

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 1240th
MEETING

Tuesday, 3 December 1968,
at 3.35 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 38:</i>	
<i>International Education Year: report of the Secretary-General</i>	1
<i>Agenda item 37:</i>	
<i>United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	4
<i>Agenda item 34:</i>	
<i>United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (continued):</i>	
<i>(a) Report of the Conference on its second session;</i>	
<i>(b) Report of the Trade and Development Board</i>	5

Chairman: Mr. Richard M. AKWEI (Ghana).

AGENDA ITEM 38

International Education Year: report of the Secretary-General (A/7203, chap. XIII, sect. E; A/7239 and A/C.2/L.1031 and Add.1, E/4518)

1. Mrs. THORSSON (Director, Social Development Division) said that it would be very appropriate to designate 1970 as International Education Year, because that would very probably be the beginning of the second United Nations Development Decade. Since the Second World War, greater importance had been given to educational planning for the development and utilization of human resources, a field in which concerted action by the whole United Nations family had legitimately been called for. The need for a reappraisal of national education programmes was being felt in most developing countries. As Mr. Julius Nyerere, the President of the United Republic of Tanzania, had said, those programmes, which absorbed an increasing part of the developing countries' budgets, should be designed to help build the kind of society that was desired. It was a general feeling that International Education Year should provide Governments with an additional opportunity to review their educational needs and to strengthen their educational systems with the assistance of UNESCO and other United Nations bodies.

2. In the notes by the Secretary-General (A/7239 and Add.1), which were before the Committee, information was contained on the steps taken to give effect to General Assembly resolution 2306 (XXII). The Economic and Social Council, in resolution 1355 (XLV), had invited the whole United Nations family to participate in the preparation of programmes of concerted action for the Year, had invited UNESCO to transmit

to the General Assembly the resolution which its General Conference might adopt on the subject and had recommended that the General Assembly should definitely designate 1970 as International Education Year. The Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC), noting that preparations were well under way, had warmly supported the objectives and modes of action for International Education Year,^{1/} as set forth by UNESCO and endorsed by other members of the United Nations family. Finally, in a resolution adopted unanimously at its fifteenth session (see A/7239/Add.1, annex), the General Conference had declared UNESCO's readiness to provide the framework for co-operative efforts in connexion with International Education Year, on the understanding that any studies and operational programmes undertaken in that field would be carried out with particular reference to the objectives and themes specified in the resolution. The General Conference had also authorized the Director-General of UNESCO to assume primary responsibility, in collaboration with other organizations of the United Nations system, for the preparation and execution of a concerted international programme.

3. If the General Assembly so desired, the Secretary-General would be ready to report to the Economic and Social Council at its forty-seventh session and to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session on the progress made in that preparatory work.

4. Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1031, noted that, with the prospect of the second United Nations Development Decade ahead, considerable interest had been shown in the subject of education. He recalled that at a conference in October 1967, the President of the United States had suggested that the United Nations should draw up a plan fixing targets in education, in order to stimulate action and ensure that the question received the attention it deserved. It was unacceptable that illiteracy should continue at a level of 70 to 80 per cent in some parts of the world. International Education Year should be a great encouragement for efforts in education at the local and national levels. There could be no doubt that with appropriate preparations for the Year and through the efforts of UNESCO, education would become a powerful and effective instrument for the development of nations. He noted the statement made by the Director-General of UNESCO that the aims and goals of the International Education Year could be accomplished with present budgetary resources. His Government fully supported the various provisions in the draft resolution and hoped that the Committee would adopt it unanimously. The following should be added to the list of sponsors: Austria,

^{1/} See Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-fifth Session, Annexes, agenda item 23, document E/4486, paras. 77-78.

Ceylon, Kuwait, Libya, Norway, Thailand and Venezuela (A/C.2/L.1031/Add.1).

5. Mr. VARCHAVER (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) noted that the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the ACC had asked UNESCO to make appropriate preparations for International Education Year. The Director-General of UNESCO was glad to be able to inform the General Assembly that at its fifteenth session the General Conference of his organization had adopted a resolution (see A/7239/Add.1, annex) laying down guide-lines for national and international action and had defined objectives and concepts. The idea of the International Education Year must be seen in relation to the educational strategy formulated by UNESCO's International Conference on Educational Planning, which was held at Paris in 1968. First of all, the word education must be taken in its broadest sense, namely, as a lifelong integrated process and not one ending with school. That meant that the various United Nations bodies, which all had training programmes of a more or less specialized nature, should take part in International Education Year. Education should be integrated with economic development, and emphasis must be laid in that connexion on the development of human resources. International Education Year should not just be an occasion for public celebrations of the importance of education. The world needed an effort of reflection and action, national and international, in order to achieve practical results. UNESCO was willing to lead the concerted international action required, which would serve as a prologue to the second Development Decade.

6. Mr. DEMBOWSKI (Poland), after noting that 1970, which it was proposed to designate as International Education Year, would be the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations and the beginning of the second United Nations Development Decade, said that the preparations for the Year should include two kinds of activities. First, the results achieved in educational development should be reviewed in order to establish more precisely its role and function. Secondly, it was necessary to make a serious analysis of the present situation and to define the needs arising in that field today and those which would arise during the second Development Decade. Because of the after-effects of colonialism and economic underdevelopment, those needs were immense. Suffice it to say that there were at present 740 million illiterates in the world. It was thus essential not only to build schools, but also to change educational systems and adapt them to the actual political, economic and social situations. Thirdly, it was necessary to define priority tasks in the light of those needs and to determine the ways and means of realizing them.

7. Many delegations had drawn attention to the relationship between education and economic development. There could be no development of industry and agriculture without adequately trained workers. There could be no question of raising the standard of living or improving social conditions without the development of science and technology and of the social sciences. The human and material investment in education was large. Although it did not yield immediately observable results, it was nevertheless indispensable for development in the long term.

8. In Poland, awareness of that need had made it possible to achieve progress in education and to liquidate the legacy of the capitalist system and the Germany occupation. For instance, illiteracy had been eliminated, and free secondary and higher education had been made accessible to everyone. It was worth mentioning that, in the school year 1966-1967, Polish universities had had about 1,700 foreign students, of whom 1,650 had been from developing countries. The International Education Year coincided in Poland with preparations to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the National Education Commission, in connexion with which the Polish Government intended to use all the mass communication media to mobilize public opinion concerning further efforts in the field of education. It was also planned to organize in Poland, in 1970, a conference of ministers of education. The Polish Government was ready to make its experiences in the field of education available to the international community, and Polish experts were ready to take part in any working groups which might be established for the purpose of making preparations for the International Education Year.

9. The activities undertaken on the occasion of the International Education Year were to develop on two levels. First, on a national scale, each country would define the tasks to be performed with respect to education and assess the means available for their implementation. Those tasks should be such as to mobilize a large part of the population and should be sufficiently realistic to be implemented. Second, on an international scale, use should be made of the possibilities created by the International Education Year. He appreciated the fact that UNESCO had agreed to co-ordinate the activities, and he believed that all competent international organizations should make their contribution to the programme. The World Federation of Trade Unions, the Women's International Democratic Federation and the International Federation of Democratic Youth definitely belonged to that category. Great attention should also be paid to the activities arranged by youth organizations, which could co-operate in propagating education and in planning leisure time.

10. He was convinced that 1970 would be a year in which the international community redoubled its efforts against illiteracy and ignorance, for the better future of humanity.

11. Mr. MASSIBE (Chad) said that economic and technological development which was not accompanied by development of human values could not be considered genuine development. The adaptation of social and economic structures to conditions of progress was an urgent objective in most developing countries and required the elimination of illiteracy and increased training of personnel.

12. The General Assembly had stressed the urgent need for a more effective mobilization of efforts in education and training in its resolution 2306 (XXII). The proposals by UNESCO submitted to ACC and to the Economic and Social Council enabled a more realistic view to be taken of the problem. It was clearly desirable to re-think educational concepts and policies for both national and international pur-

poses. It was urgently necessary to increase international co-operation in order to further educational progress, among countries and the United Nations family.

13. It was interesting to note that UNESCO would be making an international education survey under its 1969-1970 programme and would be convening an advisory group of educators. In the past, educational programmes had not taken enough account of the special circumstances of under-development and of appropriate solutions. The educational system was often oriented more towards the training of intellectuals in the humanities, the law and political science than towards the making of engineers, agronomists, doctors and middle-level technicians. Those problems might be the subject of practical recommendations from UNESCO. His delegation supported the recommendation contained in Economic and Social Council resolution 1355 (XLV) and hoped that it would be approved unanimously by the General Assembly.

14. Mr. VARELA (Panama) said that his country, which allocated 40 per cent of its budget to education, was most interested in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1031 and Add.1. However, before voting in favour of it, it would be desirable to obtain from the representative of UNESCO some clarifications concerning the resolution adopted unanimously by the General Conference of UNESCO at its fifteenth session (see A/7239/Add.1, annex). One of the objectives in the resolution was the adaptation of education to needs of the modern world, especially in rural areas. That seemed vague, and even somewhat contradictory. He wondered whether developing countries should adapt education in rural areas to the technical needs of the modern world, if those needs were not the ones of greatest importance to the rural areas. Such very advanced techniques as electronics, for instance, were needs of the modern world, but he wondered whether they could be said to be needs of the rural areas. Again, the resolution of the General Conference of UNESCO referred to "educational technology—the new methods and media", and later to "life-long integrated education". The meaning of those expressions should be made clear. Lastly, such ideas as the promotion of ethical principles in education, especially through the moral and civic education of youth, with a view to promoting international understanding and peace might appear to be more abstract and less important than social coexistence within a country. The International Education Year should pursue simple and specific objectives. It was desirable to know whether the stock-taking which Member States were invited to engage in should be aimed at integrating national education with objectives laid down internationally.

15. Mr. TANASIE (Romania) said that the special importance of the problem of education must be stressed and that greater attention must be given to that problem in view of the shortage of qualified teaching staff in almost all the developing countries. In the report which had been submitted by the Secretary-General to the Economic and Social Council at its forty-fifth session,^{2/} considerable stress was laid on the need for integrating the efforts for the development of human resources with the detailed proposals

for the second United Nations Development Decade. The designation of 1970 as International Education Year must not be merely an occasion for public celebrations but must lead to the adoption of long-term programmes of action by Governments and the international bodies concerned with education. As to the efforts of individual countries, education planning should be integrated with their general economic and social planning. The fact that education planning went far beyond the educational sector itself was a further reason for appropriate long-term planning. The question of the development and utilization of human resources continued to be one that deserved the closest attention by all parties concerned.

16. The principal proposals of UNESCO offered a general framework for the various types of action to be carried out in 1970. In the first place, the International Education Year must be an occasion for reviewing and re-evaluating the principles and policies that had a bearing on education. Secondly, increasing support must be mobilized for education in order to ensure greater equality coupled with the highest possible standards. Thirdly, the advancement of education must be encouraged by means of increased international co-operation. Specialized agencies such as the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), as well as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), could make a vital contribution to the success of such action. His delegation therefore considered it fitting for 1970 to be designated as the International Education Year.

17. Mr. KAHILUOTO (Finland) said that his delegation would support the proposal. There must be some way of focusing attention on the need to stimulate activity in the educational sector and, as the second United Nations Development Decade approached, on the importance of education in the process of social and economic development. Although education was increasingly being drawn into a continuing process, a corresponding methodology had not yet been devised. As to equality, great advances had been made, but the process must be further accelerated. Education must not be regarded as a privilege reserved for a minority but rather as one of the principal services rendered by society to its members.

18. Mr. VARCHAVER (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) emphasized that action at the country level must seek practical results in specific situations. The conditions in each country must be taken into account, including differing levels of development and the resulting differences in needs and priorities. In each country, the unanimously adopted objectives and concepts must be adapted to its particular circumstances. The promotion of the moral and physical education of youth in order to foster international understanding and peace must not in any way be interpreted as reducing the importance of the national aims and ideals which each country must incorporate in its system of education. The representative of Chad had alluded to educational systems that were ill adapted to the needs of certain countries because they had been inherited from previous régimes or from underdevelopment itself. One of the objectives

^{2/} *Ibid.*, Annexes, agenda items 9 and 10, documents E/4483 and Add.1.

endorsed by the General Conference of UNESCO at its fifteenth session was to adapt education to the needs of the world of today—in other words, to take into account the specific economic, political and other needs of each country in order to determine the appropriate type of education. There was really no contradiction on that point.

19. Mr. VARELA (Panama) thanked the representative of UNESCO for the clarification which he had provided. The paramount aim of each country, having due regard for its economic situation, must be a thorough review of its educational system with the ultimate purpose of improving education and meeting its own needs.

20. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia) said that he would support draft resolution A/C.2/L.1031 and Add.1. Desiring to draw attention to the particular needs of the developing countries, he proposed that in operative paragraph 4 the words ", especially those of the developing countries," should be inserted after the words "all possible assistance to Governments".

21. Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America) said that he personally had no difficulty in accepting that amendment.

22. Mr. ASANTE (Ghana) said that he likewise had no objection to it and did not think that the other sponsors had any either. It would therefore be possible for the draft resolution to be adopted as thus amended.

23. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in view of the importance of the objectives of the International Education Year, more time should be allowed for reflection. The text of the resolution adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its fifteenth session should be communicated to the delegations which so desired.

24. In view of the general and universal character of education, which was of concern to all mankind, it would seem appropriate for operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1031 and Add.1) to be modified. That could be done simply by deleting the words "Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency". It would therefore be made clear that education concerned all countries and not solely the Members of the United Nations. The question of education was too important to allow of the introduction of restrictive and discriminatory formulations.

25. As the draft resolution had only been submitted that same morning, his delegation had not had time to examine it thoroughly; it would like to study it at greater length, while at the same time reserving its right to speak again at a later stage. As the question had various technical aspects, the draft resolution should only be adopted with a full knowledge of the facts.

26. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) thanked the sponsors for having drawn up the draft resolution and recalled that his delegation had been a sponsor of General Assembly resolution 2306 (XXII) and of Economic and Social Council resolution 1355 (XLV). His delegation would, however, like to have more latitude in studying the draft, and it would have some difficulty in voting for its adoption in the present form. The International

Education Year must be a year in which the international community, with a full awareness of the role of education, would combine its efforts to give strong impetus to the activities undertaken by the Member States. With regard to the use of the word "objectives" in operative paragraphs 3 and 4, it should be made clear whether UNESCO had really specific objectives in mind. As there seemed to be some grounds for doubt on that score, it would be preferable to replace the last part of operative paragraph 4 with the words "their efforts undertaken within the framework of the International Education Year". For the same reason, the word "objectives" in paragraph 3 should be deleted.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that the text of the resolution adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO was contained in the annex to document A/7239/Add.1. The Committee had no objection to consideration of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1031 and Add.1) being deferred to the evening of the following day, in order that the amendments proposed by the USSR and Upper Volta could be taken into account.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 37

United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General (continued)* (A/7203, chap. III; A/7251 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.1028 and Add.1, E/4496, E/AC.54/L.25, E/AC.54/L.28, E/AC.54/L.29/Rev.1, E/AC.54/L.30, E/AC.54/L.31, TD/B/186/Rev.1)

28. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/L.1028 and Add.1 concerning the international development strategy. The debate on that subject in the Second Committee had shown that everyone recognized that development was an objective common to the entire world community and that the primary responsibility for achieving that objective rested on the developing countries themselves, though their efforts had to be supplemented by concomitant measures on the part of the developing countries in accordance with the spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations.

29. The principal lesson to be learnt from the first United Nations Development Decade was the need to ensure that, when the next Decade began, Governments and organizations in the United Nations system were able to concentrate their efforts for development within the framework of a coherent and integrated development strategy which would set out the concerted measures to be undertaken at the national, regional and international levels.

30. In the debate, the speakers had commended the work done by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Committee for Development Planning and the organizations in the United Nations system in pursuance of General Assembly resolutions 2218 B (XXI) and 2305 (XXII). There had been universal recognition of the significant role that all the organizations in the United Nations system would have to play in the formulation of the international development strategy for the next Decade; reference had been made, in particular, to the sectoral plan being prepared in their respective fields by FAO, the ILO and UNESCO, with emphasis on the need to bring those plans into phase with the

*Resumed from the 1227th meeting.

programme for the Decade. UNIDO and other specialized agencies would have to expedite their preparatory work. The appointment of the Pearson Commission by the President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development had been widely welcomed, and the hope had been expressed that that initiative would lead to steps to increase the flow of financial resources to the developing countries. Comments in the same vein had been made with regard to the capacity study being undertaken for the United Nations Development Programme by Sir Robert Jackson. The regional economic commissions and the regional development banks should be associated in the preparatory work for the second Decade, and a start had been made in that direction when the Second Committee had invited the heads of the regional development banks to participate in the deliberations on that question (see 1224th meeting, para. 1).

31. UNCTAD would play a particularly active part in the preparatory work for the second Development Decade. At its seventh session, the Trade and Development Board, in its resolution 47 (VII),^{3/} had invited to formulate suggestions and proposals on the goals and objectives in the field of trade and development within its competence and to outline a programme of practical steps for the attainment of those goals and objectives. The Board had further invited the Secretary-General of UNCTAD to convene a group composed of Governments of Member States wishing to participate in its work, in order to ensure inter-governmental guidance for the preparatory work of the Decade to be undertaken by UNCTAD.

32. He wished to take that opportunity to pay a sincere tribute to the outgoing Secretary-General of UNCTAD, Mr. Raúl Prebisch, who had shown outstanding ability, complete dedication and rare courage.

33. A recurrent theme in the discussions on the preparatory work for the second Development Decade had been the significance attached by Governments to the fact that it was the General Assembly that would finally approve the international development strategy for the 1970s and would proclaim the second United Nations Development Decade. His delegation had also suggested that a special session should be convened for that purpose, and some delegations considered that it would be necessary to involve the General Assembly with the preparatory work. There had been lengthy discussions on how that could best be done.

34. At its forty-fifth session, the Economic and Social Council had taken the first step by its resolution 1356 (LXV) in associating Governments with the preparatory work, by instructing its Economic Committee to meet between sessions to formulate an international development strategy; some delegations, however, had expressed the view that that task should be entrusted to a more representative body which would be responsible to the General Assembly itself.

35. Efforts had been made in informal discussions held in the past few weeks, particularly within the group of seventy-seven developing countries, to evolve a formula which would meet with the approval of the majority of the members of the Second Committee.

^{3/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 14 (A/7214), p. 86.

Unfortunately, that had not been possible. Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1028 and Add.1 provided for an enlargement of the Economic Committee of the Economic and Social Council by the addition of Member States to be designated by the President of the General Assembly.

36. Operative paragraph 3 sought to define the mandate of the Preparatory Committee for the second United Nations Development Decade in as clear a manner as possible. The enlarged Economic Committee would take as a basis for its work the relevant studies, conclusions and proposals formulated, within their respective fields of competence, by the bodies and organizations in the United Nations system and the comments of Governments, its task being one of integration and harmonization. The goals and objectives of the Decade would be both qualitative and quantitative and would encompass such areas as industrial development, agriculture and nutrition, education, employment and health as well as international trade and financing. The development strategy would also include targets for growth in terms of gross national product or per capita income and would set out the specific action to be taken both by Governments and by the organizations in the United Nations system for the realization of those objectives.

37. Operative paragraph 5 stressed the need for agreement on the issues referred to the Trade and Development Board by UNCTAD at its second session; those issues included preferences, supplementary financing and the aid target of 1 per cent of the gross national product to the developing countries, all of which were essential elements of an international development strategy.

38. Lastly, operative paragraph 13 endorsed Economic and Social Council resolution 1357 (XLV) on the mobilization of public opinion in developed and developing countries regarding the United Nations Development Decade, in order to shake off the apathy towards development which seemed to be growing. In conclusion, he said he would like to make it clear that the enlargement of the Economic Committee of the Economic and Social Council recommended in the draft resolution was only for the purpose of the preparatory work to be done for the elaboration of the international development strategy for the second Development Decade. In fact, the General Assembly would be establishing a new body based on the composition of the Council, and the unchanged Economic Committee would continue to perform its normal functions in accordance with the rules of procedure of the Council. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

39. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1028 and Add.1) introduced by the Pakistan delegation would be considered later.

AGENDA ITEM 34

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
(continued) (A/7176/Rev.2, A/7203/Add.1, A/7214, A/7256, A/C.2/L.1010, A/C.2/L.1011, A/C.2/L.1022 and Corr.1 and Add.1, Add.1/Corr.1 and 2 and Add.2 and 3, A/C.2/L.1030, TD/97, TD/L.37/Add.11):

- (a) Report of the Conference on its second session;
- (b) Report of the Trade and Development Board

40. Mr. KING (Barbados) said that his delegation had co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.2/L.1022 and Corr.1 and Add.1, Add.1/Corr.1 and 2 and Add.2 and 3 because it whole-heartedly supported the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and could not be a party to their abuse. The views of the Government of Barbados on the policy of apartheid practised by South Africa were well known, and he was confident that they were shared by all delegations present, save one. South Africa was essentially unfit on moral grounds to take its place in the United Nations. The policy it practised violated several of the basic principles of the Charter and bore witness to a complete contempt for human rights and the most elementary moral rules. The point at issue was clearly a moral one and it should take precedence over material considerations which unfortunately in the present case often dictated the attitude of many developed countries. If maintained, that attitude would ultimately be tantamount to supporting and even encouraging the odious policy of the South African régime. Abstaining in the vote on the draft resolution would be tantamount to voting against it and his delegation therefore hoped that all nations which condemned South Africa's policy of discrimination would vote for the draft.

41. His criticism of the opinion of the Legal Counsel contained in document A/C.2/L.1030 was based on the grounds that the question had not been adequately put to the Legal Counsel for advice. It was not comprehensive enough. It invoked Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter, which provided, respectively, that a Member of the United Nations could be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly or expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly, in both cases upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The present situation was, however, quite different. It was not a question of expelling a Member from the Organization or suspending the exercise of its rights and privileges upon the Security Council's recommendation. Everybody knew what the outcome of such an endeavour would be, since the Security Council was controlled by Powers which had close economic relations with South Africa. It was simply a matter of invoking the General Assembly's right to establish the subsidiary organs it deemed necessary for the performance of its functions, in accordance with Article 22 of the Charter, a right which automatically entailed that of the dissolution or change of the membership of the organs thus established. In any case, the draft resolution under consideration was designed merely to amend General Assembly resolution 1995 (XIX). The precedents cited by the Legal Counsel, particularly the decision of the World Health Assembly to amend the Constitution of WHO in order to enable it to suspend South Africa's voting rights, were irrelevant. What was being sought was not suspension of the exercise of South Africa's rights and privileges, but merely a change in the membership of an organ established by the General Assembly. There had been several possible solutions. For example, the General Assembly could have been requested to adopt forthwith a resolution dissolving UNCTAD and then to adopt

another re-establishing that organ and altering its membership so as to exclude South Africa. Another solution would have been to prolong UNCTAD, as now constituted, for example, until 31 December 1969 and then alter its membership. The third solution, which had led to the formulation of the draft resolution under discussion, was to amend General Assembly resolution 1995 (XIX). The text did not seem to satisfy some delegations, which considered it somewhat discriminatory, and in order to eliminate all such ambiguity from the text, it might be possible to delete the last part of operative paragraph 2, which would then end with the words "with the exception of the Republic of South Africa".

42. His delegation's position was consistent with his Government's policy concerning South Africa. Barbados had broken off all commercial relations with that country, and he appealed to all States Members of the United Nations to do the same, pursuant to the General Assembly resolution recommending the economic boycott of South Africa.

43. Mr. DAHMOUCHE (Algeria) said that the Legal Counsel had done good work in preparing document A/C.2/L.1030. In his delegation's view, however, legal considerations had very little bearing on a question such as that before the Committee and had no place in the discussion of the problem. If legal considerations of that type had been taken as a criterion, almost all the newly independent States would still be under colonialist domination and it would not even have been possible to establish the United Nations. Some countries, which, for example, refused to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, felt absolutely no compunction about watching the South African authorities practice for many years a policy which dishonoured the Organization. That proved that the question at issue was a political, i.e., in the final analysis, a moral question. If a legal argument must be used, the concept of constitutionality should be invoked, rather than that of legality. His delegation could not state that the requested suspension of South Africa was legal, but it could affirm that it was constitutional, for South Africa was shamelessly violating the principles and ideals enunciated in the Charter, the real constitution of the United Nations.

44. However, it would be advisable to invoke no argument of any kind in support of suspension and to terminate, purely and simply, the representation of an oppressive régime which held elementary human rights in contempt.

45. Mr. KAKAMBA (Uganda) said that the draft resolution before the Committee was simple, and that its objectives were clearly defined and in full accord with the feelings of peace-loving people. The South African policy of apartheid was inhuman and immoral and a flagrant violation of the principles contained in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Pretoria régime obstinately refused to comply with the modest requests of the United Nations that it should change its criminal policies. It was even doubtful whether South Africa had any respect for the other Members of the United Nations in view of the fact that it flouted their opinions.

46. The draft resolution was based on the same thinking as previous resolutions on the same matter, particularly General Assembly resolution 2202 (XXI), and it had the same objectives.

47. Some people argued that the suspension of South Africa from a United Nations body, such as UNCTAD, would not force it to discharge its obligations under the Charter and to abolish apartheid. That argument could not be taken seriously. Perhaps its purpose was to conceal other motives. Unfortunately, the ideals embodied in the Charter were being sacrificed to economic and commercial expediency.

48. His Government, which had become a Member of the United Nations in 1962, had pledged to fulfil the obligations imposed by the Charter and therefore expected all Members to do likewise. His delegation felt that the draft resolution should not encounter any opposition. It was not a matter of applying a discriminatory policy against South Africa, but an attempt to remind it of the fundamental purposes of the Charter. Experience had shown that South Africa did not comply with resolutions condemning it. In such circumstances, excommunication, where appropriate, was the only alternative.

49. His delegation was far from convinced by the arguments put forward in the Legal Counsel's opinion (A/C.2/L.1030), which was purely and simply a justification of the illegal conduct of South Africa. Indeed, the purpose of the draft resolution seemed to have been misunderstood. The intention was not to suspend South Africa from the United Nations, but for the General Assembly to endorse UNCTAD resolution 26 (II)^{4/} and amend its own resolution 1995 (XIX).

50. To raise a practical point, he wondered, like the representative of Ghana, whether the Committee really considered it reasonable that Uganda and other African countries should grant visas and open its conference halls to representatives of South Africa when UNCTAD met in one of their capitals.

51. Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America) said that his delegation opposed the draft resolution before the Committee and, if it was put to the vote, would vote against it for various reasons. In the first place, the proposal raised serious legal questions. Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Charter of the United Nations stated that the Organization was based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members. But the intention of the draft resolution was to suspend a single Member State from membership in a United Nations organ which at present included all Members. His delegation seriously doubted that the Assembly could, without affronting the principle of sovereign equality stated in Article 2, paragraph 1, properly exclude from UNCTAD one or several members, even when the overwhelming majority found their policies in conflict with the Charter. The judgement of his delegation was reinforced by the fact that the draft resolution ignored the substance and procedure of Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter and infringed the prerogatives which those Articles conferred on the Security Council and the General Assembly.

^{4/} See Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Second Session, vol. I, Report and Annexes (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.II.D.14), annex I, p. 56.

52. Member States did not necessarily have a right to be included in every United Nations body since the General Assembly was empowered to set up subsidiary bodies of limited membership, but they did have the right not to be singled out for unequal treatment in respect of the benefits of membership. If the basis for such action was the majority's abhorrence for the policies of one member, then violence would be done to one of the very concepts upon which the United Nations had been established and might endanger all the rights of States guaranteed under the Charter. Above all, the United Nations was intended to enable Member States to deal with each other in pursuit of the aims of the Charter, despite the deepest political differences among them. Sitting down in the United Nations with Members whose conduct was despised by a majority and recognizing their rights as Members implied no moral or political acquiescence in their conduct. His delegation did not need to be reminded of the outrageous institution of apartheid and knew how difficult it was for any person of normal moral sensibilities to talk of extending equal protection of the law of the Charter to a Member State which systematically denied equal protection of its own laws to the great majority of its citizens. The United States position on the draft resolution was plainly not intended as a defence of the heinous policies of South Africa, which had been condemned by the United Nations, but rather to preserve the integrity of the Charter and the effectiveness of the United Nations, both of which risked being compromised by the proposal before the Committee.

53. His delegation therefore appealed to the sponsors of the draft resolution to reflect on the full implications of their proposal and to reconsider it in the interest of the United Nations itself.

54. Mr. MOHALE (Lesotho) said that being a small enclave within the Republic of South Africa, Lesotho faced the same trade problems as Botswana and Swaziland. All three land-locked countries were inevitably heavily dependent on South Africa for transit rights for their goods. Consequently, the draft resolution before the Committee was likely to have even more serious repercussions for them than for South Africa itself. Like Botswana and Swaziland, Lesotho did not and would never pursue the South African policy of apartheid, and he appealed to the sponsors of the draft resolution to consider the undesirable economic consequences that its adoption would have for those three countries. Whatever measures were taken by the United Nations against South Africa, there was no reason why other countries should be sacrificed.

55. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, in connexion with the statement by the Legal Counsel (A/C.2/L.1030), he wished to draw the Committee's attention to the second part of paragraph 6, which, in his opinion, was the key to the document and was the only passage that had any weight. The paragraph contained extracts from a legal opinion given to UNCTAD at its second session, and it was stated in particular that, had the Assembly wished to initiate action for the purpose of excluding South Africa from the Conference, such exclusion would necessarily have had to be a matter of express

reference in a resolution. That was precisely what the sponsors of the draft resolution were seeking to accomplish.

56. He felt that the sub-title of the draft resolution, "Suspension of South Africa", was deceptive, for it gave the reader the erroneous impression that the intention was to suspend or expel South Africa pursuant to Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter of the United Nations. That, however, was not the purpose of the draft resolution, which, as was stated in operative paragraph 2, was designed simply to amend General Assembly resolution 1995 (XIX) by changing the membership of UNCTAD. Clearly, the implementation of that resolution would ultimately result in the expulsion of South Africa from UNCTAD, but the only legal question arising at present was whether the General Assembly could alter a resolution which had been adopted at an earlier session. It was logical that the Assembly, which was authorized under Article 22 of the Charter to establish subsidiary organs, should also have the power to dissolve them at a later date, if it saw fit, or to make changes in their membership.

57. It was therefore his view that the opinion of the Legal Counsel and the United States representative's comments were not relevant.

58. With regard to the apprehension expressed by the representative of Lesotho, he felt that a decision to exclude South Africa from UNCTAD would in no way affect the trade of Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland.

59. He agreed with the representative of Barbados that deletion of the last part of operative paragraph 2 would remove the slight element of ambiguity in the draft resolution, since the idea of suspending the Republic of South Africa would thus be eliminated.

60. Whatever the wording of the draft resolution, certain delegations would vote against it in defence of South Africa's position. That was inevitable, but he hoped that a vote would be taken at the present meeting.

61. Mr. ANDRE (Dahomey) said that he wished to assure the representative of Lesotho that the African countries were taking due account of the position of his country as well as of Botswana and Swaziland; however, no exceptions could be made in the present struggle. His delegation urged members of the Committee not to comment interminably and to no good purpose on the Legal Counsel's opinion contained in document A/C.2/L.1030. In any case, the sponsors' position was supported by the second part of paragraph 6 of that document. Thus, there was no need whatever to amend operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution in the way suggested by the representative of Barbados (see para. 4 above). The object was not to convince those delegations which were firm defenders of South Africa, and the sponsors would not accept a compromise.

62. Mr. COX (Sierra Leone) recalled that the representative of the United States had spoken of the sovereign equality of States Members of the Organization. In that connexion, he wondered whether the representatives of a sovereign State were required to associate, within an organization, with the representatives of a State whose policy they found profoundly

repugnant. The representative of the United States had also referred to the dangers to the Charter which would ensue from the adoption of the draft resolution. He would merely point out that the authors of the Charter had fought against fascism during the Second World War and that South Africa was continuing to pursue a policy which was remarkably similar to fascism. It would be showing a lack of respect for the founding Members of the Organization not to adopt the draft resolution.

63. The sponsors had no objection to changing the sub-title of the draft resolution to "Membership of UNCTAD".

64. Mr. NSANZE (Burundi) said he felt that the suspension of South Africa from UNCTAD would be a most salutary lesson for that country and for those who were supporting it and thus impeding the final reconciliation of the African countries and the former metropolitan countries. With regard to the draft resolution, his delegation strongly insisted that operative paragraph 2 should be retained as it stood, for otherwise it would be wondered what the purpose of the draft resolution was.

65. Mr. UBILLOS (Uruguay) said that the draft resolution was not in conformity with the rules and procedures laid down in the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft.

66. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) recalled that at the second session of UNCTAD his delegation had voted against UNCTAD resolution 26 (II). At that time, it had clearly explained that its decision to vote against the resolution had been based on the view that a Member of the Organization could not be deprived of its membership in UNCTAD unless the procedures established for that purpose in the relevant articles of the Charter of the United Nations were followed. His country was strongly opposed to the policies of apartheid and racial discrimination practised by the Pretoria régime, but his delegation would vote against the draft resolution for the same reasons that had prompted its vote on UNCTAD resolution 26 (II). At the second session of UNCTAD, political questions which were not within that organization's competence had arisen, and it was regrettable that the same thing was happening in the Second Committee.

67. Mr. PINHEIRO (Brazil) said that his delegation was in a difficult position. The strong stand which Brazil had taken against racial discrimination and the policy of apartheid was not open to question. The fact was, however, that an attempt was being made to solve that problem indirectly through a subsidiary organ of the United Nations—a procedure which his delegation found it difficult to accept. His delegation had also been unable to obtain instructions from its Government concerning the Legal Counsel's opinion (A/C.2/L.1030), which it had received that very morning. It therefore requested that a decision on the draft resolution should be postponed for twenty-four hours.

68. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) recalled that his country had always condemned the policies of racial discrimination and apartheid practised by South Africa. However, his delegation could not take part in the vote since it had not received specific

instructions from its Government regarding the Legal Counsel's opinion. It would therefore have to wait until the question was considered in plenary before taking a position on the matter.

69. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) observed that the Legal Counsel's opinion was based on the assumption that suspending South Africa from UNCTAD was equivalent to expelling it from the Organization. That curious notion, which was at the same time a conclusion, was based on Article 22 of the Charter. However, the wording of that Article was very flexible, for it stated that "the General Assembly may establish ... subsidiary organs ...". Accordingly, there was no reason why the General Assembly could not change the membership of the subsidiary organs which the Organization saw fit to establish. Furthermore, General Assembly resolution 1995 (XIX) did not state that the provisions of the Charter were applicable to the members of UNCTAD in matters relating to their suspension or exclusion. There were therefore no legal obstacles to the adoption of the draft resolution.

70. Mr. ABE (Japan) said that he supported the Brazilian proposal to postpone a decision for twenty-four hours so that his delegation could give the Legal Counsel's opinion the necessary close study.

71. Mr. OWONO (Cameroon) recalled that it was the admission of a large number of African countries to the Organization in 1960 that had resulted in bringing South Africa's policies to the attention of the General Assembly. The countries in question had immediately started a movement to expel South Africa from the United Nations. Unfortunately, on the recommendation of the former colonial Powers, that effort had not been pursued and the draft resolution submitted at that time had fallen into oblivion. Eight years had elapsed since then, but the situation had not changed. Today the question of suspending South Africa from a subsidiary organ of the United Nations, namely UNCTAD, was being considered. It was essential, in that connexion, to determine the extent to which apartheid was compatible with the policies of that body. As far as the developing countries were concerned the decisive consideration was trade, and there was no reason to suppose that South African participation in UNCTAD was likely to promote relations between that country and the developing countries.

72. The representative of Barbados had suggested that the last part of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution should be deleted (see para. 41 above). His delegation did not feel that trying to make the text more palatable would win a single additional vote for the resolution. However, it was astonishing that, even though a special committee had been set up to consider the Pretoria régime's policies of apartheid, certain countries which condemned those policies insisted that they should be divorced from the question of trade. That seemed to reflect a curious policy of applying a double standard.

73. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa) said that the proposal in the draft resolution before the Committee was viewed by his delegation with deep concern. In fact, it introduced a process of restriction and exclusion which could not be reconciled with the very principles and purposes of the United Nations, whereas throughout

the current session, all delegations had been grappling with the immense problem of improving the lot of millions of people anxiously awaiting a higher level of living.

74. The reasons for the establishment of UNCTAD were clearly set forth in the first two preambular paragraphs of General Assembly resolution 1995 (XIX). Throughout the debates in the Second Committee, efforts had been made to find ways and means of accelerating the economic growth of the developing countries. Many delegations had expressed concern that during the current United Nations Development Decade the rate of progress had not fulfilled the expectations of the poor countries. It was clear that determined efforts were required to create an economic climate, both nationally and internationally, conducive to the achievement of practical and lasting results.

75. All the nations of the world should face the many economic problems which were weighing heavily on the United Nations and its organs. The goodwill of a country as willing and able as South Africa to co-operate in finding solutions to those problems should be cultivated rather than alienated.

76. South Africa's population was approximately 18 million and it had a gross domestic product equivalent to one third of that of Africa as a whole. Its per capita income—the highest in Africa—was equal to that of some European countries and surpassed that of many countries in other continents. That was an indication at the success of South Africa's pursuit of the objectives of Article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations, to which reference was made in the preamble of the draft resolution.

77. South Africa was a major importing country, in which many developing countries found a remunerative market for their products. If due regard was had to the fact that that market was constantly expanding, the potential for the developing countries would need no emphasis. South Africa was prepared to play a responsible and honourable role in international trade and finance with a view to enabling the developing world to achieve its objectives. It had also played a constructive role in the negotiation of international commodity agreements. It was therefore ironic, indeed tragic, that the draft resolution was sponsored by developing countries interested in the production and marketing of primary commodities for which such agreements had been concluded.

78. There was no provision in the Charter which authorized the General Assembly to deny arbitrarily to any Member State any of the rights deriving from the Charter. Apart from the fact that it was illegal, the draft resolution was also diametrically opposed to the spirit and objectives of the Charter and of UNCTAD.

79. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that nothing new had been said and that the discussion was becoming sterile. He therefore asked those delegations which had proposed the postponement of the vote for twenty-four hours to reconsider their proposal. Invoking rule 77 of the rules of procedure, he requested that the draft resolution should be put to the vote immediately.

80. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked the Chairman to clarify the situation and stated that his delegation wished to explain its vote before the draft resolution was put to the vote.

81. The CHAIRMAN replied that the representative of Upper Volta had moved the closure of the debate and that explanations of vote could be given later. Only two speakers were entitled to oppose the closure.

82. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said he opposed the closure of the debate and supported the earlier proposal of the Brazilian representative (see para. 67 above). Delegations should be given time to consult their Governments before voting. Furthermore, the opinion of the Legal Counsel, which had raised many criticisms, had only been given that morning and still needed to be thoroughly examined by the competent officials.

83. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) supported the representative of the United Kingdom and also considered that a period of twenty-four hours should be allowed before the vote so as to enable those delegations which so desired to consult their legal advisers. He pointed out that the Chairman had not yet given a ruling on the Brazilian motion.

84. The CHAIRMAN replied that he had understood Brazil to have made a suggestion rather than a formal proposal. In conformity with the rules of procedure, the Committee should follow the rules relevant to the conduct of business. He would therefore put the motion for the closure to the vote.

85. Mr. BILIMATIS (Greece) invoked rule 79 of the rules of procedure and moved the adjournment of the meeting.

86. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) opposed the motion and urged the Committee to continue the meeting.

87. The CHAIRMAN said that, under the rules of procedure, a motion to adjourn the meeting had precedence over a motion for the closure of the debate. He would therefore put it to the vote.

88. Mr. DAHMOUCHE (Algeria) said that he also opposed the motion to adjourn the meeting presented by the representative of Greece.

89. Mr. BILIMATIS (Greece) called for the adjournment of the meeting pursuant to rule 78, which he read out.

90. The CHAIRMAN put the motion presented by the representative of Greece to the vote.

The motion to adjourn the meeting, presented by the representative of Greece, was rejected by 45 votes to 26, with 20 abstentions.

91. After a discussion of procedure in which Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States), the CHAIRMAN, Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. RANKIN (Canada), Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. VIAUD (France) and Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) took part, the CHAIRMAN ruled that, pursuant to rule 118 of the rules of procedure, the motion for the closure of the debate presented by the representative of Upper Volta should be put to the vote.

The motion for the closure of the debate, presented by the representative of Upper Volta, was adopted by 51 votes to 9, with 28 abstentions.

92. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to decide on the second motion presented by the representative of Upper Volta, namely, to vote on the draft resolution immediately.

The motion of the representative of Upper Volta was adopted by 41 votes to 21, with 27 abstentions.

93. The CHAIRMAN said that, before the draft resolution was put to the vote, delegations which so desired could explain their votes.

94. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation's position on the draft resolution was based on three considerations. Firstly, like the African States, the USSR wished to see the disappearance of South Africa's criminal policy of apartheid. The elimination of all forms of racial discrimination had been one of the principal results of the Revolution of October 1917 and his delegation supported the spirit of the resolution, because it considered apartheid to be one of the most despicable forms of racial discrimination. In the course of its history, the Russian people had also suffered the misdeeds of fascist and racist policies. During the Second World War, a large part of the Soviet Union's territory had been occupied by the fascists of Nazi Germany. The indigenous population of South Africa was now in a similar position. Consequently, the USSR had always supported, and would continue to support, every proposal directed against apartheid. It was one of the countries which had broken off all trade, economic and other relations with countries which practised a policy of apartheid. At the twenty-first session of the General Assembly in 1966, the USSR and Ghana had proposed that apartheid and the policy of the Portuguese colonialists should be declared to be crimes against humanity. Consequently, it had the fullest sympathy for the point of view of the African States and unreservedly supported the spirit underlying their action.

95. Secondly, the aim was to decide how to combat apartheid. It was well known that the leaders of the fight in South Africa were African heroes. The USSR and all the socialist countries supported that fight, which was being waged simultaneously at the political level in the United Nations. Many proposals for combating apartheid had been drawn up. As a means of intensifying the fight, it was both desirable and necessary to condemn, by naming them in a resolution, those Western countries which were helping to commit such crimes against humanity. The USSR had proposed that Article 6 of the Charter should be applied and considered it desirable that South Africa should be expelled from the Organization. The representative of Cameroon had pointed out that South Africa's policy was not only contrary to the principles of UNCTAD, but also to those of the United Nations. If South Africa continued to flout those principles, its presence should not be tolerated and his delegation was therefore astounded that the United Republic of Tanzania should be opposed to its expulsion from the United Nations.

96. However praiseworthy the intentions of the sponsors of the draft resolution, it was still only a half-measure. That was why any decision with regard to it could not be said to be of great importance.

97. The third consideration was extremely important to the Soviet Union, as a socialist country. The purpose of the draft resolution was to establish the membership of UNCTAD, a United Nations body of considerable importance to all Member States. The representative of Sierra Leone had proposed that the title of the draft should be changed to "Membership of UNCTAD"; that idea should be given careful consideration. As stated in the text of the draft resolution, UNCTAD was made up of States which were Members of the United Nations, or members of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The first part of the draft resolution was particularly important to the socialist countries, as it certainly was to the African countries also, in view of their community of interests. Analysis of the wording of the text showed that included among the States not Members of the United Nations which belonged to UNCTAD was the Federal Republic of Germany which approved of South Africa's apartheid policy and was one of its chief trading partners. It was obvious that the militarists of the Federal Republic of Germany were pursuing a dangerous policy which could only harm the Africans. On the other hand, another State, the German Democratic Republic, which had no ties with South Africa and condemned apartheid, did not even have access to UNCTAD. What attitude was a socialist State to take in the face of such a paradox? In such circumstances, it would not be possible for it to support the text of the draft resolution. If the draft resolution had not condemned apartheid, his delegation would have voted against it. Again, for the reasons he had just given it could not accept it. He appealed to the African countries to consider the possibility of joining together to end the discrimination practised against certain countries within the United Nations. In conclusion, he stated that he would not support the draft resolution and would abstain in the vote.

98. Mr. VIAUD (France), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that at the second session of UNCTAD his delegation had voted against resolution 26 (II).^{5/} In the same way, it would oppose adoption of the draft resolution, since there had been no recommendation from the Security Council as required under Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter.

99. Mr. PREZA QUEZADA (El Salvador) said that, although his delegation had already proclaimed its opposition to the policy of apartheid and had voted in favour of UNCTAD resolution 26 (II), the draft resolution violated the Charter of the United Nations in many respects. Consequently, his delegation would abstain.

100. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) stressed his country's opposition to apartheid but said he intended to vote against the draft resolution. The Legal Counsel's statement (A/C.2/L.1030) submitted to the Committee should be taken seriously, since it was important to realize that the draft resolution was more than a mere condemnation of South Africa or an attack against

apartheid and struck a real blow at the Charter of the United Nations. One principle should be upheld above all, that of the free participation of all Members in the activities of the Organization. UNCTAD had been set up as a result of a General Assembly resolution (resolution 1995 (XIX)). It was a permanent organ in which all Members should participate. Any General Assembly decision to suspend South Africa would be contrary to the spirit of the Charter and would establish a dangerous precedent. In addition, Canada was interested in keeping open the possibility of a dialogue with South Africa. If his country voted in favour of the draft resolution, it would not only be committing an illegal act but would also be seeking to remedy an ill by administering dangerous medicine. That was why he opposed the adoption of the draft resolution.

101. Mr. DECASTIAUX (Belgium) said he regarded the draft resolution as a corollary to an initiative dating back to the second session of UNCTAD. At that time his delegation had expressed anxiety at seeing the operation of the United Nations, and consequently its very future, imperilled by the distortion of the statutory powers of its various organs. The statement of the Legal Counsel (A/C.2/L.1030) had confirmed his delegation's serious doubts that the General Assembly was competent to decide alone on the suspension of a Member's rights, without following the procedure laid down in the Charter for the purpose. While his delegation condemned the policy of apartheid, it remained firm in its allegiance to the Charter and upheld the protection which it afforded to States in the exercise of their sovereign equality. The motives of the sponsors of the draft resolution should not make them forget the constitutional principle laid down in the Organization's fundamental law; otherwise arbitrary action might take the place of legality and hegemony that of law. Such a situation would herald the decline of the United Nations by suppressing the right of each State to express its views. His delegation refused to share the responsibility for violating the basic rules of the Charter and would consequently oppose the adoption of the draft resolution.

102. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that it had not been possible to hear the opinion of the Legal Counsel until that day and his Government must first examine it. That was why his delegation had supported the Brazilian proposal to postpone the vote for twenty-four hours. It would vote against the draft resolution, not out of sympathy for the champions of apartheid, but because it was opposed to the idea that political popularity should be a criterion for admission to the United Nations. It felt that the expulsion of a member of UNCTAD would set a dangerous precedent and that the measures taken against South Africa would not help to solve the problem. The statement of the Legal Counsel had had the effect of confirming the doubts which had arisen as to whether it was advisable for the General Assembly to amend its resolution 1995 (XIX). Such action would be tantamount to suspending Members' rights. In view of the fact that the procedures laid down in Article 5 had not been carried out, his delegation doubted whether the proposed action was in keeping with the principles of the Charter. That was why it would vote against the draft resolution.

^{5/} Ibid.

103. Mr. PINHEIRO (Brazil) regretted to announce that, owing to the circumstances, his delegation would be obliged to vote against the draft resolution. The Committee was not competent to deal with the problem and, in addition, the procedure followed was unacceptable. If the draft resolution were to be adopted, it would establish a dangerous precedent both for the Organization and for UNCTAD.

104. Mr. VARELA (Panama) said he had examined the opinion of the Legal Counsel (A/C.2/L.1030) and had listened to the supporting arguments. Since there had not been time for him to receive instructions from his Government, his delegation would abstain in the vote, but would express its views on the draft resolution when it was taken up in the plenary meeting.

105. Mr. DEMBOWSKI (Poland) said that Poland had always supported the African people's fight against racism and the odious policy of apartheid practised by the Pretoria régime. But his delegation also shared the view of the Soviet delegation with regard to the discrimination shown against the German Democratic Republic and would therefore abstain.

106. The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1022 and Corr.1, Add.1, Add.1/Corr.1 and 2 and Add.2 and 3) as amended, to the vote. He reminded the Committee that the sponsors had altered the title to "Membership of UNCTAD".

At the request of the representative of Upper Volta, the vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Barbados, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Dahomey.

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

Abstaining: El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Lesotho, Malawi, Maldives Islands, Malta, Mongolia, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Singapore, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 49 votes to 22, with 23 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 9.10 p.m.