



General Assembly

PROVIS IONAL

A/44/PV. 63
1 December 1989

ENGLISH

Forty-fourth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVIS IONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 22 November 1989, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. GARBA (Nigeria)

later: Mr. HURST (Antigua and Barbuda)

- Tribute to the memory of René Moawad, President of the Lebanese Republic
- Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa [28] (continued)
 - (a) Draft resolutions
 - (b) Report of the Fifth Committee
- Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: report of the Fifth Committee [126]

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF RENE MOAWAD, PRESIDENT OF THE LEBANESE REPUBLIC

The PRESIDENT: Before proceeding with the consideration of the items on the agenda for this afternoon, I should like to invite the General Assembly to join in a tribute to the memory of Mr. René Moawad, President of the Lebanese Republic.

It was with deep sorrow that I learnt this morning of the tragic death of President Moawad. President Moawad had been a Member of Parliament over three decades and symbolized the highest qualities of public service. He worked tirelessly, with vision and remarkable human qualities, for peace and social justice in Lebanon. His death is a tragic loss to his country.

On behalf of the General Assembly, I request the representative of Lebanon to convey our heartfelt condolences to the Government and people of Lebanon and to the bereaved family.

I call on the Secretary-General.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL (interpretation from French): This is a day of mourning for Lebanon and a day of consternation for the entire international community. A cowardly and terrible attack has cost the life of President René Moawad, whose election we had just welcomed. We condemn most energetically this hateful crime.

President Moawad was a Lebanese patriot who shouldered his responsibilities in full awareness of the danger and the challenge involved, and that is not the least of the reasons why he attracted so much respect and admiration. This tragedy occurred on the day on which Lebanon was commemorating its independence, and at a time when it was hoped that the acts of violence which for so long had ravaged that country were a thing of the past.

At this moment of tragedy, I appeal to the Lebanese people to renounce violence and unite in determination to restore the values which made Lebanon

(The Secretary-General)

great. They owe it to the memory of President Moawad and the other Lebanese leaders who sacrificed their lives in the service of their country to continue with courage the process of national reconciliation and reconstruction of the legal institutions of Lebanon.

The PRESIDENT: I invite members of the Assembly to stand and observe a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of President Moawad.

The members of the General Assembly observed a minute of silence.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on Mr. Phoofo, representative of Lesotho, who will speak on behalf of the African Group of States.

Mr. PHOOFOLO (Lesotho): In the current international political climate the international community is distancing itself from the use of violence as a means of resolving political conflicts and differences. The new international mood continues to evoke new hope for all members of the international community.

Just as we hope for the definitive settlement of all regional conflicts, so it has been our fervent hope that an end to the suffering which the people of Lebanon have endured for more than a decade was in sight. The commendable initiative carried out by our brothers in the Middle East was welcomed and hailed as a positive and very constructive contribution towards a return to normality in Lebanon.

It is indeed incomprehensible that the forces of darkness and mischief maintain their shameless and inhuman selfishness in order to attain their personal ends, at the expense of the general welfare, peace and tranquillity so longed for by the Lebanese people and the international community.

On behalf of the African Group and of my country, I must say that we learnt with a great sense of shock of the dastardly and cowardly act that resulted in the untimely death of the President of Lebanon, Mr. René Moawad. The leadership of the

(Mr. Phoofofo, Lesotho)

late President was a product of the intense efforts of all those people who cherish peace and the ideals of democracy. He was the hope of the new Lebanon, which was striving for the happiness and joy of all its people.

The untimely death of President René Moawad is, regrettably, a temporary setback for all the forces of peace, justice and freedom in Lebanon, but the forces of darkness should not deceive themselves; their cowardly act, which was a short-sighted act of frustration and defeat, will bring them no success.

Africa shares the grief of the Government and people of Lebanon. We convey to them, and particularly to the next of kin of the late President, our sincere sympathy and condolences.

We say to the people of Lebanon, draw fortitude and strength from the ideals and principles that guided and made President René Moawad the leader he was; continue to be inspired by all that he stood for and valued.

May his soul rest in peace.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Brunei Darussalam, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Asian States.

Mr. JAYA (Brunei Darussalam): On behalf of the members of the Group of Asian States, I wish to associate myself with the other speakers in expressing our immense sorrow on the tragic demise of His Excellency President René Moawad of Lebanon.

I sincerely extend to the Lebanese delegation, to the people and the Government of Lebanon and to the bereaved family of the late President our condolences and heartfelt sympathy for the loss of their leader.

May I also appeal to all concerned to remain calm and exercise restraint during this moment of sadness. It is hoped that all parties will continue to co-operate and extend their indulgence in the interest of peace and stability in that area.

At this hour of grief, I request, on behalf of the Group of Asian States, that this message be conveyed to the Government of Lebanon and to the late President's family.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Antigua and Barbuda, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States.

Mr. HURST (Antigua and Barbuda): On behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, I wish to convey our heartfelt sympathy to the people and the Government of Lebanon. The acts of violence which have racked that country will only make more difficult the solution of what appears to be intractable problems. I wish to convey to the Lebanese delegation and to the family of the late President that Latin America and the Caribbean share their loss, and we shall continue to act in this forum to promote peace in that region.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Norway, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Western European and other States.

Mr. TELLMANN (Norway): It was with shock and grief that the delegations of the Group of Western European and Other States learned of the tragic news of the assassination of President René Moawad and his compatriots. Scarcely more than a fortnight has passed since Mr. Moawad was elected President of Lebanon; and his untimely death thus coincided with the accomplishment of an important stage on the road to restoring peace and unity in Lebanon and rejuvenating its institutions.

This heinous deed has left the world with a sense of great loss and outrage and the Lebanese people without an inspiring leader who had raised expectations and hope of bringing unity to that war-torn country so that the Lebanese people could achieve peace, dignity and harmony.

In this dark hour we pledge our support to the people of Lebanon and appeal to all sectors of the Lebanese people to keep alive the hope and the vision of President Moawad for a peaceful end to the tragic situation in Lebanon.

On behalf of the Group of Western European and Other States, I should like to convey our most sincere condolences to the bereaved families, to the people and the Government of Lebanon and to our colleagues in the Lebanese delegation.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Kuwait, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Arab States.

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): It was with extreme shock that the Arab Group in New York received the news of brotherly Lebanon's loss of its President, René Moawad, as a result of a hateful criminal act. That loss is not Lebanon's alone, it is the Arab nation's as well. He was a President in whom many hopes had been placed to extricate Lebanon from the plight in which it has found itself for so many years.

If the loss of any President is a grave loss, that of the President of brotherly Lebanon, in the context of the circumstances besetting that Arab country, is indeed so catastrophic that its consequences cannot be predicted.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

The late President, who was a man of moderation and justice, from the very first moments of his election attempted the monumental task of ridding Lebanon of its plight, stemming the bloodshed and achieving national reconciliation. The steps he took testify to the purity of his objectives and were a genuine expression of the wishes of the Lebanese people. However, the criminal hand of blind violence has extinguished that torch of hope in Lebanon.

Death is an act of God, an act we must accept. It is the inevitable fate of every human being. However, the motives behind the assassination must always be denounced and condemned. Truth will always prevail; and the truth of Lebanon is that its people is creative and faithful to its true Arab identity in defending its territorial integrity, sovereignty and institutions and in working for national reconciliation. These qualities have characterized the Lebanese nation and have earned it the admiration of the world. The Lebanese people, which have given their country great leaders such as the late President Moawad, will undoubtedly be able to find a worthy successor through the exercise of its legitimate constitutional process and by upholding the principle of legitimacy. It will thus be able to renew its institutions.

The international community is called upon not to stop short at expressing its feelings of regret for Lebanon and its people. What Lebanon needs under the circumstances is continuing support for its legitimacy, its territorial integrity and the restoration of its sovereignty and stability. It is that kind of ongoing support Members are called upon to extend.

On behalf of the Group of Arab States, which I have the honour of chairing this month, I wish to express our condolences to the Lebanese delegation, hoping that this expression of solidarity will be conveyed to the people and the Government of Lebanon and to the bereaved family.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

The Arab Group is particularly appreciative of and grateful for the feelings of the international community expressed by all the speakers who have preceded me in expressing condolences to Lebanon and its people. We fully appreciate these condolences and the expressions of support by you, Mr. President, the Secretary-General and the Chairmen of the regional groups.

Ashes to ashes; dust to dust.

The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of Yugoslavia, who will speak on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): In my capacity as Chairman of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries at the United Nations in New York I wish to express profound shock and outrage at the tragic news of the assassination of the newly elected President of Lebanon, His Excellency Mr. René Moawad. Allow me to take this opportunity to convey our most sincere sympathy and condolences to the Government and people of Lebanon and the bereaved family at this tragic death.

The late President Moawad will be remembered for his courage and dedication to the cause of the restoration of the national unity and reconciliation in his country, which has suffered for so long. He had assumed his responsible duties at a crucial time for the fate of his country and in full knowledge of the dangers and challenges involved. We join in the condemnation of this senseless and brutal murder, committed by those who have been blinded by short-sightedness and who act against the interests of the Lebanese people and their desire to live in a unified and peaceful country, after long years of bloodshed and destruction.

This criminal act was clearly aimed against the implementation of the Taif Agreements, reached as a result of the tireless efforts by the Tripartite High Committee of the Arab League - efforts which enjoy the full support of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Security Council and the entire international community.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

We believe that in this tragic moment of grief and mourning the Lebanese people will lend its full support to the Taif Agreements, which are widely recognized as the only basis that can guarantee the restoration of the Lebanese State and the establishment of renewal institutions, thus supporting the process that started with the election of the late President Moawad.

We trust that the Lebanese people will overcome the tragic experiences of the past, caused by the national division, and unite in an effort to bring about national reconciliation.

On those lines, we join in the appeal by the Secretary-General to the Lebanese people not to resort to further violence but to unite in their determination to restore the values for which Lebanon was once known and respected. At the same time, we call upon the international community to continue its support of the efforts of the Arab League and the United Nations to ensure the restoration of the national integrity, sovereignty and unity of Lebanon, making their contribution to the establishment of peace and prosperity for that country and region.

The non-aligned countries will spare no effort to contribute to the accomplishment of that goal, for which President Moawad has given his life.

The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of France, who will speak on behalf of the States members of the European Community.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): The Twelve heard with great dismay the news of the despicable assault that cost the life of the President of Lebanon, Mr. René Moawad. At this tragic time, they express their condolences to the family of the late President and all the Lebanese people.

The Twelve pay a tribute to this man, devoted to dialogue, who having been elected to the highest office and fully aware of the difficulties facing him,

(Mr. Blanc, France)

placed his patriotism and his experience at the service of his country. He undertook to act prudently and with clear-sightedness.

The Twelve categorically condemn this cowardly attack, which has occurred at a time when the recent election of a President of the Republic offered Lebanon a chance for a fresh start.

The Twelve reaffirm the need to keep going the peace process begun in Taif - an initiative under the auspices of the Tripartite Arab Committee - in order to set up renewed structures and restore full sovereignty to Lebanon throughout its territory, free of any non-Lebanese presence.

The Twelve appeal to all Lebanese to exert joint efforts in order to enable the process of national reconciliation to succeed, affirming the existence of an independent, united and sovereign Lebanon, whose territorial integrity is respected. The Twelve express their readiness, more than ever, to stand side by side with Lebanon, once again sorely tried.

The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of Czechoslovakia, who will speak on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States.

Mr. ZAFOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia): I should like on behalf of the Eastern European countries to express deep condolences to the Lebanese people on the recent tragic terrorist act. We trust that act will not end the hopes, linked with the election of the President of Lebanon, for a solution of the internal conflicts which have led to the loss of so many human lives.

I should like to emphasize on this occasion the necessity of the practical implementation of the decision of the Tripartite Committee of the League of Arab States on Lebanon.

Once again I should like to express our condolences to the Lebanese people on this sad occasion.

The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of the United States, who will speak on behalf of the host country.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): On behalf of the people and Government of the United States, I should like to express our heartfelt condolences to the families of the assassinated Lebanese President, René Moawad, and those who were so brutally murdered with him.

The United States condemns in the strongest possible terms this cowardly assault on the leader of, and the process of national reconciliation in, Lebanon. We believe that the courage which this constitutionally elected President of Lebanon demonstrated throughout his life should strengthen the resolve of all Lebanese, as well as of the Arab League, in their efforts to continue the democratic process and to restore the unity, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon.

The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the Alternate Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations.

Mr. CHOUERI (Lebanon) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to extend my delegation's appreciation to you, Mr. President, to the Secretary-General, and to the Chairmen of the regional groups, as well as to the representative of the host country. We are grateful for the expression, on behalf of all Member States, of these feelings towards my country on the occasion of this tragedy which has stricken Lebanon and its people as a result of the criminal act of which our President, Professor René Moawad, was the victim.

(Mr. Choueri, Lebanon)

I shall not fail to convey these expressions of sympathy to my people and to the family of the deceased President. The tragic loss suffered by Lebanon and its people during its national holiday is another link in the chain of trials and tribulations that have afflicted this small country and its martyred people for more than 15 years now.

The election of President Moawad on the fifth of this month and the support he obtained from Lebanon, the Arab countries and internationally was an opportunity that is hardly likely to present itself again for the initiation of a rescue process for Lebanon and support of the efforts to ensure reconstruction, unity and sovereignty of the country. This man's death is a great setback for the Lebanese people's hopes and expectations of achieving their national aspirations. For many the question is whether Lebanon has lost the only possible chance of saving itself?

It need hardly be said that there is deep sadness in Lebanon today at the loss of its new President, who, because of his patriotism, experience and moderation, represented the hopes and aspirations of the people of Lebanon. This is why today there is a prevailing sense of despair and loss in Lebanon.

The friends of Lebanon may experience now a sense of confusion and anxiety over the future of the country. This affects all of us in the difficult, ominous times through which Lebanon is now passing. That is why today Lebanon needs the support of the United Nations and the international community. I hope that Lebanon will continue to have the sustained support of the brother Arab countries, the international community, the United Nations - of which Lebanon was one of the founding Members - and the Secretary-General, who has always been tireless in his efforts on behalf of Lebanon. We hope for the assistance we need, because we know, in spite of all the sadness and tribulation, that the salvation of Lebanon is a responsibility accepted by the international community and those that work for international peace and justice.

AGENDA ITEM 28 (continued)POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

- (a) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/44/L.26 to A/44/L.30, A/44/L.31 and Corr.1, A/44/L.32, A/44/L.33, A/44/L.34/Rev.1, A/44/L.35, A/44/L.36 and A/44/L.40)
- (b) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/44/758)

The PRESIDENT: I remind representatives that the debate on this item was concluded at the 52nd plenary meeting, on Friday 10 November 1989.

I draw the attention of representatives to the amendment to draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1 contained in document A/44/L.46.

I call on the representative of Nigeria, who will introduce four draft resolutions: A/44/L.26, L.27, L.28 and L.30.

Mr. ANKA (Nigeria): On behalf of the sponsors, which include my own delegation, I have the honour to introduce draft resolutions A/44/L.26, entitled "International solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa"; A/44/L.27, entitled "International support for the eradication of apartheid in South Africa through genuine negotiations"; A/44/L.28, entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa"; and A/44/L.30, entitled "International financial pressure on the apartheid economy of South Africa".

I would like at the outset to bring to the General Assembly's attention the efforts made by the sponsors of these draft resolutions to ensure that they are very clear and succinct. The length of the draft resolutions has been deliberately kept short. Where a Member State has been mentioned by name, it is merely in the process of giving a true and factual account of the existing reality.

I introduce first draft resolution A/44/L.26 on international solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa.

This draft resolution is similar to that which the General Assembly adopted last year under the same heading. In expressing its concern about South Africa's

(Mr. Anka, Nigeria)

internal situation, its acts of aggression and destabilization against independent African States, and the continuing practice of arbitrary detentions and trials, including those of women and children and executions of political prisoners, the ongoing use of vigilante groups and the stifling of the press, the General Assembly would reaffirm its full support for the majority of the South African people in their struggle to eradicate apartheid totally. It would reaffirm further that, under the leadership of the national liberation movements, the people of South Africa have the right to choose whatever means they deem necessary in order to attain their objective of establishing a free, democratic, unfragmented and non-racial South Africa.

In operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, the General Assembly would list a catalogue of demands the, implementation of which it regards as creating appropriate conditions for free consultations among the people of South Africa with a view to negotiating a just and lasting solution to the conflict in that country.

(Mr. Anka, Nigeria)

Moreover, the General Assembly, in operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, would appeal to all States, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals to extend all possible assistance to the struggling people of South Africa, to step up material, financial and other forms of support to the front-line and other neighbouring independent States that are subject to South Africa's destabilization activities, and, in particular, to contribute generously to the Action for Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid (AFRICA) Fund.

Finally, in operative paragraph 8 the General Assembly would decide to continue the authorization of adequate financial provision in the regular budget of the United Nations to enable the South African liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to maintain offices in New York in order to participate actively in the deliberations of the Special Committee against Apartheid and other appropriate bodies.

With regard to draft resolution A/44/L.27, entitled "International support for the eradication of apartheid in South Africa through genuine negotiations", the General Assembly would express its conviction that the system of apartheid cannot be reformed but must be eliminated. Furthermore, the General Assembly would take note of the declaration of the OAU Ad Hoc Committee on Southern Africa adopted at Harare on 21 August 1989. The draft resolution emphasizes the need for support for the efforts of the South African people to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the conflict in their country through genuine negotiations.

Similarly, in particular in operative paragraph 3, the General Assembly would recognize the urgent need for the lifting of the state of emergency, the immediate and unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners and detainees, the withdrawal of the troops from black townships, the cessation of all political trials and executions, and, lastly, the lifting of the ban on all

(Mr. Anka, Nigeria)

individuals and political organizations opposing apartheid, and the repeal of restrictions on the press.

On behalf of the sponsors, I wish to express our collective hope, and our desire, that this draft resolution will be adopted unanimously. But, more important, it is our hope that member States, in truly following up the provisions of the draft resolution, will contribute to giving effect to its operative paragraphs 4 and 5.

My delegation is equally pleased to introduce draft resolution A/44/L.28, entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa".

Under this draft resolution the General Assembly would reaffirm that apartheid is a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security, and that it is a primary responsibility of the United Nations to assist in efforts towards its elimination without further delay.

The crux of the draft resolution is that it expresses the General Assembly's conviction that the imposition by the Security Council of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations remains the most appropriate and effective means of bringing about a peaceful end to apartheid.

In this connection, the Assembly would also call upon those States that are still opposed to the application by the international community of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa to reassess their policies and cease their opposition to the application of such sanctions by the Security Council. The Assembly would also urge the Security Council to consider immediate action under Chapter VII of the Charter with a view to applying comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa for as long as it continues to

(Mr. Anka, Nigeria)

disregard the demands of the majority of the people of South Africa and of the international community that it eradicate apartheid.

Finally, the Assembly would call upon those States that have increased their trade with South Africa to sever those trade relations.

In submitting draft resolution A/44/L.30, on international financial pressure on the apartheid economy of South Africa, the sponsors wish to reiterate that the financial support given to the apartheid régime by some member States constitutes an affront to the international community and defiance of the United Nations General Assembly. The General Assembly, therefore, calls on Member States that continue to maintain trade and financial links with South Africa to restrict the provisions of the trade and to cease such collaboration with South Africa. It would also call on Governments and other bodies to take adequate measures to give effect to the draft resolution. We urge Member States to vote unanimously for adoption of the draft resolution.

Considering the importance of the question of apartheid, which has been declared a crime against humanity, and the progressively deteriorating situation in South Africa, I wish, on behalf of the sponsors, to take this opportunity to appeal to all delegations to give this draft resolution their maximum support. It is necessary at this juncture that the General Assembly indicate to South Africa in very clear terms that the international community will no longer tolerate the abhorrent system of apartheid.

On behalf of the sponsors of these draft resolutions, I ask members of the Assembly to show their support, individually and collectively, for the anti-apartheid struggle by voting for the draft resolutions. In doing so, we shall be lending our support to resolution of the crisis in South Africa by peaceful means.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of India, who will introduce draft resolution A/44/L.29, entitled "Imposition, co-ordination and strict monitoring of measures against racist South Africa".

Mr. DAMODARAN (India): On behalf of the sponsors, which include my country, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/44/L.29, entitled "Imposition, co-ordination and strict monitoring of measures against racist South Africa". In this context, I should like to add that Barbados, Haiti, Jamaica, Myanmar, Pakistan and Suriname have also become sponsors.

This draft resolution recalls previous resolutions on sanctions against South Africa, but also takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on restrictive measures affecting externally dependent areas of the South African economy and of the recommendations contained in the report of the Panel of Eminent Persons, which held public hearings on the activities of transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia at Geneva from 4 to 6 September 1989. It is pointed out in the fifth preambular paragraph that:

"measures taken by States individually or collectively, while commendable, vary in coverage and degree of enforcement and monitoring".

In this connection, the General Assembly would, under operative paragraph 1, urge all States that have not yet done so, pending the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, to adopt legislation and/or comparable measures to impose effective sanctions, and would list the measures that need to be implemented.

(Mr. Damodaran, India)

It would also call upon Governments, intergovernmental organizations, the specialized agencies of the United Nations, non-governmental organizations and the public at large to take full account of the recommendations of the Panel of Eminent Persons that held hearings on transnational corporations, and request the Secretary-General to report to the Assembly at its forty-fifth session.

I hope that the members of the Assembly will vote in favour of draft resolution A/44/L.29.

The PRESIDENT: I now have pleasure in calling on the representative of Kuwait, who will introduce draft resolution A/44/31 and Corr.1, entitled "Relations between South Africa and Israel".

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): I have pleasure in introducing, on behalf of the sponsors, draft resolution A/44/L.31 and Corr.1. There are 54 sponsors in all, including two States which have recently joined the list, Morocco and Mongolia. The draft resolution deals with relations between South Africa and Israel, which, no matter how hard Israel tries to hide them, keep a low profile on them, or understate them, and no matter what justifications it tries to find for them, continue and, indeed, escalate. Through those relations Israel continues to feed that inhuman régime, which must be fully eradicated.

The co-operation between South Africa and Israel is not limited to trade or economic co-operation. Deserving of condemnation and denunciation as that co-operation is, it has now spread to encompass both military and nuclear co-operation. The aim of this expanded co-operation, which is undeniably important, is ultimately the use of the consequent military and nuclear capability against the people of South Africa, the neighbouring African peoples, the people of Palestine and the neighbouring Arab peoples, and against their just struggle for freedom and emancipation.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

For those reasons, under operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution the General Assembly would condemn the collaboration between the two régimes.

Under operative paragraph 2 it would reiterate its demand that Israel desist forthwith from all forms of collaboration with South Africa, particularly in the military and nuclear fields.

I hope that the draft resolution will enjoy the support of the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: I call now on the representative of Nepal, who will introduce draft resolution A/44/L.32.

Mr. RANA (Nepal): On behalf of the sponsors, which include my own delegation, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/44/L.32, entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid". In this context I wish to inform the Assembly that Haiti, Mongolia, Myanmar, Pakistan and Peru have joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Under the draft resolution, the General Assembly would commend the Special Committee against Apartheid for its work in the discharge of its mandate, in particular in promoting international action against apartheid. In taking note of the annual report of the Special Committee, it would endorse the recommendations in paragraph 274 of the report, relating to the Special Committee's programme of work for 1990.

The financial request in operative paragraph 8 is the minimum amount that would allow the Special Committee to fulfil its responsibilities and carry out the 1990 programme effectively. Therefore, this year the Special Committee, consistent with its self-imposed austerity measures, requests an amount of \$430,000 for the budget. I should like to state clearly that this amount for 1990 should in no way be understood as indicating a reduction in the activities of the Special Committee.

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

We plan to carry out our programmes with effectiveness, especially at this juncture when serious developments are taking place in South Africa. The resources will be used to the maximum to increase pressure and to mobilize action against apartheid.

Under the draft resolution the General Assembly would also request Governments and organizations to provide financial and other assistance for the special projects of the Special Committee and to make generous contributions to the Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid.

Finally, it would appeal to all Governments, intergovernmental organizations, information media, non-governmental organizations and individuals to co-operate with the Centre against Apartheid and the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat in their activities relating to apartheid and, in particular, in disseminating information on the situation in South Africa, in order to mitigate the effects of the restraints on the press in South Africa and effectively counteract South African propaganda.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, who will introduce draft resolution A/44/L.33, entitled "Oil embargo against South Africa".

Mr. NYAKYI (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, as the representative of Nigeria, which is an active and committed member of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa, and as Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, you will understand the satisfaction that I feel at seeing you presiding over the debate at this time. The emergence of the consensus represented in the draft resolution I have the honour to introduce to the Assembly was in no small measure due to your personal contribution in both capacities as well as in your capacity as President of the General Assembly.

For a long time the General Assembly has recognized the importance of an effective oil embargo in the international effort to eradicate the abhorrent system of apartheid. Directly or indirectly, virtually every human activity is dependent on oil. There is, therefore, a sense in which oil can be characterized as the oxygen of the apartheid machine. If we were able completely to deny the régime the oil supplies it requires, the whole system would grind to a halt. Its security forces would be virtually grounded and, with them, much of its ability to oppress and repress its people and to commit acts of aggression and destabilization against front-line and other neighbouring States. This reality is, of course, also known to the régime and to the Governments and oil and shipping companies which share a common desire with the régime to frustrate the embargo - which explains to a great extent the immense difficulties the Intergovernmental Group faces in carrying out its mandate to investigate and expose violations of the oil embargo.

Monitoring the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa is one of the most difficult tasks in the enforcement of sanctions against apartheid. The absence of mandatory action by the Security Council constitutes the most serious obstacle. But, additionally, certain Governments, as well as the oil

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic
of Tanzania)

and shipping industries, are not co-operative in taking effective and concrete measures to enforce the embargo. In spite of these difficulties, the Intergovernmental Group has been able to make some progress in its work.

Draft resolution A/44/L.33 is the result of a consensus reached by the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa after thorough consideration of all aspects of our mandate and our work. This draft resolution, which is essentially the same as resolution 43/50 J, adopted by this body last year, contains three new elements, which I should like to explain briefly.

There are three new operative paragraphs, namely, paragraphs 2, 3 and 6. In operative paragraph 5, subparagraphs (g) and (h) have been rephrased.

Operative paragraph 2 addresses itself to the work of the Intergovernmental Group in a new area of possible violation of the embargo. This new area of inquiry is the monitoring of port calls which may have resulted in possible clandestine deliveries of oil to South Africa. The number of such calls over three years, from 1986 through 1988, was no less than 474, and the number of Governments from which information has had to be requested for thorough clarification of those 474 cases was no less than 57. The information necessary for evaluating these cases is often available in the records of harbour authorities, maritime ministries or the like and must be obtained and analysed before the results can be communicated back to the Intergovernmental Group. This, of necessity, requires time. Therefore the Intergovernmental Group felt it necessary to postpone reporting on this matter for another six months in order to give Governments adequate time to compile and analyse the required information. The area is new and technically complex. Before making its final judgement, the Intergovernmental Group felt it would also benefit from further consultations.

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic
of Tanzania)

In operative paragraph 3 note is taken of the report of the Panel on the Hearings on the Oil Embargo against South Africa, which met in New York on 12 and 13 April 1989. This was a special event in this year's work in discharging the mandate contained in resolution 43/50 J.

In operative paragraph 5, subparagraphs (g) and (h), the words "petroleum products" have been added to make it clear that what is said about oil, that is, petroleum in its crude form, also applies to refined petroleum products. These words were not contained in the equivalent subparagraphs of last year's resolution. However, this year's hearings on the oil embargo have led to a greater appreciation of the importance of shipments of petroleum products to the apartheid régime. In addition, the words "petroleum products" were included alongside the word "oil" in subparagraph (b) of the same paragraph last year, and the discrepancy in the wording of these subparagraphs could have led to a misunderstanding that the words "petroleum products" applied only to trade in oil and not to its transportation. This not being the case, it was decided to standardize the terminology in all relevant subparagraphs.

Finally, operative paragraph 6 makes provision for enhancing public awareness of the oil embargo against South Africa. Specifically, it provides for the Intergovernmental Group, when necessary, to consider participating in meetings of other relevant international forums. The Intergovernmental Group has not so far initiated missions of its own, and it has no plans to do so. Last year the Group was invited to attend meetings away from Headquarters. When necessary, the Group would like to take advantage of such invitations in the future. Operative paragraph 6 makes provision for this.

I commend the draft resolution to the General Assembly for adoption and hope it will be adopted by consensus, as was the case in the Intergovernmental Group.

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic
of Tanzania)

I am pleased to announce that since the draft resolution was circulated three more countries have added their names to the list of sponsors: Haiti, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Venezuela.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Zambia, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Military collaboration with South Africa".

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): It is a great honour and privilege for me, as a representative of one of the front-line States, to introduce the draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Military collaboration with South Africa".

I wish to emphasize that the independent African countries of southern Africa view with deep concern the collaboration of States and organizations with South Africa in the military, nuclear, intelligence and technological fields, which has over the years strengthened the military machine of the racist Pretoria régime.

(Mr. Eise, Zambia)

To a large extent, this collaboration has contributed to the repression of the black majority in South Africa by the racist régime and to its committing acts of aggression and destabilization against the front-line and other independent African States in the region. The draft resolution I have the privilege to introduce reiterates the need for the full implementation of an arms embargo against South Africa, and expresses serious concern at the increasing number of violations of the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa.

Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution strongly deplores the actions of those States which directly or indirectly continue to violate the arms embargo against South Africa. I wish to emphasize that the text before the Assembly represents the barest minimum we can demand of those who continue to violate the mandatory arms embargo. In the view of the sponsors it does not fully reflect the outrage and the indignation of the international community at large against the violators of the arms embargo against South Africa.

On behalf of its sponsors, I request the Assembly take action on the draft resolution as a whole. In this regard I appeal to all Member States to extend their support to the draft resolution, so that the Assembly can send a unanimous and unequivocal message to the violators of the arms embargo against South Africa.

I wish to inform the Assembly that the delegation of Vanuatu has just joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Pakistan, who will introduce draft resolution A/44/L.35, entitled "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa".

Mr. AHMED (Pakistan): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/44/L.35 on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. The draft resolution is sponsored by 31 Member States. In addition to the States whose names have already been circulated, Antigua and Barbuda, Haiti, Tunisia and Vanuatu, have joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

As the Assembly is aware, the Trust Fund was established in 1965 to provide humanitarian, legal and relief assistance to persons persecuted for their opposition to apartheid and to their dependants. Over the years, the Fund has enjoyed the strong support of Member States, which have contributed a total of \$35 million to this humanitarian effort and thereby demonstrated in concrete terms their concern and solidarity with the plight of the victims of apartheid, as well as their support for international efforts for the peaceful elimination of apartheid.

As we meet here today, repression of opponents of apartheid in South Africa continues, despite repeated calls by the international community for the release of all political prisoners, the lifting of the state of emergency and the repeal of the apartheid legislation. Recent developments indicate that the international and domestic pressure brought to bear on the apartheid régime did result in the release of some political prisoners and the dismissal of legal proceedings in some cases of political dissent, as well as in the de facto authorization of a few anti-apartheid political gatherings.

It must be pointed out, however, that pressure has to be sustained so as to bring about a speedy end to apartheid. Over the years, the resources from the Trust Fund have helped finance the legal defence of large numbers of political prisoners who otherwise would have been deprived of access to adequate legal assistance. In many cases this year detainees have been released, sentences

(Mr. Ahmed, Pakistan)

reduced and dependants allowed access, with legal assistance provided by the Fund. Furthermore, lawyers have been able in some instances successfully to challenge repressive apartheid legislation, thereby making a tangible contribution to the cause of human rights and the establishment of a democratic and non-racial society in South Africa.

The Secretary-General's report (A/44/556) provides an account of the activities of the Trust Fund since the last session of the General Assembly. The Committee of Trustees of the Trust Fund has been making every effort to meet, to the extent possible, the ever increasing needs for assistance from the Trust Fund. Voluntary organizations involved in assistance to the victims of apartheid have reported increases in the number and extent of requests for assistance.

The draft resolution before the Assembly calls for increased contributions to both the Trust Fund and to the voluntary organizations involved in providing assistance to the victims of apartheid. It has long been recognized that the legal and humanitarian assistance from the Trust Fund represents a tangible contribution to the elimination of apartheid through peaceful means. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the Committee be able to provide assistance commensurate with the ever increasing demand on its limited resources. Therefore, I should like on behalf of the Committee of Trustees to take this opportunity to appeal to Member States, and particularly to those that have not yet contributed to the Trust Fund, to consider the special circumstances and translate their solidarity with the plight of the victims of apartheid, so eloquently expressed from this rostrum in the last few days, into a generous contribution to this international humanitarian effort.

(Mr. Ahmed, Pakistan)

On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/44/L.35, I express the hope that this year, as in the past, the General Assembly will adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Denmark, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/44/L.36, entitled "Concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid".

Mr. MORTENSEN (Denmark): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/44/L.36 entitled "Concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid".

For the last six years a similar text has been submitted as the result of a joint effort by a number of countries, with the aim of rallying as broad as possible support of the international community on ways and means finally to persuade South Africa of the necessity to abolish apartheid.

The draft resolution emphasizes the responsibility of the United Nations and the international community to co-ordinate and render more effective its pressure on South Africa as a way of achieving the immediate abolition of apartheid by peaceful means. It urges the Security Council to consider without delay the adoption of effective mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

Similarly, the draft resolution recognizes the urgent need for assistance both to the oppressed people of South Africa and to the neighbouring States. This is reflected in appeals to increase humanitarian, legal and educational assistance to the victims of apartheid, as well as assistance to the front-line States and to the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC).

While continuing to favour effective mandatory sanctions by the Security Council, the draft resolution, pending such action, contains an appeal to increase the pressure on the apartheid régime by implementing a large number of voluntary measures listed in operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution.

The present text is sponsored by a wide group of countries: Angola, Australia, Austria, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Iceland, India, Ireland, Madagascar, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Sweden, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. In addition, the following States have today joined us as sponsors: Antigua and Barbuda, the Congo, Haiti, Jamaica, Pakistan and Peru.

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

It is in the light of the manifest need for joint international action that we now urge all Member States to support the just aspirations of the South African people by casting a positive vote on this draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Ghana, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/44/L.40, entitled "Support for the work of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports".

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I have the honour and the pleasure to introduce to the General Assembly draft resolution A/44/L.40, entitled "Support for the work of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports", and the first report of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports, contained in document A/44/47, dated 27 October 1989. Both documents represent a landmark in a sequence of events stretching as far back as 1977. As members recall, the General Assembly at its thirty-second session adopted and proclaimed the International Declaration against Apartheid in Sports. An Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports was set up and worked continuously on the Declaration, and in 1985 it submitted the final text of the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports to the General Assembly for adoption. Since then it has become an important instrument in the struggle against apartheid, ratified or acceded to by 43 States to date. It is the Commission's hope that those States which have as of now only signed but not ratified the Convention will soon do so and that those States which have not yet acceded to it will also proceed to do so.

It will further be recalled that the Convention also made provision for the establishment of a Commission mandated to assist in achieving the objectives of the instrument. The Commission held its first session this year in New York, during which it deliberated on various issues connected with apartheid in sports. I have the honour therefore to present the Commission's report to the General Assembly.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

It is important to stress that in the performance of its mandate the Commission will continue to work closely with the Special Committee against Apartheid and with the International Olympic Committee and other sporting organizations. This co-operation is vital to the successful performance of our mandate. The Commission hopes to expand its co-operation with national and international sporting organizations in the future.

On behalf of the Commission and on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/44/L.40, I wish to remind those States which have not yet submitted national reports on the implementation of the Convention to do so. Guidelines for reporting on implementation are contained in annex 5 of the report of the Commission, which the Commission hopes will help States submit reports.

An extremely important instrument for the practical implementation of the international community's endeavours to eliminate apartheid in sports and to help isolate the apartheid régime is the Register of Sports Contacts with South Africa, which is issued annually by the Special Committee Against Apartheid.

I wish also to recall that the Assembly has urged sports organizations and athletes to adhere to the boycott of apartheid sports. May I therefore take this opportunity again to call on all those sportsmen and women whose names are currently included in the Register to terminate their sports contact with South Africa and to give assurance that they will abide by the boycott of apartheid sports by refraining from engaging in any sporting activities in or contacts with South Africa while the system of apartheid still prevails in that country.

In its report the Commission calls upon all Governments, sports organizations and individual sports persons to observe the policy of sports isolation of apartheid South Africa and to consult the Register, which the Special Committee

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

against Apartheid will continue to issue. The Register has proved most effective. An increasingly large number of sportsmen and women have, at their individual request, been deleted from the Register. This bold stand against apartheid is an appreciated step. It means that more and more athletes, sportsmen and women are accepting the principles the States parties have incorporated in the Convention. Indeed, it also means that, despite enormous pressures being exerted on them, increasing numbers of sportsmen and women who pledge to boycott sporting contacts with South Africa until apartheid is eradicated are making a public moral choice against racism, racial discrimination and apartheid in sports. Finally, it testifies to the increasing political sensitivity of the world sporting community towards the overwhelming majority of South Africans who are denied their human and political rights because of their colour.

The Commission's report consists of five sections which highlight the work of the Commission. Emphasis has been placed on the importance of holding consultations with international and national sporting organizations and on their vital role in the isolation of apartheid in sports. As I have mentioned earlier, the report stresses the importance of the continued issuance of the Register by the Special Committee.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

While expressing appreciation of the action taken by the International Olympic Committee and other sports organizations, as well as by individual sportsmen and sportswomen, to ensure the total isolation of South Africa, we call for more action to that end, particularly by those federations which continue to admit South Africa to their membership or allow sports contacts with South Africa.

Our task represents an affirmation of the Olympic principles, which stipulate that there should be no discrimination in the field of sports on account of colour, race or ethnic origin. Furthermore, apartheid represents an affront to humanity, therefore there can be no moral sports contacts with an abnormal society.

We hope that the work of the Commission will expedite the eradication of apartheid from sports and the society in South Africa.

The co-sponsors of draft resolution A/44/L.40 therefore request members of the General Assembly to give that draft resolution enthusiastic support.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Chile, who wishes to introduce an amendment (A/44/L.46) to draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1.

Mr. DAZA (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): My country is requesting an amendment to draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1 entitled "Military collaboration with South Africa", because it contains a reference which is not in accordance with fact. Chile is not an outlet for the sale of South Africa's military hardware. The report of the Special Committee against Apartheid refers to South Africa's participation in an international air show held in Santiago in March 1988. That statement is correct.

The Chilean Mission received communications concerning that event from the competent bodies of the United Nations active in this area when the air show was under way. It responded immediately last year to the concerns expressed and stated the following:

(Mr. Daza, Chile)

"My Government wishes to reaffirm to the Committee that it pays the greatest attention to and fully respects the various Security Council resolutions and intends to comply with them in its international relations. It wishes to reaffirm that it will instruct the competent agencies to pay special attention to the points that have been made when future events of this kind are organized."

As a result of this demonstration of its position, there is no question of South Africa participating in the forthcoming international air show, which will take place in Santiago next March.

We do not wish the paragraph to be eliminated from the draft resolution because we do not wish to imply that we oppose the concepts referred to therein. We simply request that Chile's name be eliminated and that operative paragraph 2 be drafted as follows:

"Further deplores the actions of certain countries which have become important outlets for the sale of South Africa's military hardware and strongly urges them to refrain forthwith from such acts."

Our position of opposition to apartheid has been clearly established in statements made by successive Ministers for External Relations of my country in the Assembly and also by Chile's stance on this issue at the present session. For these reasons, we believe that the new language that we are proposing for operative paragraph 2 better reflects the concern of the international community and will be a greater contribution to the cause of opposition to apartheid.

I ask the Assembly and especially the Group of African States, and the countries sponsoring the draft resolution to demonstrate the necessary objectivity by adopting my country's amendment.

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Assembly that the lists of additional sponsors of the draft resolutions before us will be issued as addenda to the respective draft resolutions.

Before the Assembly begins its consideration of the 12 draft resolutions before it, which have just been introduced, I wish to draw the attention of members to the fact that the revised version of the draft resolution on military collaboration with South Africa - draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1 - and the proposed amendment thereto (A/44/L.46) have been circulated only today. It has been requested that, if possible, the revised draft resolution and the amendment thereto be considered at this meeting together with the other draft resolutions. With regard to the proposals before the Assembly rule 78 of the rules of procedure reads, in part, as follows:

"As a general rule, no proposal shall be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the General Assembly unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting. The President may, however, permit the discussion and consideration of amendments, or of motions as to procedure, even though such amendments and motions have not been circulated or have only been circulated the same day."

In view of the limited time available and the desire of members to dispose of this item expeditiously, I suggest that, with the Assembly's concurrence, it proceed to take a decision today on draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1 and the amendment thereto (A/44/L.46). If I hear no objections, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to this proposal.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now turn to consideration of the draft resolutions before the Assembly.

I call first on representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on any or all of the draft resolutions. I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. BROCHAND (France) (interpretation from French): The twelve member States of the European Community, on whose behalf I have the honour of speaking, have strongly reaffirmed during the debate their total rejection of the apartheid system. Our objective remains the abolition, pure and simple, of that odious system. In this, the United Nations has a crucial role to play.

By and large, the draft resolutions submitted to us differ little from those adopted by the Assembly at its forty-third session.

(Mr. Brochand, France)

The adoption this year of a new draft resolution by consensus demonstrates, however, that a constructive approach to the elimination of apartheid is possible. The Twelve would like to see in future a larger number of draft resolutions being adopted by consensus. Indeed we believe that a unanimous vote in the General Assembly would help to strengthen the urgent appeal the international community is making to South Africa with a view to the total and final elimination of the system of apartheid.

Furthermore, the Twelve regret that some of the texts currently before the Assembly contain elements which give rise to reservations in principle on their part. They therefore believe that the distribution of powers between the General Assembly and the Security Council as provided for in the Charter should be strictly complied with. In particular, only the Security Council is authorized to adopt decisions that are binding upon Member States.

Similarly, the Twelve would like to reiterate their dedication to the principle of universality of the United Nations. We cannot support appeals for the total isolation of South Africa, which would not serve our common objective - the abolition of apartheid. The Twelve are especially of the view that the means of communication should remain open so that the outside world might effectively exert pressure on the South African Government with a view to the dawning of a free, democratic society without racial discrimination.

During the debate the Twelve expressed grave concern over the continued violence and repression in South Africa, while noting with interest the developments which are under way. We remain convinced that peaceful change is still possible and that the United Nations should encourage it, as recommended by the Charter. Even though we do understand the helplessness of the majority of the people of South Africa, we cannot agree that draft resolutions adopted by the General Assembly should approve the use of force or armed struggle.

(Mr. Brochand, France)

The Twelve reaffirm that they are firmly opposed to having, in an arbitrary, selective and unjustified manner, certain Member States or groups of countries mentioned by name. The Twelve deplore that practice especially since this year one State member of the European Community has been implicated by name. That is why we shall vote against draft resolution A/44/L.34, on military co-operation with South Africa, if that implication is maintained. The Twelve continue, however, to support firmly the arms embargo against South Africa, as decided by the Security Council.

The Twelve also remain faithful to the Olympic ideal and reject any form of apartheid, and in sports as well. In their respective countries the organization of sports meetings comes within the sphere of private initiative. The national sports organizations are well aware of the opposition of their Governments to sports competitions which violate the Olympic ideal. The Twelve will continue to discourage firmly any sports contacts which involve racial discrimination.

For all those reasons the Twelve will not be able to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions submitted today. They nevertheless remain firmly committed to act, both collectively and individually, to convince the South African Government of the need to abolish apartheid and to that end to begin basic reforms, as demanded by the international community.

Mr. MORTENSEN (Denmark): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries - Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark.

The Nordic countries have during the general debate expressed their strong condemnation of South Africa's abhorrent policies of apartheid. Apartheid constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. Consequently the Security Council should adopt, as soon as possible, effective sanctions against

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

South Africa as a means of achieving the peaceful abolition of apartheid. Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions are the most effective instrument to that end. Pending such sanctions the Nordic countries have, as previously described, adopted a wide range of unilateral measures against apartheid, including a trade embargo.

The Nordic countries agree with the main thrust of the draft resolutions before the Assembly.

We particularly welcome the introduction this year of a new draft resolution on international support for the eradication of apartheid in South Africa through genuine negotiations, which seems likely to be adopted without a vote. This augurs well for the special session on apartheid next month.

Some of the other draft resolutions do, however, continue to raise difficulties with regard to questions of principle important to the Nordic countries. I shall briefly describe them.

First, the Nordic countries consider universality a basic principle of the United Nations and we cannot, therefore, accept formulations that might put that principle in doubt. Secondly, peaceful solutions to conflicts is a fundamental principle enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations; therefore, we cannot accept that the United Nations should directly or indirectly endorse the use of armed struggle. Thirdly, the Nordic countries deplore the continued practice of selectively singling out individual countries and groups of countries. This practice - most evident in the draft resolution on relations between Israel and South Africa - makes it all the more difficult to achieve international concerted action in the struggle against apartheid. For similar reasons the Nordic countries will not be able to support draft resolution A/44/L.34, even though we strongly support the scrupulous and full implementation of the Security Council's arms

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

embargo against South Africa. Fourthly, certain formulations would encroach upon constitutional freedoms and rights of Nordic citizens and private organizations. This applies in particular to certain parts of the International Convention for the Prevention of Apartheid in Sports. In view of the strict and active policy of the Nordic countries against sport contacts with South Africa, they regret that they cannot fully endorse the Convention. Fifthly, because of the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the provisions of the Charter we must reserve our positions with regard to formulations which fail to take into account the fact that only the Security Council can adopt decisions binding on Member States.

The Nordic countries will also this year vote in favour of the draft resolution on the imposition, co-ordination and strict monitoring of measures against racist South Africa in spite of the fact that the text poses a number of difficulties for us. It is well known that the Nordic countries have imposed one of the most comprehensive packages of sanctions against South Africa. We do, however, have reservations on some of the selective sanctions listed in operative paragraph 1, in particular subparagraphs (d), (f), (g) and (h) of draft resolution A/44/L.29.

The situation in southern Africa remains critical. The responsibility for this situation rests with the South African Government and its policy of apartheid, but the world community has moral as well as legal obligations according to the Charter of the United Nations and should therefore maintain its pressure on South Africa by adopting effective sanctions against the apartheid régime. Also, the international community should urgently increase its economic and humanitarian assistance to the Southern African Development Co-operation Conference and to individual countries and persons that are victims of South Africa's aggressive

(Mr. Mortensen, Denmark)

policy. We must all voice our strongest condemnation of apartheid but also strive to agree on concerted international action of effective concrete steps to achieve rapidly the abolition of apartheid.

Mr. KAGAMI (Japan): Japan firmly and steadfastly opposes racial discrimination in all its guises and extends maximum co-operation to United Nations efforts for the elimination of apartheid. It is in this spirit that we will support four draft resolutions, A/44/L.27, L.32, L.35, and L.36. Indeed, Japan co-sponsored draft resolution A/44/L.35, on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, the efforts of which we value highly.

(Mr. Kagami, Japan)

As for draft resolution A/44/L.36, on concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid, my delegation will support it as a positive effort to achieve unity in the international community, although we have some difficulty with some of the wording. At the same time, my delegation believes that comprehensive and mandatory sanctions and international financial pressure must be considered with the utmost care.

As for the remaining draft resolutions, although my delegation fully supports those elements contained in them that are common to the ones in draft resolutions A/44/L.27 and A/44/L.36, they also contain certain formulations to which we cannot subscribe, such as those commending armed struggle. Furthermore, as a matter of principle, Japan is opposed to the practice of name-calling in resolutions of the United Nations. My delegation will vote on those draft resolutions accordingly.

Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom): My delegation is in full agreement with the statement made a few moments ago by the representative of France on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, but I should like to add a brief explanation, on a national basis, of the votes which my delegation will cast.

I should emphasize, as we have done on many previous occasions, that my delegation shares the abhorrence of apartheid expressed by all those who have spoken in this debate. We utterly condemn apartheid and we wish to see its total eradication. Only then can all the inhabitants of South Africa live in dignity and play a full part in the political life of their country. The United Nations can play a role in bringing this about.

We therefore share the objective of the sponsors of the draft resolutions before us today. But we believe that the United Nations can play a more positive and constructive role in helping a new South Africa to emerge. Over the last few months there have been important and positive changes in South Africa. The new South African Government is formally committed to the concept of negotiations.

(Mr. Richardson, United Kingdom)

Peaceful political activity by the black majority has been accepted. Eight of the political prisoners whose release has long been a goal of this Organization have been set free.

In these new circumstances the British Government believes that the United Nations should concentrate now on encouraging change rather than on punitive actions against a Government which is already committed to it. The Kuala Lumpur statement on southern Africa issued after the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting last month recognized that important changes were under way in South Africa and that a relaxation of existing sanctions should be considered when there was evidence of clear and irreversible change. We do not believe that the time is right to be considering further measures and shall accordingly vote against several of the draft resolutions before us.

But we shall join the consensus on draft resolution A/44/L.27, on international support for the eradication of apartheid in South Africa through genuine negotiations, as it is consistent with our own approach, and on the understanding that it is intended to help bring about peaceful change. We do not regard our acceptance of operative paragraph 3 (e) of that draft resolution as implying any change in our policy relating to the application of the ordinary criminal law in South Africa.

We shall, as we did last year on a similar text, abstain on draft resolution A/44/L.32, on the programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid, even though we do not agree with many of the elements of the Committee's report. The appropriation of a sum of money for unspecified activities is incompatible with the principles of programme budgeting.

Finally, we look forward to participating constructively in the preparatory negotiations leading to the special session against apartheid later this month. We hope that the special session will send an unequivocal message to the South African

(Mr. Richardson, United Kingdom)

authorities that the international community is determined to help bring about the end of apartheid through peaceful means as soon as possible. As my Prime Minister said in an interview with the black South African newspaper The Sowetan last month, domination of the majority by a minority is practically and morally unacceptable.

Mr. DA COSTA PEREIRA (Portugal): The Permanent Representative of France has already expressed the common views of the 12 States members of the European Community on the draft resolutions before us. It goes without saying that Portugal fully subscribes to that statement.

Portugal has often expressed, not only in the United Nations but also in other forums, the conviction that the system of apartheid constitutes a violation of basic human rights and human dignity and must be dismantled in order to create a full democracy on a non-racial basis.

As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal stated during the general debate, the international community demands a change in the situation of polarization that exists between the black majority and the white minority and considers the recent release of eight political prisoners to be an important step towards the establishment of dialogue in South Africa.

Portugal is in favour of the tenor of most of the principles in the draft resolutions before us, but we still have reservations regarding certain aspects. We do not agree that United Nations draft resolutions should endorse violence, as appears to be done in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/44/L.26, referring to the justification for armed struggle. On the contrary, they should encourage peaceful change and national reconciliation.

Furthermore, we do not believe that the imposition of punitive and other measures aimed at the total isolation of South Africa, including provisions to sever all air, sea and other transport links with South Africa - provisions contained in draft resolution A/44/L.29 - will help to dismantle apartheid.

(Mr. Da Costa Pereira, Portugal)

We cannot support the calls for the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions contained in some of the preambular and operative paragraphs of draft resolution A/44/L.28, for we consider that they would militate against the interests of the majority of the South African people.

With respect to draft resolution A/44/L.30, my Government cannot endorse some of its provisions - namely, those contained in operative paragraph 1 - which we believe lie strictly within the competence of the international private banking sector. We shall therefore be forced to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution.

It is our deep conviction that only world-wide consensus can be the basis for effective international pressure to create a free and democratic society in which all South Africans enjoy equal human, political and civil rights.

Mr. NOTERDAEME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): It goes without saying that Belgium fully agrees with the statement just made by the Permanent Representative of France on behalf of the States members of the European Community. I should like, however, to make more specific the reasons for the votes my delegation is about to cast.

Belgium regrets that draft resolution A/44/L.26 this year once again - as corresponding draft resolutions have done in the past - contains a justification for armed struggle. That is not appropriate in this body. It will therefore abstain on that draft resolution.

My delegation has always opposed a selective and discriminatory reference to certain countries or groups of countries. This year one of our partners in the European Community is twice implicated in this way. That is one of the reasons why my country will vote against draft resolutions A/44/L.28 and A/44/L.34 - if this reference is maintained. The same principle will oblige us also to vote against draft resolution A/44/L.31.

(Mr. Notredaeme, Belgium)

My delegation attaches great importance to the distribution of powers provided for by the Charter. That is why we cannot approve of a call, direct or indirect, for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions. That is a matter entirely within the purview of the Security Council. This is another reason why we shall vote against draft resolution A/44/L.28 and shall abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/44/L.33. In this connection, Belgium nevertheless recalls that it continues to carry out the positive but restricted measures adopted by the States members of the European Community and will apply the embargo on the supply of crude oil to South Africa.

Belgium does not believe that the complete isolation of South Africa, which, moreover, is contrary to the United Nations principle of universality, is likely to foster the elimination of apartheid by peaceful means. That is why we cannot support draft resolutions A/44/L.29, A/44/L.30 and A/44/L.32.

As regards draft resolution A/44/L.40, I can only refer to the explanation that has been given on behalf of the Twelve.

Belgium will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/44/L.35 and A/44/L.36 despite its reservations in respect of the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4 of the latter.

Finally, Belgium will be pleased to join in the consensus that will no doubt emerge on draft resolution A/44/L.27. We hope that the text of this draft resolution will serve as an example for other draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly in future. Thus, further consensus could become possible.

Those are the reasons for the votes Belgium will cast in a few minutes. My country believes that we should work - still and always - towards a peaceful, rapid transition to the elimination of apartheid once and for all.

Mr. KIRSCH (Canada): There can be no doubt about Canada's unrelenting opposition to apartheid - what Prime Minister Mulroney has called a massive and institutionalized violation of human rights. Canada has fought against apartheid because we know that it is wrong. We also believe that it is an issue where our joining forces with others through the United Nations and the Commonwealth has made a significant difference. These shared efforts have brought us to the point where, with continued steady pressure, we could soon hope to see apartheid in retreat. This vision is now within our reach, but it is not yet within our grasp.

On behalf of the Canadian delegation, I shall explain how Canada will vote on the 12 draft resolutions before us. Some of these draft resolutions are improved, versions of earlier ones as was the case last year also, while others show evidence of new and constructive thinking. I hope that this welcome trend will continue as we approach the special session, for it enables Canada and others to respond more positively and brings our overall message closer to the strength of unanimity.

In draft resolution A/44/L.26, on solidarity with the liberation struggle, there is much that Canada can support. Further releases of political prisoners, the lifting of restrictions on organizations and individuals, and the ending of the state of emergency are goals that we have long pressed for and that would help to create a climate for genuine negotiations. Our assistance to the people of South Africa is already substantial and is growing, and it takes many forms. Our assistance to the front-line States and to the countries of the South African Development Co-ordination Conference that suffer from destabilization is larger still. However, even as we look to the launching of a real dialogue on fundamental change, we should stress that violence from any quarter makes realization of this hope more distant, not closer. We cannot condone the use of violence, whether to maintain apartheid or to oppose it, and thus Canada cannot support language that

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

seeks to justify armed struggle. At the same time, we have noted and welcomed the newly expressed preference for peaceful means. Canada will therefore abstain on this draft resolution.

Canada this year will move to an abstention on the draft resolution - A/44/L.28 - that deals with comprehensive and mandatory sanctions. We agree that sanctions work and that Pretoria is beginning to feel their effect. We have ourselves implemented many important sanctions, and we agree that pressure should be maintained at this time. We agree also that mandatory sanctions - notably the vital arms embargo - have a role to play, and we could support efforts to make mandatory some of the other widely applied sanctions. We recognize that South Africa's actions in the past have constituted a threat to regional peace and security. None the less, as my Prime Minister has said, the objective of all this pressure is to bring South Africa not to its knees but to its senses. We should not impose a greater toll than is necessary to achieve this objective. The comprehensive approach is a last resort - an admission that all else has failed.

Draft resolution A/44/L.29, on the co-ordination and monitoring of measures, is closer to Canada's approach, and shall support it. Thus we shall be supporting such a draft resolution for the second time. The list of measures includes many that Canada and the Commonwealth have implemented. While there are also a number that we have not implemented, the thrust of this draft resolution, clearly, is effective pressure for peaceful change.

Canada will support draft resolution A/44/L.30. Like the Commonwealth's Kuala Lumpur statement, it stresses the importance of financial sanctions against South Africa and the need for wide international participation. However, Canada has difficulties with some of the language. The preamble goes too far in condemning the banks involved in the renegotiation. While we would have preferred that the

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

renegotiation not be completed at this time, the timing at least shows that South Africa considers financial sanctions a serious threat. Operative paragraph 1 ignores the fact that tougher terms, as requested by the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers, were obtained by the banks and that South Africa has paid a high price for this agreement. The renegotiation maintains financial pressure on South Africa, which faces significant capital outflow in the next few years. That said, Canada fully supports the important steps outlined in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 and urges all States that have not already done so to implement them.

Draft resolution A/44/L.31 on relations between South Africa and Israel really has no place under this agenda item, and Canada will oppose it for well-known reasons.

On the work programme of the Committee against Apartheid, Canada, as in the case of similar draft resolutions in the past, will support draft resolution A/44/L.32 because we support much of what the Committee does. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to you, Mr. President, for your leadership in this regard. At the same time, I must clarify Canada's understanding of operative paragraph 2. What the General Assembly is endorsing, in its own words, are those recommendations relating to the Committee's work programme, and only those recommendations.

Canada is, with some regret, unable to support draft resolution A/44/L.33, on an oil embargo. Our own voluntary embargo on oil supply is effective, and we recognize this as a potential area for further international co-operation. None the less, a mandatory embargo on both supply and shipping raises the problem of extraterritoriality of laws and other issues of long-standing concern and particular sensitivity for Canada, and perhaps for others.

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

In the vote on draft resolution A/44/L.34, on military collaboration, Canada will abstain. It is unfortunate that language that would have enabled us to support this draft resolution did not come forward and that, by engaging in gratuitous and largely unsubstantiated name-calling rather than looking for ways to make the embargo more effective, the present text detracts from universal support for the arms embargo.

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

Draft resolution A/44/L.36, on concerted action, is traditionally supported by Canada and we shall do so again. Canada has implemented all the measures in paragraph 7 and also provides substantial assistance to the front-line States, as urged in paragraph 8.

Finally, on draft resolution A/44/L.40, dealing with apartheid in sports, Canada is obliged to abstain. We have difficulty about ratifying the United Nations International Convention on this subject, given our legal, constitutional and human rights framework. Moreover, we do not agree with the principle of secondary boycotts and thus cannot support the United Nations Register of Sports Contacts. That said, Canada has this year further tightened its policy of sports contacts with South Africa - a policy that is already among the toughest in the world. Our objective remains the effective elimination of all sports contacts between Canada and South Africa pending the end of apartheid.

We must all do our part to encourage peaceful change in South Africa. The statements we have heard in the debate and the draft resolutions before us are, taken together, a clear message to the Government of South Africa that it must take more concrete action. South Africa itself knows what it has to do. Let us hope, as we move on to the special session and shortly into a new decade, that Pretoria can find the courage and wisdom to turn over a new leaf. Let us also be ready, while maintaining effective pressure, to recognize progress when it comes and to assist in overcoming difficulties when this would be appropriate.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): My delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions under agenda item 28, entitled "Policies of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa". My delegation recognizes that, in an effort to increase support for these draft resolutions, many of them this year are shorter and milder in tone than the corresponding draft resolutions were in previous

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

years. My delegation therefore hopes that today members of this body will vindicate and encourage the wisdom of this approach through their increased support.

The draft resolutions before us strike the correct balance. They are brief, without losing content, factual without being tendentious, balanced and moderate but not banal and irrelevant. They call for a negotiated settlement to eliminate apartheid; reaffirm the importance of maintaining pressure by intensifying sanctions and other measures to persuade the South African régime to begin negotiations with the genuine leaders of the majority population in that country; stress the need to give assistance to the victims of apartheid wherever they may be; and urge some of Pretoria's key collaborators to eschew self-interest and join the international community's concerted efforts to persuade South Africa to abandon its apartheid policies.

Some countries which have shown little restraint in exploiting the miseries of apartheid are being asked to control their appetite for profit. None of these countries has been condemned. Nor have offensive names or language been used to refer to them; name-calling has been strictly avoided. What we have here, however, is this: some of them have been mentioned by name in order to identify them. In English, that is not "name-calling": it is the mentioning of a name for the sake of identification. Of course, by appealing to these countries by name we hope to bring moral pressure on them to help us in eradicating apartheid by peaceful means. It is true that there are other countries too which in varying degrees are guilty of similar faults. Our hope is that by mentioning the names of the players in the "A Team", we are also sending messages to those in the minor league. The sponsors have not deliberately singled out some countries selectively; these countries have selected themselves by their outstanding achievement in collaboration with apartheid South Africa. The texts merely recognize this reality.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

It is our earnest wish that this year's leaders will do their best to avoid excelling in the apartheid league table once again next year. It has happened once before.

My delegation's affirmative votes on all the apartheid draft resolutions before the Assembly are directed against no country represented in this body. They reflect my country's strenuous efforts to gain the release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, to assist all the victims of apartheid, and to ensure the elimination of apartheid. They are an affirmation in favour of peace, progress, justice and development in southern Africa. With the support of all members of the Assembly, these noble goals can be achieved.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take decisions on the various draft resolutions before it. The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme-budget implications of these draft resolutions has been issued as document A/44/758.

I call on the representative of Zambia on a point of order.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): I wish humbly to remind the Assembly that my delegation has made a formal proposal regarding draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1. In this regard, my delegation will reject any request for division under rule 89 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure. Similarly, my delegation wishes to propose formally, in accordance with rule 74 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure, that the Assembly take no action on the amendment submitted by Chile, which has been circulated in document A/44/L.46.

The PRESIDENT: I can say to the representative of Zambia that the Assembly will deal with that when the draft resolution in question comes up for discussion.

The General Assembly will now begin the voting process and take a decision first on draft resolution A/44/L.26, entitled "International solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden

Draft resolution A/44/L.26 was adopted by 129 votes to 4, with 21 abstentions (resolution 44/27 A).*

* Subsequently the delegation of Bangladesh advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/44/L.27, entitled "International support for the eradication of apartheid in South Africa through genuine negotiations".

May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt draft resolution A/44/L.27?

Draft resolution A/44/L.27 was adopted (resolution 44/27 B).

The PRESIDENT: Next, we turn to draft resolution A/44/L.28, entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa".

A separate vote has been requested on the words "and, particularly, the Federal Republic of Germany, which recently emerged as the leading trading partner of South Africa," in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. If there is no objection to that request, I shall put those words to the vote first.

A separate, recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chad, Chile, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Jamaica, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Myanmar, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire

The words "and, particularly, the Federal Republic of Germany, which recently emerged as the leading trading partner of South Africa," were retained by 53 votes to 40, with 41 abstentions.*

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/44/L.28 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

* Subsequently the delegation of Bangladesh advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belize, Botswana, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Lesotho, Malawi, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden

Draft resolution A/44/L.28, as a whole, was adopted by 118 votes to 11, with 22 abstentions (resolution 44/27 C).*

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will next take a decision on draft

resolution A/44/L.29, entitled "Imposition, co-ordination and strict monitoring of measures against racist South Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Subsequently the delegations of Bangladesh and Papua New Guinea advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

Against: Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Botswana, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Spain

Draft resolution A/44/L.29 was adopted by 135 votes to 3, with 15 abstentions (resolution 44/27 D).

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/44/L.30, entitled "International financial pressure on the apartheid economy of South Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaïre, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

* Subsequently the delegation of Bangladesh advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Abstaining: Belgium, Botswana, France, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Portugal, Swaziland

Draft resolution A/44/L.30 was adopted by 140 votes to 4, with 11 abstentions (resolution 44/27 E).*

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will next take a decision on draft resolution A/44/L.31 and Corr.1, entitled "Relations between South Africa and Israel".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

* Subsequently the delegation of Bangladesh advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Belize, Cameroon, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Grenada, Japan, Malawi, Malta, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/44/L.31 and Corr.1 was adopted by 114 votes to 22, with 18 abstentions (resolution 44/27 F).*

* Subsequently the delegation of Bangladesh advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/44/L.32, entitled

"Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/44/L.32 was adopted by 145 votes to none, with 10 abstentions (resolution 44/27 G).*

* Subsequently the delegation of Bangladesh advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will next take a decision on draft resolution A/44/L.33, entitled "Oil embargo against South Africa".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Botswana, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Israel, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Portugal, Swaziland

Draft resolution A/44/L.33 was adopted by 139 votes to 2, with 14 abstentions (resolution 44/27 H).*

* Subsequently the delegation of Bangladesh advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will next take a decision on draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Military collaboration with South Africa".

Members will recall that the representative of Zambia moved, within the terms of rule 74 of the rules of procedure, that no action be taken on the amendment contained in document A/44/L.46. Rule 74 reads as follows:

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote."

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak under rule 74 of the rules of procedure.

Mr. KARUKUBIRO-KAMUNANWIRE (Uganda): My delegation has asked to speak in order to support fully and whole-heartedly the formal proposal made a short while ago by the Permanent Representative of Zambia on draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1 requesting that the General Assembly take a decision on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. DAZA (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Zambia has requested that no action be taken on the amendment I have proposed. The entire meaning of the debate on this issue is related to the idea of justice and human beings being deprived of their rights.

At this moment I am wondering - aside from human rights and the rights of institutions and countries - what right could be stronger than the right of a country to have its proposal considered. I am not questioning general concepts. I agree with the concept underlying the draft resolution. I am simply proposing a vote with regard to my country's situation - and this goes to the heart of the kind of coexistence we must have in the Assembly. To deny, by a procedural manoeuvre, a

(Mr. Daza, Chile)

country the right to raise such a vital issue as its own position in the Assembly would be incompatible with the atmosphere which should prevail in this body, where the value of justice should predominate in the debates on this issue.

For that reason, of course, I oppose the proposal made by the representative of Zambia.

Mr. GBERO (Ghana): In terms of rule 74 of the rules of procedure, which the President was kind enough to read out to the Assembly a short while ago, my delegation would like to support the motion of the delegation of Zambia, which was supported by the delegation of Uganda. In doing so, I wish to stress that it is not the intention of my delegation to rob any country or any delegation of its rights here in the Assembly. We support the motion purely on the basis of the approved rules of procedure.

It could be argued that to seek to amend a paragraph of a draft resolution is to indulge in procedural gerrymandering, but we do not believe that to be the case; nor is it so if provisions of the rules of procedure are invoked legitimately to take a certain course of action.

It is purely for those reasons that my delegation begs to support the motion of the Zambian delegation, supported by the Ugandan delegation.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the motion submitted by the representative of Zambia that no action be taken on the amendment contained in document A/44/L.46. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, Dominica, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Hungary, Maldives, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Suriname, Togo, Venezuela

The motion was adopted by 72 votes to 39, with 20 abstentions.*

The PRESIDENT: An objection has been made to the request for division in connection with draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1. In accordance with rule 89 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure:

* Subsequently the delegation of Bangladesh advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. BROCHAND (France) (interpretation from French): I have the honour to speak again on behalf of the twelve States members of the European Community. The Twelve would recall that it is not the practice to object to a separate vote when a Member State requests such a vote. Hence, the Twelve support the request made by the Federal Republic of Germany that part of operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1 be voted upon separately.

Mr. HAJNOCZI (Austria): As a matter of principle, Austria supports the right of every Member State to have a separate vote taken.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Zimbabwe on a point of order.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): The representative of Zambia moved that this draft resolution be taken as a whole, without amendment. Specifically he was aware only of the Chilean amendment; but certainly his motion was that the draft resolution should be voted on as a whole. I thought that, as a result of the vote we just took, we had disposed of any attempts to have separate votes on parts of the draft resolution. I seek clarification, but my impression of the way the motion was presented is as I have just stated it.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly voted on the motion presented by Zambia, in accordance with rule 74, that no action should be taken on the Chilean amendment. We are now voting on the motion presented in accordance with rule 89. That is the clarification.

Mr. KARUKUBIRO-KAMUNANWIRE (Uganda): I want to reiterate what I said before and to express agreement with what the representative of Zimbabwe said when he asked for clarification of the problem - namely, that we have voted on the motion submitted by the representative of Zambia.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Zimbabwe on a point of order.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): With due respect, Mr. President, the representative of Zambia, to the best of my understanding, first invoked rule 89, which you, Mr. President, are now referring to; and then, specifically with reference to the Chilean amendment, he invoked rule 74. So both rules were invoked. When the representative of Zambia made the proposal that this draft resolution should be voted on as is, as a whole, he referred specifically to rule 89, and then to rule 74.

The PRESIDENT: We took care of the motion under rule 74, and now we are going to vote on the motion under rule 89.

I call on the representative of Zimbabwe on a point of order.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): The principal motion by the representative of Zambia was made under rule 89. That is the rule he used. In other words, he invoked rule 89 to deal with the Chilean amendment - or any other proposal with this same aim. Now we are being asked to vote again under rule 89 - something that we have already done.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has been requested to vote on the words:

"and two corporations based in the Federal Republic of Germany, for supplying blueprints for the manufacture of submarines and other related military matériel,"

and on the words:

"and upon the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to honour its obligations under resolution 421 (1977) by prosecuting the said corporations;".

Those words are contained in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution

A/44/L.34/Rev.1.

I call on the representative of Zambia.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): When I moved the motion - and there was only one motion - I was invoking rules 89 and 74. Under rule 89, I was objecting to a request for division under that rule, which was, as I understand it, made by the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany. Rule 74 is specific on the same motion, and I was invoking that rule in respect of the request by the delegation of Chile to amend the particular paragraph that refers to his country. I moved one motion and invoked two rules.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Mr. BRAUTIGAM (Federal Republic of Germany): There seems to be some confusion. I should like to point out that no vote has been taken yet on our request for a separate vote, and for that reason I repeat the request that there be a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1, in which the Federal Republic of Germany is named.

The PRESIDENT: If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon. Permission to speak on the motion for

(The President)

division shall be given only to two speakers in favour and two speakers against. To answer the representative of Zambia, he did make a request which was disposed of according to procedure by invoking rule 74. Now a vote will have to be taken on the objection by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with rule 89.

I call on the representative of Malta, on a point of order.

Mr. BORG OLIVIER (Malta): For some time now, I have been trying to raise this point of order so that I may perhaps assist you, Mr. President, in clarifying the procedural situation.

The situation under the rules of procedure is clear, Sir. Any member of the Assembly may request a separate vote. Such a request has been made. Now, any member may similarly object to the division, in which case the request will have to be put to the vote. The statement made by the representative of Zambia can only be interpreted as an objection to division. That is the situation. We have disposed of the other motion under rule 74 and we now have to dispose of the request, and the objection thereto, under rule 89.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with rule 89, I put to the vote the motion for division. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the representative of Zimbabwe on a point of order.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): I have voted twice, on both sides. I am not sure what is required. Could we start the voting process again and be clear on what we are voting?

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Federal Republic of Germany has asked for a division. If your vote is "yes," it will be in favour.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): I take it that if I vote "no", I will be opposing the motion of the Federal Republic of Germany. I intend to vote against.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Ghana.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): What is at issue here is the exact nature of the question that should be put to the Assembly in the present circumstances. That is what is not clear to many delegations. I am in complete agreement with the representative of Malta in his explanation. Now that the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany has explained his motion, it is assumed that the motion of Zambia is against division, in which case it is the motion of Zambia that should be put to the vote. In other words, those who vote for the motion of Zambia will be against division and those who vote against the motion of Zambia will be voting for the proposal of the Federal Republic of Germany to have a division. That should be the exact nature of the question and not the motion put by the Federal Republic of Germany.

The PRESIDENT: Rule 89 says:

"If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon."

I have announced the beginning of the voting, and no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the conduct of the voting.

The representative of Malta has made very clear what the Assembly is voting upon - the motion of the Federal Republic of Germany.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zaire

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining: Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, Cyprus, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, German Democratic Republic, India, Jamaica, Mexico, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia

The motion for division was carried by 58 votes to 45, with 26 abstentions.*

* Subsequently the delegation of Bangladesh advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the following phrases in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/44/34/Rev.1, on which a separate, recorded vote has been requested:

"and two corporations based in the Federal Republic of Germany, for supplying blueprints for the manufacture of submarines and other related military matériel";

and

"and upon the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to honour its obligations under resolution 421 (1977) by prosecuting the said corporations".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Abstaining: Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, India, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Myanmar, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire

By 53 votes to 45, with 38 abstentions the following phrases were retained:
"and two corporations based in the Federal Republic of Germany, for supplying

blueprints for the manufacture of submarines and other related military matériel", and "and upon the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to honour its obligations under resolution 421 (1977) by prosecuting the said corporations".*

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, Chile, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belize, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Grenada, Iceland, Kenya, Malawi, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sweden, Togo

Draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 106 votes to 17, with 26 abstentions (resolution 44/27 I).**

* Subsequently the delegation of Bangladesh advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

** Subsequently the delegations of Bangladesh and Papua New Guinea advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/44/L.35, "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa". May I take it that the General Assembly decides to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/44/L.35 was adopted (resolution 44/27 J).

The PRESIDENT: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/44/L.36, "Concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Germany, Federal Republic of, Lesotho, Portugal

Draft resolution A/44/L.36 was adopted by 151 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions (resolution 44/27 K).*

* Subsequently the delegation of Bangladesh advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT: Lastly we turn to draft resolution A/44/L.40, entitled "Support for the work of the Commission against Apartheid in Sports".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/44/L.40 was adopted by 127 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions

(resolution 44/27 L).*

* Subsequently the delegations of Bangladesh and Mauritania advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after the voting.

I would remind delegations that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. MOORE (United States of America): It is a source of great sadness and disappointment to us that we must meet once again, as we have so many times in the past, to consider draft resolutions concerning apartheid. It is a tragedy that apartheid still exists. The United States Government and people have repeatedly made clear our abhorrence of apartheid. We remain convinced that it must be dismantled and replaced, and we shall continue to work for that objective through peaceful negotiations to achieve a non-racial, democratic system of government.

I shall not elaborate at length my Government's view on apartheid or what steps need to be taken by the South African Government and its people to resolve the situation in that troubled country. We have done so on numerous occasions, in many places. I shall confine my remarks to the draft resolutions that were before the Assembly.

The United States was pleased to be able to join the consensus on the draft resolution on international support for the eradication of apartheid in South Africa through genuine negotiations. My Government has made explicit numerous times its belief that the only way truly to resolve the difficult issues in South Africa is through peaceful negotiations. Violence will not work. It creates problems rather than solving them; it leaves lasting scars which perpetuate hate and fear.

The demands articulated in this resolution are among the actions that can be taken by one of the parties to "help create the necessary climate for genuine negotiations" (A/44/L.27, para. 4). This is not an exhaustive list of what could

(Mr. Moore, United States)

be done nor does it include actions which other parties to this conflict could also take to further and accelerate the peaceful resolution of this issue. If we are to see progress, all parties involved in this tragic issue need to act to forestall violence and begin the process of negotiation.

We are encouraged by the positive actions taken by the new South African Government as well as by the recognition in the Harare Declaration of the need for peaceful negotiations. These are first steps. There is still a long and difficult road ahead. However, if the problems still to be faced are addressed positively and with sincerity, all the South African people will reap the benefits of peace, freedom and democracy.*

Unfortunately, not all the draft resolutions which came before this body demonstrated as much wisdom. As I have already made clear, the United States has repeatedly emphasized its objection to armed struggle, which was endorsed in several of the draft resolutions which came before us. In this forum especially we should not accept language that legitimizes armed conflict. This is wholly contrary to the dedicated search for peaceful solutions to the world's problems which is the *raison d'être* of the General Assembly, our purpose in meeting here. A call to violence only increases the probability of greater violence. For that reason we have again opposed draft resolutions which endorse violence.

My Government maintains firmly its opposition to comprehensive, mandatory sanctions. The irony of the Assembly's call for them is hard to ignore. Others with more active trade ties with South Africa have been among the most vocal in calls for sanctions. The United States has imposed and enforced the most stringent sanctions against South Africa of any Member of the Assembly. The stated purpose of these sanctions is to encourage the South African Government to move through

* Mr. Hurst (Antigua and Barbuda), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Moore, United States)

peaceful negotiations towards the elimination of apartheid and the establishment of a non-racial, democratic society. The release of some important political prisoners, the repeal of laws which segregated some public places, and the visits of South Africa's Presidents to various capitals in southern Africa suggest that South Africa is moving in that direction. While such steps must continue and go further, now is not the time to rebuff these signs of progress by the introduction of additional sanctions by the international community.

My delegation has been on record for many years as opposed to the practice of name-calling by United Nations bodies; yet the practice persists. We cannot support resolutions which single out any country by name to condemn for actions which we all know are also taken by others, including some of the most vocal in their criticism. We shall continue to oppose this practice.

Change is in the air in southern Africa. The time has never seemed better to move the processes of change forward. However, progress must be recognized and taken advantage of. We felt compelled to abstain on the draft resolution on the work of the Special Committee against Apartheid because it failed to take adequate note of the changes which have occurred and are continuing to occur. I also wish to make clear my delegation's position that this resolution does not mandate additional expenditures by the Department of Public Information. It is now time to focus on the future, and we must use all our skills to help devise mechanisms to bring the parties forward. The resolution on eradicating apartheid through genuine negotiations is an example of the type of constructive action that can be taken, and I hope it is an example of the approach we shall increasingly see in the future.

For the first time in years it is possible to be somewhat hopeful that a negotiation scenario may be just on the horizon. The great pressures, internal and external, on South African whites to accept change are growing and are helping to convince the South African Government that it must move beyond its current position

(Mr. Moore, United States)

and accept fundamental change. It is now increasingly clear to that Government that the well-being of the white minority cannot be sustained without a negotiated political settlement that results in political equality for all South Africans. The aim of the United States in all of this is to maximize our ability to promote dialogue leading to full-fledged negotiations on a non-racial, democratic future for South Africa.

Mr. FFIRTER (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): Argentina voted for all the draft resolutions under agenda item 28 because those draft resolutions correspond fully with the principles and objectives that inspired them and faithfully reflect the firm position that has been taken by Argentina with respect to the international struggle against apartheid.

Nevertheless, with respect to the procedural motions in connection with draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1, we voted in principle to support the right of States to request separate voting on the paragraphs that concern those States directly. We also voted for the motion of the Federal Republic of Germany in connection with the content of operative paragraph 1 of that draft resolution because we did not agree that there should be a separate critical mention of States with respect to behaviour that cannot be attributed to the Governments involved. Furthermore, in the case of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Government immediately set in motion a process of investigation into the alleged practices.

In any case, we understand that the practice of naming States militates against the co-ordination of effective intergovernmental action in the struggle to eradicate apartheid.

Mr. GREALY (Australia): The Australian Government's continued and implacable opposition to apartheid was made abundantly clear in our statement on this item at a plenary meeting earlier in the month.

I am pleased to mention that this year my delegation has been able to sponsor four of the resolutions before us - an increase from two - and we have endeavoured to be as forthcoming as possible on others. We welcome the very real efforts that have been made this time to improve a number of the texts, including that of draft resolution A/44/L.26, and to widen support to increase their effectiveness in implementation.

(Mr. Grealy, Australia)

While my delegation supports the broad thrust of most of the texts, I should like to point out that our support should not be construed as agreement to all the elements contained in each of them. We do, for example, retain our well-known reservations with respect to the legitimacy of armed struggle, prisoner-of-war status, the Convention against Apartheid in Sport and the selective singling-out, in resolutions, of particular Member States.

Australia's support for effective forms of pressure, including economic pressure, on the South African Government is well known. We particularly welcome the support this year for draft resolution A/44/L.30 on international financial measures - which is new - and we call on the international financial community to respond positively to its recommendations. The announcement last month by South Africa of an agreement with its foreign creditors on a payment schedule affecting part of its debt has not let South Africa off the debt hook. Very considerable pressure can still be exerted through financial sanctions, including efforts to restrict South Africa's access to trade credits.

My delegation's continuing support for the broad thrust of the resolutions that have just been adopted reflects our belief that the international community must continue to ensure that South Africa receives the clear and unmistakable message that apartheid policies cannot and will not be tolerated.

Mr. BRÄUTIGAM (Federal Republic of Germany): The representative of France, in his statement on behalf of the 12 State Members of the European Community, has explained the position of the Twelve on the resolutions that have just been adopted.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany subscribes fully to this statement and, in particular, shares the essential political principles set out therein. The Twelve have made clear their unequivocal rejection of apartheid and

(Mr. Bräutigam (Federal
Republic of Germany))

their determination to contribute to its total eradication. My delegation would like to add the following.

My Government shares the conviction of this Assembly that apartheid constitutes a flagrant violation of the fundamental human rights laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The system of apartheid cannot be reformed but must be eradicated to create a democratic society in which all South Africans enjoy equal human, political and civil rights.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany welcomes the steps that the South African Government, under its new President, has taken recently. It urges the South African Government to continue along this path without delay and to take further steps - in particular, steps to end the state of emergency, to unban the African National Congress (ANC) and other political organizations in South Africa, to repeal the existing apartheid laws and to release all political detainees, including Nelson Mandela. This could create the conditions necessary for genuine negotiations between the Government of South Africa and the black majority.

It is, however, with great disappointment that my Government finds itself singled out in two of the resolutions that have just been adopted. My delegation is especially concerned that in operative paragraph 1 of the resolution entitled "Military collaboration with South Africa", the Federal Republic of Germany is accused of a breach of the United Nations arms embargo.

I should like to put on record that my Government has at no time approved, allowed or condoned the supply, by German companies, of blueprints for submarines or any other related military matériel to South Africa. It implements the embargo strictly and has co-operated actively with the Committee that was established by

(Mr. Bräutigam (Federal
Republic of Germany))

Security Council resolution 421 (1977) to oversee the implementation of the arms embargo. That co-operation has been forthcoming since the Committee began its investigations into the case. Immediately after receiving information that blueprints were being delivered by two German companies the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany took measures to stop the provision of the remaining parts of the blueprints indispensable for the construction of the submarines.

With respect to the resolution entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa", in operative paragraph 2 of which the Federal Republic of Germany is singled out as the leading trading partner of South Africa, I should like to put on record that by trading with South Africa my Government does not contravene any existing international laws of a mandatory nature. It is well known that many other countries maintain commercial links with South Africa. My Government is aware of the pressure that restrictive economic measures can exert on Pretoria. It is for this reason that the Federal Republic of Germany, together with its partners in the European Community, adopted a range of restrictive measures in the economic field. These measures include, inter alia, a ban on the export of oil to South Africa and a ban on the import of South African steel and iron products. On our initiative, the 12 States members of the European Community recently strengthened the code of conduct that governs the relationship of the European Community companies operating in South Africa with their employees.

(Mr. Bräutigam, Federal
Republic of Germany)

It ensures that none of these companies will discriminate against its black workers. Furthermore, in the past year German companies, as the latest report of the Special Committee against Apartheid illustrates, considerably disinvested their operations in South Africa.

The singling out of the Federal Republic of Germany in the two draft resolutions is arbitrary and unjustified. It is out of place at a time when the international community is uniting in its efforts to press South Africa for the abolition of the apartheid system.

Mr. MATNAI (Israel): Notwithstanding the inclusion of certain formulations on which we have reservations, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/44/L.36, on concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid. Israel voted in this manner in order to emphasize clearly its commitment to the struggle against apartheid and racial discrimination. My delegation, however, voted against draft resolution A/44/L.26, regarding international solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa, since it calls inter alia for armed struggle. My delegation strongly believes that true, genuine and direct negotiations are the only way to solve conflicts, and therefore Israel joined the consensus on draft resolution A/44/L.27, which calls for the eradication of apartheid through genuine negotiations.

My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/44/L.33, on the oil embargo, because its obvious motivation is to divert the focus of attention from the oil-producer States to the shipping States, on which it would lay the blame. It is the firm belief of my delegation that the prime responsibility in this matter rests on the shoulders of the oil-producer countries which have organized a world-wide network of middlemen and straw companies to camouflage their oil deals.

(Mr. Matnai, Israel)

At the same time, my delegation voted against draft resolution A/44/L.28, as it should be a matter for the States themselves to impose and monitor the actions to be taken against South Africa; however, it abstained on draft resolution A/44/L.30.

For the same reason, my delegation abstained on draft resolution A/44/L.40, although Israel itself has curtailed, by the Government's decision of 16 September 1987, sports ties with South Africa and has adhered to the decisions of the international sports associations. My delegation also abstained on draft resolution A/44/L.32, on the programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid, because of the unfair and unsubstantiated singling out of Israel in the Committee's reports.

My delegation voted against draft resolutions A/44/L.31 and A/44/L.34/Rev.1, much debated here, because of the singling out of Israel and the baseless and unfounded allegations against it. It is regrettable that the struggle against apartheid is harnessed to the all-out diplomatic onslaught on Israel staged against it by certain countries.

As for the recent allegations in the press leaning, purportedly, on official documents, they have been emphatically denied not only by Israel but by the very same sources on which the press relied. My delegation wants once again to declare - loud and clear - that it is Israel's adamant and long-standing policy to have no co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field. On 30 October the Minister of Defence of Israel, Mr. Rabin, said in a radio interview:

"When it comes to the nuclear field, we have no relations whatsoever with South Africa and therefore all stories about any relationship between our country and South Africa on this issue are totally unbased and without any justification".

(Mr. Matnai, Israel)

In conclusion, my delegation reiterates without the slightest hesitation the abhorrence of Israel, Government and people, for apartheid and all other forms of racism.

Mr. HAYES (Ireland): My delegation endorses the views expressed by the representative of France in his statement on behalf of the twelve States members of the European Community.

This debate on apartheid represents each year the reiteration of a moral challenge by the members of the international community to a system that is universally condemned. We may disagree at times on particular ways of framing that challenge but we are united in our central moral message: the system of apartheid is unacceptable, it is an affront to all of us, and it debases the standards of justice and reason by which we aspire to live.

In a few weeks we shall have a special session on apartheid. That will be an opportunity for the international community to reassert that apartheid is a bondage of fear and injustice but that it is not too late to build a society that will be based on respect for the rights and dignity of every individual.

Ireland supported six of the draft resolutions before us today, three of which we co-sponsored. We found it necessary to abstain on some draft resolutions as they contain a number of formulations and ideas which are not consistent with my Government's approach. We abstained on four draft resolutions and we voted against two.

I turn first to the draft resolutions which Ireland supported.

Ireland co-sponsored draft resolution A/44/L.27, on international support for the eradication of apartheid. We especially welcome the fact that this draft resolution has been adopted with the support of all delegations.

(Mr. Hayes, Ireland)

Ireland supported draft resolution A/44/L.30, on international financial pressure on South Africa. We agree with the general content of the draft resolution while believing that the right policy for the international community is one of steady and graduated pressure for change through carefully chosen, selective, graduated sanctions. However, we believe such sanctions should be mandatory - that is, that they should be imposed by the Security Council and fully implemented by all countries.

We voted in favour of draft resolution A/44/L.32, on the programme of work of the Special Committee against apartheid. We strongly support the work of the Special Committee in its role of focusing attention on the unacceptable situation in South Africa and of promoting international action against apartheid. I should add, of course, that our attitude to the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee must be understood in accordance with the general policy of my Government.

Ireland voted in favour of draft resolution A/44/L.33, which deals with the question of an oil embargo against South Africa. My Government has for many years favoured the imposition by the Security Council of a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa.

Ireland co-sponsored draft resolution A/44/L.36, on concerted international action against apartheid, which inter alia urges the Security Council to consider the adoption of effective mandatory sanctions against South Africa. We also co-sponsored draft resolution A/44/L.35, on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa; here again, we are pleased that this draft resolution was adopted by consensus.

(Mr. Hayes, Ireland)

My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/44/L.26, which calls for international solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa. We should have liked to vote in favour of this draft resolution as it contains many provisions we support. However, we cannot accept the reference to armed struggle. My delegation has made it clear in the past that we do not wish to see this Assembly endorse violence.

My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/44/L.28, which calls for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions. As I said earlier, we favour the application by the Security Council of a range of selective, graduated sanctions.

We abstained on draft resolution A/44/L.29, on the imposition and co-ordination of measures against South Africa. We agree with the broad thrust of the draft resolution, but certain of its formulations and elements cause us difficulties.

Ireland abstained also on draft resolution A/44/L.40, on the sports boycott of South Africa, which, inter alia, calls on States to ratify the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports. The Convention, unfortunately, contains a number of provisions which are incompatible with provisions in Ireland's Constitution relevant to freedom of travel.

My delegation voted against draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1, on military collaboration with South Africa. We fully support the arms embargo but must express regret at the way in which certain States are selectively singled out in the draft resolution.

Ireland, as in the case of similar draft resolutions in previous years, voted against draft resolution A/44/L.31, on relations between Israel and South Africa, in view of its selective singling out of one Member State of this Organization for condemnation.

Mr. SAVUT (Turkey): Turkey has no diplomatic or consular relations with South Africa. Furthermore, being opposed to South Africa's policy of apartheid, Turkey has always supported all resolutions adopted within the framework of the United Nations and in other international organizations for the eradication of apartheid. Similarly, my delegation has voted in favour of all the draft resolutions presented to the General Assembly on this subject.

Having said that, I wish to refer to the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/44/L.28, entitled "Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa", wherein reference is made to certain paragraphs of the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid. We do not consider that the wording of those paragraphs is appropriate. Furthermore, we are not satisfied with the way in which operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/44/L.28 has been drafted.

Finally, my delegation does not approve of name-calling in General Assembly resolutions, and consequently voted accordingly in the separate votes.

Mr. BORG OLIVIER (Malta): I should like to explain briefly my Government's position on the resolutions just adopted.

Malta fully shares the widespread abhorrence and condemnation of the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa. We are unequivocally committed to their total and immediate eradication and are therefore determined to continue supporting all effective measures, including increasing international pressure, to achieve this objective. We also continue to give our full support to the front-line States. In this spirit, my delegation was pleased to support the seven draft resolutions contained in documents A/44/L.27, L.29, L.30, L.32, L.33, L.35 and L.36. My delegation had, reluctantly, to abstain on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/44/L.26, L.28, L.31 and Corr.1 and L.34/Rev.1, for the same reasons as those given in the case of similar resolutions last year.

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

We also had to abstain on the draft resolution contained in document A/44/L.40. My Government actively discourages sporting contacts with South Africa. It cannot, however, agree to some of the enforcement measures contained in the 1985 International Convention against Apartheid in Sports, which conflict with principles enshrined in Malta's Constitution.

I wish to stress that my Government supports the general thrust of all these resolutions and that our abstentions are addressed exclusively to certain formulations with which we have difficulties, including in particular those involving selective name-calling and those which, in our view, are inconsistent with our commitment to the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes. Our abstentions should in no way be interpreted as a weakening of our unswerving opposition to the policies of apartheid and our full support for all effective measures aimed at their total and immediate eradication.

Mr. KEMBER (New Zealand): The New Zealand Government is pleased at the way in which efforts have clearly been made since last year to ensure that the texts on which we have taken action today reflect the views of a wider section of the United Nations membership. As this year's debate clearly indicated, there is no doubt about the abhorrence that States share for the apartheid system, or about the need for its eradication.

It is therefore gratifying for my Government that this year we have been able to sponsor four of the 12 draft resolutions. These include the resolution on the oil embargo, with which New Zealand, as a member of the Intergovernmental Group, has been closely involved, as well as the new resolution on financial pressures, which is consistent with the decisions taken at the recent meeting of Commonwealth Heads of Government in Kuala Lumpur. We understand that our co-sponsorship of this resolution will be reflected in the final records on this item.

(Mr. Kember, New Zealand)

New Zealand regrets that despite the vastly improved language in draft resolution A/44/L.26, it has not been able to lend its support to the draft resolution. As we noted last year and previously, New Zealand is unable to accept an endorsement of the use of force in a manner inconsistent with the United Nations Charter. We understand and sympathize with the frustration of those who, in their quest for a just and democratic South Africa, face violent repression and inhumane treatment. Violence and repression as practised in South Africa or anywhere else are beyond justification. Nevertheless, New Zealand cannot accept that such action in turn gives licence for other illegal activity. Because of the references in operative paragraph 2, we have thus had to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

New Zealand was unable to support draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1 because of references to specific States. Name-calling is not, in New Zealand's view, acceptable. We much regret the retention of this language in a text whose broad objectives we favour.

With regard to draft resolution A/44/L.40, there can be no misunderstanding on New Zealand's position on sporting contacts with South Africa. On the basis of the Commonwealth's Gleneagles Agreement of 1977, New Zealand is fully committed to the policy of discouraging contact and competition by New Zealanders with sporting organizations, teams or players from South Africa. New Zealand denies entry to South African sportspeople, and we are firmly opposed to competition in third countries between New Zealand and South African players. This policy is understood and accepted by virtually all New Zealand sports bodies.

(Mr. Kember, New Zealand)

New Zealand was, however, unable to support draft resolution A/44/L.40 because of the reference in operative paragraph 2 to a convention to which New Zealand could not become a party. Signature of the International Convention against Apartheid in Sport would be contrary to the obligations already assumed through our ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the provision therein for freedom to leave one's own country. That said, let there be no doubt that New Zealand fully subscribes to efforts by the United Nations to encouraging States to help achieve the total isolation of apartheid in sports, as described in operative paragraphs 3 to 6 inclusive of that draft resolution.

Mr. HAJNOCZI (Austria): Austria is on record as having consistently condemned and opposed the policies of apartheid as a particularly serious violation of human rights that deprives the majority of South Africa's population of their civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. We therefore hold the view that the eradication of this system of institutionalized racial discrimination remains one of the most important challenges confronted by the United Nations.

For these reasons we find ourselves in agreement with the general thrust of the draft resolutions submitted under this item. It is our firm conviction that the international community must stand united in the struggle against the evil of apartheid. Therefore, we regret all the more that a few provisions which Austria cannot support prevented us from voting in favour of some of the draft resolutions.

In particular, Austria has always held the view that the United Nations should concentrate all its efforts on bringing about political and social change by peaceful means. We therefore cannot support the concept of armed struggle, since we firmly believe in the resolution of conflicts exclusively by peaceful means. Therefore, we call for the eradication of apartheid through genuine negotiations.

Let me also reiterate that Austria, as a matter of principle, is against singling out Member States in General Assembly resolutions and that this practice, in our view, does not promote the cause of the oppressed people of South Africa. Moreover, Austria believes that the General Assembly should respect the prerogatives of the Security Council with regard to comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

In the light of these considerations, Austria sponsored draft resolutions A/44/L.27, L.35 and L.36. Although Austria is well-known for its liberal banking rules, we also voted in favour of draft resolutions A/44/L.30, L.32 and L.33. I should like to welcome certain modifications in draft resolution A/44/L.26, but,

(Mr. Hajnoczi, Austria)

for the reasons stated, we abstained on this as well as on draft resolutions A/44/L.28, L.29, L.34/Rev.1 and L.40. Since on legal grounds, Austria will not accede to the International Convention against Apartheid in Sports, Austria cast a negative vote on draft resolution A/44/L.31 and Corr.1.

Our positive attitude to the main thrust of the resolutions just adopted reflects our support for a free, democratic and non-racial society in a united South Africa based on the free exercise of universal suffrage.

Ms. DITLHABI-OLIPHANT (Botswana): The Botswana delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions under item 26, entitled "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa", with the exception of draft resolutions A/44/L.28, L.29, L.30 and L.33, on which we abstained. We did so guided by our strong conviction that apartheid, which is the root cause of the acts of aggression and destabilization in the region and of oppression and repression in South Africa, should be totally eradicated, not reformed. We urge all the parties concerned to recognize this fact and fulfil their responsibilities.

My delegation wishes, however, to go on record once more with its well-known position regarding the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa. Botswana itself cannot impose economic sanctions on South Africa but does not wish to be used as an excuse by those who can and for not deciding to do so.

Mr. EHLERS (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): The Uruguayan delegation, consistent with its traditional position, joined the international community in condemning the racist apartheid régime by voting for the majority of the draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly for consideration. However, in accordance with the position which we have maintained in this and other United Nations forums, we were compelled to express reservations in connection with selective naming of countries such as occurs in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of

(Mr. Ehlers, Uruguay)

draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1. References of this kind are liable to be unfair and discriminatory, for reasons either of inclusion or of omission, and should not appear in texts such as those we have just adopted, the force and authority of which stem precisely from the fact that these draft resolutions formulate general principles and recommendations for application in the resolution of general situations.

For these same reasons, we wish to place on record our reservations with respect to operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/44/L.28.

Finally, we abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/44/L.31 and Corr.1 because we consider that its subject-matter was adequately covered in draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1.

Mr. GUPTA (India): My delegation has consistently stressed the need for concerted and effective sanctions by the international community to exert pressure on the Pretoria régime to take the steps necessary for the peaceful eradication of apartheid. Full and effective implementation of the various sanctions, and in particular the mandatory arms embargo, against South Africa is in our view an indispensable element of international action. Any direct or indirect violation of the arms embargo, therefore, must be deplored in unambiguous terms, and my delegation deplores it without any equivocation.

At the same time, it is important to call upon all States which continue to violate directly or indirectly the arms embargo to refrain from such acts and scrupulously to observe their obligations under the mandatory arms embargo. In operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Military collaboration with South Africa", which has just been adopted, the General Assembly, while deplored the actions of those which directly or indirectly

(Mr. Gupta, India)

continue to violate the arms embargo, calls upon only a few selected countries to comply strictly with the arms embargo against South Africa. While the call upon those States is justified, my delegation is of the opinion that this call should have been addressed to all those States and organizations which continue to violate, directly or indirectly, the arms embargo. The absence of such a call, in the view of my delegation, is an important omission because of which my delegation was constrained to abstain in the separate vote recorded on some portions of operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/44/L.34/Rev.1. I wish to clarify, however, that if the two phrases had been put to the vote separately, my delegation would have voted in favour of the first phrase, which refers to the activities of the two corporations based in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid.

Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Acting Chairman, Special Committee against Apartheid: In my capacity as Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, I wish to express my appreciation to those Member States which supported the draft resolutions, both those initiated by the Special Committee and those prepared by other groups. It is particularly encouraging that draft resolution A/44/L.27, "International support for the eradication of apartheid in South Africa through genuine negotiations", was adopted by consensus. This is one of the welcome rare occasions when on a substantive matter relating to the subject of apartheid the international community has spoken with one voice.

This is a particularly encouraging development and I wish to express appreciation to all those who made it possible. It is an auspicious omen for the forthcoming special session, which will be held three weeks from today.

Forging a united front, an international consensus on the conditions, the process and the goals of political settlement ending apartheid and establishing a free, non-racial South Africa, through genuine negotiations, would represent a landmark in the United Nations and a formidable diplomatic instrument to put pressure on South Africa to eradicate apartheid promptly and peacefully.

I should also like to emphasize the importance of the adoption of all the other draft resolutions by the General Assembly at this session. They are of paramount significance for the speediest achievement of the goal of complete eradication of the apartheid system in South Africa. The Special Committee will be encouraged by the fact that for the first time the draft resolution on its programme of work - this year contained in document A/44/L.32 - was adopted without a negative vote.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Acting Chairman,
Special Committee against
Apartheid)

In the present circumstances, an emerging international consensus on the subject of apartheid would acquire profound importance. I hope that there will be a constructive approach, which does not abandon the lofty principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which does not sacrifice the most essential imperatives of our civilization, which does not neglect the ugly realities of apartheid, which does not disregard the implications of cynical collaboration with the apartheid régime. Such an approach would be of utmost value and would prove to be enormously effective. I sincerely hope that we shall be able to fulfil our challenging task in the very near future.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its 3rd plenary meeting, on 22 September 1989, I now call on the representative of the African National Congress of South Africa.

Mr. MAFOLE (African National Congress (ANC)): Once again this body has had occasion to pronounce itself on a matter which is of great concern to my organization, the African National Congress (ANC), and to the people of South Africa: the issue of apartheid.

We should like at the very outset to extend our profound gratitude to the United Nations, which has expressed itself so unambiguously in condemnation of apartheid, that crime against humanity. We wish to commend the General Assembly for having spoken so unequivocally in favour of democracy in South Africa. Let me also take this opportunity to express our sincere appreciation to all those Member States that not only have expressed their abhorrence of apartheid but also have demonstrated this by casting their votes in favour of the draft resolutions.

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

It is our considered view that today's vote, if anything, will contribute immensely towards strengthening and inspiring the millions of people in South Africa who are daily engaged in a struggle to bring peace and democracy to their country. Today's vote, it is to be hoped, will send an important and very clear signal to the Pretoria régime - namely, that the international community cannot and will not allow itself to be duped by pronouncements of good intentions on the part of the régime of F. W. De Klerk. Indeed, what the United Nations is saying is that the new régime will be judged not by its words but by its actions in ending a system that not only has denied fundamental human rights to the majority of the people of my country because of their skin colour, but also has brutalized and terrorized the people of the entire subcontinent of southern Africa.

It is a matter of deep regret that some Member States, in spite of their declarations of abhorrence of apartheid, have seen fit to vote against some of the draft resolutions. While we recognize and respect the prerogative of those Member States to exercise their vote, we cannot fail to express our amazement at some of the explanations given for the negative votes. We should like very briefly to address some of these questions.

We are being told that the international community should not take action against apartheid, simply because the new régime has said that it is ready to negotiate. It should however be recalled that for many years a number of countries here obstructed concerted international action against apartheid long before De Klerk came on the scene, long before any intention to negotiate was expressed on the part of the South African régime. Therefore, we cannot help feeling that this is a mere excuse.

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

As regards the issue of name-calling, we can only agree with the position outlined by the Ambassador of Zimbabwe in his statement in explanation of vote before the voting.

Regarding the issue of armed struggle, we wish only to state that we have over the years presented our views from this rostrum and in other international forums. Let us merely add that had it not been for armed struggle the representatives of a number of Member States would not be seated in this Hall today, including some of those that have vociferously opposed this method of struggle.

Our organization and the people of South Africa have over the years reiterated their preference for a peaceful resolution of the tragic conflict in our country. In spite of the years of brutal repression, the ANC has never abandoned the hope of a negotiated settlement in South Africa. Indeed, the Declaration adopted by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in Harare and endorsed by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in Belgrade testifies to this. We were therefore highly gratified to note that draft resolution A/44/L.27, entitled "International support for the eradication of apartheid in South Africa through genuine negotiations", was adopted by consensus.

(Mr. Mafole, ANC)

Hence we are highly gratified to note that draft resolution A/44/L.27, entitled "International support for the eradication of apartheid in South Africa through genuine negotiations" was adopted by consensus. It correctly places the onus on the Pretoria régime to undertake measures to create the climate necessary for negotiations. It is therefore to be hoped that the forthcoming special session on apartheid will speak in one voice on this very issue.

In conclusion, on behalf of the African National Congress I wish to thank the United Nations and the international community for their unswerving support in the campaign for the release of political prisoners. We are happy to say that seven leaders of the African National Congress have now been released, after a quarter of a century in prison, to join the ranks of the struggle and to continue the work that has started. May I also say that we shall rely on the international community to continue to apply the kind of pressure that has made it possible for the South African régime to sit at the negotiating table, particularly in the case of Namibia. However, we wish to state here that the onus of the struggle rests with the people of South Africa and that the African National Congress will spare no effort to ensure that our country and the world are rid of the scourge of apartheid.

The PRESIDENT: One representative has requested to speak in exercise of the right of reply. May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to 5 minutes for the second, and should be made by delegations from their seats.

I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of the Zionist racist régime in occupied Palestine, in trying to explain his vote today, has resorted once again to oft-repeated and refuted fabrications. He alleged that the Zionist régime he represents rejects the policies of apartheid in South Africa. In so doing, he simply repeated the statement he had previously made during the general debate, namely that:

(spoke in English)

"Israel and the Jewish people reject and condemn apartheid in the most categorical and unequivocal manner, both as an ideology and as a political system. Together, with all the community of black nations, they call upon South Africa to abolish apartheid, to desist from any kind of racial discrimination and to grant full equal rights to all its citizens - black, white and coloured. Israel and the Jewish people tell Africa and the world forcefully: We are with you in the just struggle to eliminate apartheid and all forms of racial discrimination."

(continued in Arabic)

If we review the 10 resolutions, which have just been voted upon, we shall find that that representative has voted against four and abstained on five. As a ploy, he voted in favour of just one resolution. Even then he voiced numerous reservations which qualified his vote for that one resolution. It is significant that the average number of the delegations which voted in favour of those resolutions was 130.

The representative of world zionism sought to hide behind the sort of rhetoric of which I have just given members a sample and which he has repeated this evening. His honeyed words, however, deceive no one. We are not interested in misleading statements but in declared positions that translate words into deeds. At the time, we pointed out that his words were no more than idle talk.

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

The negative vote by the representative of the Zionist régime in Tel Aviv shows that that racist régime is not merely beyond the pale of the international community but is also the ally of the Pretoria régime. Therefore, that régime is a full partner of Pretoria and lends support for its policies of racism and domination. Its negative vote flies in the face of the international community and the action taken by the Organization to eliminate apartheid. It is also further evidence of that régime's insistence on maintaining relations with the apartheid régime and to co-operate in the political, military, nuclear and economic fields, thus demonstrating the identical nature of the two racist régimes, their community of interests and the oneness of their goals.

The relationship between the two racist régimes of Tel Aviv and Pretoria is a chain with various links. They aid and abet each other in pursuing their expansionist-colonialist goals and ambitions. That is why the Zionist régime is invariably opposed to every resolution adopted by the Organization against the racist régime in South Africa. In this connection, we should emphasize the fact that the Zionist racist régime has never let a single opportunity pass to vote against United Nations resolutions condemning apartheid.

The negative vote by the Zionist racist régime in Tel Aviv is patent evidence that, notwithstanding its misleading and repeated allegations, it supports the apartheid policies pursued by South Africa and encourages its acts of aggression. This demonstrates the degree of credibility we should attach to the statements of the representative of world zionism when he speaks again in the Assembly early next month.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of item 28.

AGENDA ITEM 126

ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY CO-ORDINATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS WITH THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY; REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/44/724)

The PRESIDENT: If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the report (A/44/724) of the Fifth Committee which is before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendations of the Fifth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report (A/43/724).

The Committee adopted without a vote draft decision I, entitled "Harmonization of the statutes, rules and practices of the administrative tribunals of the International Labour Organisation and of the United Nations". May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft decision I was adopted.

The PRESIDENT: Draft decision II, entitled "Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions", was also adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft decision II was adopted.

The PRESIDENT: That concludes the Assembly's consideration of agenda item 126.

The meeting rose at 7.40 p.m.