted in that connexion that, on the whole question of southern Africa, too much stress was, perhaps, being placed on combating the external manifestations of the evils, without eradicating their profound causes.

33. Mr. JHA (India) withdrew the suggestions he had made at the preceding meeting in connexion with operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1415 (XLVI). The resolution recently adopted by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee on the same subject (resolution 2506 B

(XXIV)) did not prevent the United Nations from setting up in the autumn of 1970 the radio unit provided for in operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution submitted to the Third Committee. In the circumstances, the appropriate course would be for the Secretary-General to inform the Special Political Committee next year of the establishment of a unit of United Nations Radio in southern Africa, pursuant to the resolution of the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly adopted on the recommendation of the Third Committee.

34. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that the procedure that had just been proposed, namely, that a text adopted by the General Assembly in plenary meeting should be amended to conform to a draft resolution which had not yet been adopted, seemed to him somewhat irregular.

35. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said that in the Economic and Social Council his delegation had supported the provisions of the draft resolution under consideration, including the one concerning the setting up of a radio unit for southern Africa, and it would vote in favour of it. The few objections that the idea had given rise to in the Council had all been in connexion with its financial implications. In his opinion, the Special Political Committee had not had enough information at its disposal about the necessity and importance of setting up the radio unit, or about the positive and useful consequences of such an action.

36. Mr. BARTTFELD (Argentina) requested separate votes on the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 9 and 10 of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1415 (XLVI).

37. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 11.

38. Mrs. NAZARENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) requested separate votes on operative paragraphs 12 and 13 of the draft resolution.

The sixth preambular paragraph was adopted by 75 votes to 13, with 11 abstentions.

The seventh preambular paragraph was adopted by 73 votes to 9, with 17 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 9 was adopted by 73 votes to 16, with 9 abstentions.

At the request of the Libyan representative, the vote on operative paragraph 10 was taken by roll-call.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda,

Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Barbados, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville).

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

Abstaining: Israel, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Spain, Thailand, Uruguay, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia.

Operative paragraph 10 was adopted by 68 votes to 18, with 13 abstentions.

At the request of the Somali representative, the vote on operative paragraph 11 was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile.

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

Abstaining: Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Norway, Panama, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada.

Operative paragraph 11 was adopted by 69 votes to 8, with 23 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 12 was adopted by 69 votes to 1, with 22 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 13 was adopted by 75 votes to 1, with 20 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 79 votes to 1, with 20 abstentions.

39. Mrs. BEGMATOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that she had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, despite the fact that she considered it unduly weak in its condemnation of the Western Governments which, in contravention of United Nations resolutions, were continuing to maintain relations of various kinds with South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. However, she had been obliged to abstain on paragraph 11, since the setting up of a radio unit for southern Africa would not produce results to justify the high cost involved. On the contrary, the expenditure which the new undertaking would absorb would result in a lessening of the over-all efforts being directed towards the elimination of *apartheid*. With regard to paragraphs 12 and 13, on which she had also abstained, her delegation did not believe that the establishment of a judicial committee for Namibia could contribute anything towards the achievement of the final objective, namely, the liberation of the Namibian people.

40. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that he had abstained both on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1740 and the text which had just been adopted, because he thought it was improper to adopt, with no prior debate, provisions which were still being considered by other bodies, none of which had reached a decision, and because he had reservations concerning the financial implications of the second draft resolution.

41. Miss DUBRA (Uruguay) explained that, although she had voted in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council when it was taken as a whole, she had had to abstain on the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs and—a *fortiori*—on operative paragraphs 9 and 10 because she felt that only the Security Council was competent to condemn a State for its policies. Moreover, she wished to make it clear that she had supported operative paragraph 7 on the understanding that it did not constitute an appeal for the use of force.

42. Mr. WAHLUND (Sweden) said that, for legal and constitutional reasons, he had abstained on the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council, despite his unswerving opposition to *apartheid* and any other form of racial discrimination. As a matter of fact, the Security Council alone was competent, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, to apply sanctions such as those implied in operative paragraphs 9 and 10 of the text just adopted. The Swedish Government had unreservedly supported the Security Council in its decisions concerning Southern Rhodesia and had introduced legislation ensuring the full implementation of those decisions.

43. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) said that he had voted in favour of paragraph 11 of the draft resolution, recommended by the Council on the understanding that the unit of the United Nations radio which was to be set up in southern Africa would be staffed entirely by Africans and would always be at the disposal of the region's various national liberation movements, whose freedom of expression would be respected without any restrictions.

44. Mrs. KUME (Japan) said that she shared the feelings which had led the Committee to adopt the text of the Economic and Social Council but that she had had to

abstain because she had serious doubts about whether the Committee was competent to deal with the matters covered by the draft resolution. In her opinion, only the Security Council was entitled to impose obligatory sanctions. Japan, as a resolute opponent of *apartheid*, had strictly observed the decisions taken by the Security Council concerning South Africa.

45. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that she had abstained on the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council because she thought that, in the present case, the General Assembly could not have been exercising its function of co-ordinating the work of the various Committees, since, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, it had already adopted a draft resolution on the same subject (resolution 2506 B (XXIV)).

46. Mr. HJELDE (Norway) said that, although he supported the main objectives of the resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council, he too had abstained, because operative paragraphs 9 and 10 had presented a problem in that only the Security Council could decide that diplomatic, commercial, military, cultural and other relations with South Africa and Southern Rhodesia should be broken off, and also because such a measure would lead those countries to adopt an even more rigid policy.

47. Mrs. GUNAWARDANA (Belgium) said that she had abstained on the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council because, although she firmly rejected the policy of *apartheid*, she did not accept the view that the maintenance of diplomatic relations with a country signified approval of its internal system. Moreover, she had had reservations about operative paragraph 11, since it not only involved exceedingly high financial implications but was also inconsistent with the decision already adopted by the General Assembly with regard to the matter under discussion.

48. Mrs. CADIEUX (Canada) said that she had abstained on operative paragraph 11 because she felt that it was not

the best way to achieve the desired end. She had also abstained on the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 9 and 10 because, in her opinion, breaking off relations with South Africa and Southern Rhodesia would make it impossible to bring any influence at all to bear on those countries to abandon their policies of *apartheid* and racial discrimination.

49. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that he had voted affirmatively in every vote on the draft resolution. The establishment of a unit of the United Nations radio, provided for in operative paragraph 11, was not perhaps the best way of dealing with the problem but at all events it was one of the steps that should be taken in the fight against *apartheid*. He did not understand why some delegations had had difficulty with operative paragraphs 9 and 10, since they merely comprised a repetition of measures already approved in previous resolutions.

50. Mr. TANNER (Finland) said that he had abstained on the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council since, although he was firmly opposed to the policy of *apartheid*, he thought that the measures envisaged in operative paragraphs 9 and 10 went beyond the competence of the Committee and were not constructive ways of eliminating the policies of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa.

51. Miss GUEVARA (Argentina) said that she had voted in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1415 (XLVI) but had abstained from voting on the sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 9 and 10. She condemned *apartheid* and discrimination in all its forms, but she felt that the economic isolation of South Africa would only aggravate the situation.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.