

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1067th
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 28 November 1961,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Statement by the President	879
Decision on procedure	879
Agenda item 17: Election of the members of the International Law Commission	879
Agenda item 56: Appointments to fill vacancies in the member- ship of subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly (<i>continued</i>): (c) Board of Auditors Report of the Fifth Committee'	880
Agenda item 58: Audit reports relating to expenditure by spe- cialized agencies and the International At- omic Energy Agency: (a) Expenditure of technical assistance funds allocated from the Special Account of the Expanded Programme of Technical As- sistance; (b) Expenditure as executing agencies for Special Fund Projects Report of the Fifth Committee	880
Agenda item 65: Base salary scales and post adjustments of the staff in the professional and higher categories of the international civil service: reports of the International Civil Service Advisory Board and of the Secretary-General Report of the Fifth Committee	880
Agenda item 94: Enlargement of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions Report of the Fifth Committee	881
Agenda item 19: Question of disarmament Report of the Fifth Committee (part I)	881
Agenda item 74: The status of the German-speaking element in the Province of Bolzano (Bozen); imple- mentation of General Assembly resolution 1497 (XV) of 31 October 1960 Report of the Special Political Committee. .	881
Agenda item 75: Treatment of people of Indian and Indo- Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa Report of the Special Political Committee. .	882

Agenda item 76:

*Question of race conflict in South Africa re-
sulting from the policies of apartheid of the
Government of the Republic of South Africa
Report of the Special Political Committee. .* 882

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Before we take up the different items on the agenda of this meeting, I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to the statement which I made last evening (1063th meeting) indicating the specific procedure to be followed, in conformity with the Rules of Procedure, in considering an item discussed by a committee.

Decision on procedure

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the First and Fifth, and the Special Political, Committee.

AGENDA ITEM 17

Election of the members of the International Law Commission

2. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): In accordance with rule 94 of the Rules of Procedure, the election will be held by secret ballot. The names of the eligible candidates are shown on the ballot papers which have just been distributed. Only those candidates whose names appear on the ballot papers are eligible. Members of the Assembly may vote for a maximum of twenty-five candidates by placing a cross opposite the name of the candidates for whom they wish to vote. Any ballot paper on which a mark has been placed against the names of more than twenty-five candidates will be declared invalid.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Guerreiro (Brazil) and Mr. Caimeron Measketh (Cambodia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	103
Invalid ballots:	1
Number of valid ballots:	102
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	102
Required majority:	52

Number of votes obtained:

Mr. Luis Padilla Nervo (Mexico)	97
Mr. Gilbert Amado (Brazil)	96
Mr. Herbert W. Briggs (United States of America).	90

Mr. Marcel Cadieux (Canada)	89
Mr. Erik Castrén (Finland)	87
Mr. Alfred Verdross (Austria)	87
Sir Humphrey Waldock (United Kingdom)	87
Mr. Roberto Ago (Italy)	86
Mr. Milan Bartos (Yugoslavia)	86
Mr. Grigory I. Tunkin (USSR)	86
Mr. André Gros (France)	85
Mr. Abdul Hakim Tabibi (Afghanistan)	84
Mr. Tesilimi Olawole Elias (Nigeria)	83
Mr. Abdullah El-Erian (United Arab Republic)	81
Mr. Manfred Lachs (Poland)	79
Mr. Mustafa Kamil Yasseen (Iraq)	79
Mr. Victor Kanga (Cameroon)	74
Mr. Senjin Tsuruoka (Japan)	70
Mr. Antonio de Luna García (Spain)	69
Mr. Radhabinod Pal (India)	65
Mr. Obed Pessou (Dahomey)	64
Mr. Angel Modesto Paredes (Ecuador)	62
Mr. Eduardo Jiménez de Aréchaga (Uruguay)	61
Mr. Liu Chieh (China)	61
Mr. Shabtai Rosenne (Israel)	56
Mr. Ahmed Matine-Daftary (Iran)	55
Mr. Nihat Erim (Turkey)	47
Mr. Melquiades Gamboa (Philippines)	44
Mr. Muhammad Munir (Pakistan)	44
Mr. Soelaiman H. Tajibnapis (Indonesia)	36
Mr. Rudolf Bystricky (Czechoslovakia)	35
Mr. Truong Cang (Cambodia)	29
Mr. R. S. S. Gunewardene (Ceylon)	22
Mr. Alfonso M. Mora (Ecuador)	22
Mr. Konti Suphamongkhon (Thailand)	17
Mr. Migel R. Urquiza (El Salvador)	12
Mr. Stephen Verosta (Austria)	8
Mr. Juan B. de Lavalle (Peru)	7
Mr. Manuel Cisneros Sánchez (Peru)	6
Mr. Héctor Paysse Reyes (Uruguay)	6
Mr. Mariano Argüello Vargas (Nicaragua)	5
Mr. Modesto Valle Candia (Nicaragua)	0

Having obtained the required majority, the following twenty-five persons were elected members of the International Law Commission: Mr. Ago (Italy), Mr. Amado (Brazil), Mr. Bartos (Yugoslavia), Mr. Briggs (United States of America), Mr. Cadieux (Canada), Mr. Castrén (Finland), Mr. El-Erian (United Arab Republic), Mr. Elias (Nigeria), Mr. Gros (France), Mr. Jiménez de Aréchaga (Uruguay), Mr. Kanga (Cameroon), Mr. Lachs (Poland), Mr. Liu (China), Mr. de Luna García (Spain), Mr. Padilla Nervo (Mexico), Mr. Pal (India), Mr. Paredes (Ecuador), Mr. Pessou (Dahomey), Mr. Rosenne (Israel), Mr. Tabibi (Afghanistan), Mr. Tsuruoka (Japan), Mr. Tunkin (USSR), Mr. Verdross (Austria), Sir Humphrey Waldock (United Kingdom) and Mr. Yasseen (Iraq).

AGENDA ITEM 56

Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly (continued):*

(c) Board of Auditors

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/4958)

3. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I invite the Assembly to vote on the draft resolution contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/4958],

* Resumed from the 1044th meeting.

which recommends its adoption. If there are no objections, I shall consider this resolution to have been adopted by the Assembly.

The draft resolution was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 58

Audit reports relating to expenditure by specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency:

- (a) Expenditure of technical assistance funds allocated from the Special Account of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance;
- (b) Expenditure as executing agencies for Special Fund projects

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/4963)

4. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Fifth Committee has approved unanimously draft resolutions I and II contained in its report [A/4963]. In the absence of any observations, I shall consider these resolutions to have been adopted by the General Assembly.

Draft resolutions I and II were adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 65

Base salary scales and post adjustments of the staff in the professional and higher categories of the international civil service: reports of the International Civil Service Advisory Board and of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/4977)

5. Mr. ARRAIZ (Venezuela) Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee (translated from Spanish): I should like to express my satisfaction at appearing before the Assembly, in my capacity as Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, in order to request approval for various measures recommended by the Fifth Committee for the benefit of those deserving and unselfish servants of the United Nations, the members of the Secretariat. This question forms the subject of the report which I have the honour of presenting [A/4977], entitled: "Base salary scales and post adjustments of the staff in the professional and higher categories of the international civil service".

6. The Fifth Committee has examined the proposals made by the Secretary-General [A/4823] in agreement with the executive heads of the other organizations which apply the same system of salaries, allowances and benefits as that of the United Nations. Two of those proposals were based on recommendations made by the International Civil Service Advisory Board [A/4823/Add.1], and the other was based on recommendations made by the Expert Committee on Posts Adjustments [A/4823/Add.2].

7. The proposals consisted in the consolidation into the base salary scales for P-1 and higher levels of 10 per cent of the existing post adjustment, an increase in the present base salary scales and a revision of post adjustments. The Fifth Committee also had before it the corresponding report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions [A/4930].

8. Paragraphs 9 to 14 of the report of the Fifth Committee summarize the general discussion on this matter. Some representatives maintained that the

data supplied by the International Civil Service Advisory Board were not conclusive; but generally speaking the subject gave rise, within the Committee, to general expressions of appreciation in respect of the Secretariat staff, and of sympathy with the favourable measures proposed by the Secretary-General.

9. Only one of these proposals—that calling for the abolition of "minus" post adjustments—was rejected by the Committee. The others were approved by substantial votes in favour, none against and a few abstentions, as may be seen from paragraphs 21, 22, 24 and 28 of the report. It is further indicated, in paragraph 31, that 1 January 1962 was approved as the date for the measures' entry into effect.

10. The recommendations thus approved by the Fifth Committee are embodied in parts A and B of the draft resolution constituting annex 2 to the report, which I now submit for the Assembly's consideration, with the hope that it will meet with the approval of the Assembly also.

11. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I put to the vote draft resolutions A and B contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/4977], which recommends their adoption.

Draft resolutions A and B were adopted by 88 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 94

Enlargement of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/4973)

12. Mr. ARRAIZ (Venezuela), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee (translated from Spanish): Nineteen Latin American Member States requested the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the present session. In the explanatory memorandum [A/4916], the countries making the request noted the absence of an expert from Africa among the members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. The request for inclusion became item 94 of our agenda. This item forms the subject of the report which I have the honour of submitting to the General Assembly [A/4973], entitled: "Enlargement of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions".

13. When this item was referred to the Fifth Committee, seventeen African Member States joined the Latin American States in submitting a draft resolution in which it was asked that the membership of the Advisory Committee be increased to eleven. In the preamble of the draft resolution, reference was made to the fact, already noted in the explanatory memorandum, that there was no African expert on the Advisory Committee.

14. The draft resolution was favourably received in the Fifth Committee. Many speakers emphasized that the fact of the Advisory Committee's small membership had represented one of the greatest contributions to the Committee's universally recognized efficiency. Nevertheless, they admitted that the arguments put forward in the draft resolution were well founded and that an increase was necessary. These comments are referred to in paragraphs 3 to 10 of the report which I have the honour to submit.

15. Other representatives argued that Africa was not the only region which in their opinion lacked representation on the Advisory Committee, and that an expert from Eastern Europe was also needed. They accordingly proposed various amendments with a view to remedying this omission. These amendments provided that the membership of the Advisory Committee would be increased to twelve instead of to eleven and that, in the preamble, reference should be made to Eastern Europe as well as to Africa. Paragraphs 12 to 14 of the report refer to the ensuing debate of these amendments.

16. Following this debate, the Fifth Committee evolved a compromise. The thirty-six Latin American and African States which had sponsored the draft resolution agreed that the membership of the Committee should be increased to twelve and that the reference to Africa in the preamble should be deleted, and the East European representatives for their part agreed to withdraw their amendments. Paragraphs 15 to 18 of the report refer to this compromise and to the debate which followed it.

17. The draft resolution as thus amended was approved in the Fifth Committee by a roll-call vote of 81 to none, with 6 abstentions; it is reproduced in paragraph 21 of the report. In view of the result of this vote, I trust that the General Assembly too will give its approval to this draft resolution.

18. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I invite the Assembly to vote on the draft resolution contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/4973], which recommends that it should be adopted.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 19

Question of disarmament

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (PART I) [A/4980]

Mr. Enckell (Finland), Rapporteur of the First Committee, presented the report of this Committee.

19. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The First Committee has adopted unanimously the draft resolution contained in part I of its report [A/4980]. If no one has any observations to make, I shall consider that the General Assembly too unanimously adopts this draft resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 74

The status of the German-speaking element in the Province of Bolzano (Bozen): implementation of General Assembly resolution 1497 (XV) of 31 October 1960

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/4982)

20. Mr. FUKUSHIMA (Japan), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee: The General Assembly now has before it the report [A/4982] of the Special Political Committee on its consideration of item 74 on the agenda, entitled "The status of the German-speaking element in the Province of Bolzano (Bozen); implementation of General Assembly resolution 1497 (XV) of 31 October 1960". The General Assembly in-

cluded this item on its agenda at the request of the delegation of Austria [see A/4802 and Add.1] and referred it to the Special Political Committee.

21. Discussion in committee took place at six meetings, held between 15 and 23 November, during which time the Committee was assisted by the participation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Austria and of Italy. More than thirty other representatives also participated in the Committee's general debate on the question.

22. On 22 November a draft resolution, sponsored by Cyprus, India and Indonesia, was introduced in the Committee. In a revised form, circulated the following day, it called for further efforts between the two parties concerned to find a solution according to the provisions of resolution 1497 (XV). I am pleased to report to the Assembly that the draft resolution was adopted in the Special Political Committee unanimously. Accordingly, I recommend it most warmly to the General Assembly.

23. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Special Political Committee has adopted unanimously the draft resolution contained in its report [A/4982]. If there are no objections, I shall take it that this draft resolution is adopted unanimously by the General Assembly.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 75

Treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/4988)

Mr. Fukushima (Japan), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee, presented the report of this Committee.

24. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The draft resolution contained in the report of the Special Political Committee [A/4988] was adopted unanimously by that Committee. If no one has any objections, I shall take it that this draft resolution is also adopted unanimously by the General Assembly.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 76

Question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/4968)

25. Mr. FUKUSHIMA (Japan), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee: I have the honour to submit to the General Assembly the report [A/4968] of the Special Political Committee on its consideration of the question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. This question was first considered by the General Assembly at its seventh session in 1952 and has been considered at each subsequent session.

26. At this session of the General Assembly the item was put on the agenda at the request of forty-six delegations. Once again this year, the General Assembly allocated the item to the Special Political Committee for consideration and report. I believe that the thoroughness of the Committee's examination of the matter is attested to by the fact that the Committee devoted nearly three and a half weeks for the study of the matter. It held twenty-two meetings on the problem and heard nearly seventy speakers in the course of the general debate. The Committee was encouraged by the attendance, this year, of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of South Africa.

27. In the report which is now before the Assembly the Committee recommends two draft resolutions for adoption. Draft resolution I, which was sponsored by thirty-one delegations, was voted upon in parts and was adopted as a whole by a vote of 55 to 26, with 20 abstentions. Draft resolution II was originally sponsored by eight delegations. During the voting the Committee approved three amendments to the eight-Power text which had been sponsored respectively by Ethiopia, the USSR and Pakistan. Draft resolution II, as amended, was adopted by 72 votes to 2, with 27 abstentions.

28. I have the honour, therefore, on behalf of the Special Political Committee, to place before this Assembly the two draft resolutions which appear in paragraph 13 of the report of the Special Political Committee.

29. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I should like to remind the Assembly that, in accordance with the decision on procedure which was taken at the beginning of the meeting, statements should be limited to explanations of vote.

30. As I stated yesterday [1066th meeting], five speakers have asked to explain their votes before the vote is taken. I shall give them the floor. Any other representatives wishing to explain their vote will be heard after the voting. In view of the late hour, I strongly urge speakers to make their remarks as brief as possible.

31. Mr. LOUW (Republic of South Africa): My statement will be a relatively short one.

32. Let me at once assure my honourable colleagues that I have no intention of dealing with the allegations upon which these draft resolutions are based—allegations which, as I showed in my reply to the discussion in the Special Political Committee, are either devoid of truth or are distortions of fact.

33. I may, however, be permitted this remark—namely, that it is bad enough when such allegations are made in the course of an ordinary discussion, or in support of a condemnatory resolution, but that it is infinitely more serious when such allegations are the basis of resolutions calling upon the United Nations to take punitive measures against a Member State.

34. For the purpose of considering such resolutions, the General Assembly assumes the character similar to that of a court of law, which is called upon to judge as to the guilt of an accused and, if necessary, to condemn and to punish a person found guilty of a crime or of an offence. I suggest that the principles followed in the judicial systems of all civilized countries should also be applied by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Member State against whom it is intended to apply punitive measures should be informed,

first, under what particular section of the Charter such measures are sought to be taken and, secondly the Assembly must be satisfied that satisfactory and convincing evidence has been produced to justify such action. Even a feeling of "repugnance" or "abhorrence"—terms used by certain delegations—that feeling is surely not a sufficient reason for taking punitive measures; nor would evidence based on hearsay be accepted by a court of law in any civilized country.

35. And, to quote an expression in the Washington Post editorial dealing with the vote of censure in the Assembly on 11 October 1961, feelings of "passion, hate and hysteria" animating some of the accusers are equally, I suggest, not sufficient justification for taking punitive action against a Member State.

36. I suggest to the more responsible Member States of this Organization that they give very careful consideration to the matters I have mentioned before passing judgement on South Africa, and recommending punitive measures.

37. I leave aside the consideration which I mentioned in the Special Political Committee [284th meeting], namely, whether all those Member States that have joined in accusing South Africa have themselves come to this court of the United Nations with clean hands. That is a matter between the accuser and his conscience, and we know that a conscience is often made of elastic material, stretched to suit selfish purposes and interests. I shall, therefore, not pursue that aspect any further.

38. A few minutes ago I repeated the question which I put when I replied to the discussion in the Special Political Committee, namely, under what Article of the Charter is it proposed to take punitive action against South Africa? In draft resolution I, contained in the Committee's report [A/4968], there is, in operative paragraph 4, a general and somewhat vague assertion that the policies followed by the Government of South Africa "have led to international friction", and, further, that they endanger "international peace and security". I ask in what way have these policies led to international friction—in the sense in which that term is used, and also intended, in the United Nations Charter? Is it seriously suggested that because a number of Member States choose annually to attack South Africa at the sessions of the United Nations General Assembly that that is a manifestation of international friction? Delegations that vote for that paragraph, which appears in both draft resolutions, must seriously consider whether they are not joining in establishing a dangerous precedent.

39. And then there is our old friend, "danger to international peace and security". As I pointed out on a previous occasion, this already hackneyed phrase is in danger of becoming a "cliché". I am sure that the founders of the United Nations never intended it to be lightly used in this haphazard and careless manner. It is clear that the sponsors of the draft resolutions before the Assembly are relying heavily on the "danger to international peace" argument. Draft resolution I closes with a reference to Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter, which lays down that the General Assembly "may discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security".

40. It is clear, therefore, that the proposal to apply sanctions to South Africa—to take punitive action against South Africa—rests upon the allegation that

international peace is being endangered as a result of the policies pursued by the Government of that country. There clearly must be at least two parties if there is to be a threat to the peace. South Africa has no intention of creating a situation such as is envisaged in the Charter. Such a situation can only arise if there are Member States that are contemplating aggressive action against South Africa—only in that case.

41. In this connexion it is necessary to remind the Assembly that one of the representatives stated in the Special Political Committee that:

"A massive rebellion would seem to be the only course open to the non-white population of South Africa".

This statement was followed by that of another representative, who said:

"If the non-white people of South Africa were to revolt, the other African nations would be compelled to assist their non-white brothers".

And only yesterday, in the Fourth Committee, another African representative stated:

"The African States have not attacked South Africa with arms. We do not want to fight for the time being. Peaceful methods should first be tried".

42. If the General Assembly is really worried about world peace being endangered, which is the basis of these draft resolutions, then it will have to look in other quarters for the incitement which is likely to lead to the situation contemplated in the draft resolutions before the Assembly.

43. If an imagined threat to world peace is to be the reason for applying punitive measures such as sanctions and expulsion, I suggest that Member States, however much they may be out of sympathy with South African policy, would be taking a very grave risk if they joined in establishing a precedent which is not in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and which may in future be used against themselves or against their friends.

44. The attitude of the South African Government is that there is no evidence, nor any reason to believe, that international peace is being threatened or endangered as the result of South Africa's domestic policy of separate development along parallel lines of its white and non-white peoples.

45. There is another aspect to which I would invite the General Assembly's attention. South Africa has in the past consistently maintained that Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter prohibits the United Nations from either discussing or in any other way interfering in our internal affairs—a view to which we still adhere. In my statement to the Special Political Committee I quoted a number of representatives—some of them sponsors of these draft resolutions—who, when in the past arguing against our contention, maintained that South Africa was placing too narrow an interpretation on the meaning and scope of Article 2, paragraph 7. They agreed—it is in the records of the United Nations—that this Article prohibited intervention, but disagreed with us as to what constituted intervention. It is a question of intervention or discussion.

46. I do not think that anybody can deny that the principles contained in draft resolution I would in fact constitute deliberate intervention in the domestic af-

fairs of South Africa and will, as such, be a violation of Article 2, paragraph 7.

47. In the circumstances set out above, I wish to emphasize that the steps in operative paragraphs 5 and 6 of draft resolution I are not permitted by, and will not be in accordance with, any provision of the Charter. Even if the draft resolution were to be adopted by the General Assembly it would not by that fact acquire legal validity.

48. If Member States, by virtue of such a resolution, were to take punitive action against South Africa, they would be acting in contravention of the provisions of the Charter, and particularly of Article 11, upon which the sponsors of the draft resolution rely, and which clearly refers only to "situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security".

49. Mr. President, may I ask these gentlemen ahead of me to stop talking so loudly. It is most disturbing; I do not know whether they—the Ukrainian delegation—are doing it on purpose.

50. I say again, if Member States, by virtue of such a resolution, were to take punitive action against South Africa, they would be acting in contravention of the provisions of the Charter, and particularly of Article 11, upon which the sponsors of the draft resolution rely, and which clearly refers only to "situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security".

51. The Assembly may also usefully bear in mind that punitive action works both ways. Its action may be retroactive. For instance, a situation may arise similar to that of the Suez Crisis of 1956, when South African harbours were working day and night, full twenty-four-hour shifts—to handle the huge accumulation of shipping resulting from the closing of the Suez Canal. The proposals envisaged in this draft resolution—particularly that devoted to shipping—would, if adopted and if carried out, make it difficult for the South African Government to render such assistance and co-operation, if a similar case should arise in the future. I would add that the assistance rendered by South Africa at the time of the Suez Crisis was deeply appreciated by the countries concerned.

52. In conclusion, I wish to refer to operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution I which envisages the expulsion of South Africa as a Member of the United Nations. In this connexion I shall say no more than I said in the Special Political Committee, namely, that once the United Nations starts expelling Member States, that will be the beginning of the end of the United Nations.

53. Mr. REEDTZ-THOTT (Denmark): I have asked for the floor in order to explain the vote of my delegation and to propose that separate votes be taken on certain paragraphs of draft resolution II contained in the report of the Special Political Committee [A/4968] concerning the question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

54. My delegation has taken this initiative because Denmark was one of the sponsors of the original draft resolution which was presented as a result of co-operation among India, Afghanistan, Ceylon, the Federation of Malaya, Venezuela, Norway, Togo and Denmark.

55. Permit me to explain briefly my reasons for requesting separate voting on the paragraphs which

constitute the amendments to the original draft resolution.

56. As we all know, we have before us two draft resolutions from the Special Political Committee concerning the question of the apartheid policy in South Africa, namely, draft resolution I, sponsored by several African States, and draft resolution II, sponsored by India and the States I have just mentioned.

57. Now why did we get two draft resolutions? I suppose because there are, in this Assembly, two sets of opinions about how to face this problem most efficiently.

58. I well realize that the traditional approach, as recommended in draft resolution II, the Indian draft, has failed to bring about any change in the apartheid policy of the South African Government and that, therefore, the sponsors of draft resolution I, the African draft resolution, have lost patience and are calling for definite action.

59. This, however, should not conceal the fact that the sponsors of both original draft resolutions have the same goal for their efforts here, namely, the abolishment of the apartheid policy. We are only attempting to pursue that goal along different lines—or, rather, we were, before draft resolution II was amended.

60. As adopted by the Special Political Committee, draft resolution II was given a new content, namely, the new operative paragraphs 4, 6 and 7, thereby changing precisely the idea that made the two drafts different.

61. The result of this change became evident in the voting of the Committee. Many countries were forced to abstain on draft resolution II, as amended—even my own delegation, which had been a sponsor of the draft.

62. Certainly this is neither right nor wise. Certainly it could not be the intention of this General Assembly, in which practically all countries have expressed abhorrence of the apartheid policy, to prevent a number of States from voting in favour of a draft resolution which actually condemns the apartheid policy, just because these countries disagree on certain paragraphs. After all, those who want definite sanctions still have their desires expressed in draft resolution I, which is now before us.

63. I believe that my colleagues in the General Assembly will agree with me that it would be a poor outcome of this session's discussion of the question of apartheid in which, for a change, the Republic of South Africa has participated, and of our voting here, if the draft resolution against apartheid got weaker support than last year.

64. For this reason my delegation proposed a separate vote on the amendments made to draft resolution II, simply because we hope, thereby, to restore to the draft resolution its original content. I feel confident that the draft resolution, thus restored, will be passed by the vote of practically all Members.

65. I therefore propose that separate votes be taken on the first part of operative paragraph 4, on the second part of that paragraph, and on operative paragraphs 6 and 7 of draft resolution II.

Mr. Schurmann (Netherlands), Vice-President, took the Chair.

66. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) (translated from French): The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Senegal has already explained from this rostrum [1012th meeting] our country's position regarding the policy of racial segregation practised by the South African Government.

67. We have already said here that we are sceptical about the paradise and happiness of the African inhabitants described to us by the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs. We have already said here that the happiness given to them is selective. No doubt they have been given fine homes, fine clothing and good food, but at the same time they have been deprived of the most fundamental human rights, of their dignity and their honour. The happiness given to them is very much that of some human sub-species bordering on the plant or animal kingdom.

68. But we must never forget that man is first and foremost a creature of thought and feeling. No form of human happiness is valid unless it has the intellectual assent and moral support of the people for whom it is intended. But the happiness given to the South Africans—a vegetative happiness based on the satisfaction of material needs or on the crudest materialism—mistakes the trappings for the essentials. The Africans of South Africa are fully aware of the lot that has fallen to them. They know very well that the condition imposed on them is that of the pariah and the slave.

69. In spite of all the resolutions which this Assembly has adopted—resolution 616 (VII) in 1952, resolution 917 (X) in 1955 and resolution 1598 (XV) in 1961—South Africa persists in violating the most fundamental human rights of the country's indigenous people and even cynically boasts of violating these rights, which are recognized in all truly democratic constitutions and above all in the United Nations Charter. Indeed, it is this which has led certain international organizations to take sanctions against South Africa. Thus South Africa has been excluded from the International Labour Organisation, from the Commission for Technical Co-operation in Africa South of the Sahara at the Abidjan Conference, and even from the British Commonwealth.

70. Senegal has asked that the General Assembly should follow the example of these international organizations and impose the same penalty of expulsion on South Africa. Today we content ourselves with supporting and voting for draft resolution I submitted by the Special Political Committee. This text is, of course, much more moderate than our original proposal, but in operative paragraph 5 it does provide for consideration of the possible exclusion of South Africa from the United Nations if, despite the solemn warning we address to it today, it persists in its policy of racial segregation, a policy which is obsolete, short-sighted and absurd in the context of modern developments and which will be swept away like a straw in the political currents of the future.

71. Before the end of our century, the irresistible surge of human progress will bear away all those countries which, like South Africa, have become rigidly and inflexibly rooted in their past errors. As a result such countries are unable to adapt themselves to a changing world and hence are unfit for survival.

Mr. Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.

72. Mr. AMONOO (Ghana): The history of racial policies in South Africa, which has beset the General

Assembly for the past ten years, is too well known for me to elaborate upon. But the delegation of Ghana wishes to record its utter opposition to man's inhumanity to man. No argument, no subterfuge, will convince us that the United Nations should not take drastic, positive and comprehensive measures against the Government of South Africa.

73. The world has been tolerant—too tolerant—in respect of apartheid, the most pernicious system of government of this earth. Never in the history of mankind has a small group of persons dominated so brutally—by political, economic, cultural, military and theological means—the innocent majority, the indigenous masses, in their own country, with such low depths of depravity.

74. Mr. Louw of South Africa, who spoke just before me, is not even defending his country, for he is only defending a very small minority. We in Africa cannot believe that this system can be uprooted by persuasion, understanding and moderation. Such methods have been used before in the case of South Africa, to no avail, since the present leaders of South Africa are no respecters of such considerations.

75. The apostles of moderation among us have advanced legal, economic and other reasons to oppose sanctions or expulsion from this Organization. It is my fervent belief that wherever the question is discussed—whether in this Assembly or in the Security Council, or outside the United Nations—those who oppose our measures or solutions will always oppose them until there is a massive world pressure upon them to change their views. For our friends, as we all know, have economic, military, diplomatic and political interests in sustaining the white régime in South Africa. Moreover, there are blood ties between them and South Africa.

76. Were apartheid to be confined to the territorial limits of South Africa, it would be bad enough; but what is happening is that this wicked policy of domination is stretching and strengthening itself outside South Africa into South West Africa.

77. We agree with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions—which, I believe, has the full support of United States labour circles—that all Governments should refrain from entering into arms deals with South Africa, since such equipment would undoubtedly lead to increased government means to enforce its inhuman apartheid policy, and also because any such deal would be interpreted as abetting oppression in South Africa.

78. We believe that all three amendments to draft resolution II adopted in the Special Political Committee should be adopted in the plenary, since they put some teeth into the original draft resolution.

79. We are happy that several countries—on their own initiative—have already broken off diplomatic relations with South Africa, and have embarked upon a total economic and trade boycott of its Government. It is our hope that other Governments will follow these very good examples. We are certain that it is because South Africa feels ostracized that Mr. Eric Louw, the Foreign Minister of South Africa, has spent the longest time he has ever spent in New York during the current session of the General Assembly.

80. We earnestly hope that Mr. Eric Louw will report at first hand how very unpopular his Government's policies are with the rest of the world, and so force

his Government to turn over a new leaf in the direction of sanity.

81. The die has been cast; the hour of decision has arrived. We are at the crossroads. March forward we must. There is no turning back until this pernicious evil of racism is for ever uprooted from our beloved continent, Mother Africa, nay, even from the rest of the world.

82. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): In connexion with the voting in the General Assembly on the draft resolutions [A/4968] regarding apartheid in the Republic of South Africa which were recommended for adoption by the Special Political Committee, the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement.

83. The discussion, at the General Assembly's present session, on the question of racial conflict in South Africa caused by the apartheid policy of the Government of the Republic of South Africa has shown that the present overwhelming majority of the General Assembly not only repudiates the shameful policy of apartheid but also demands that there should be an immediate end to this anti-human racial policy. In the course of the general debate the representatives of more than thirty States resolutely condemned this policy. And at its 1034th plenary meeting on 11 October 1961 the Assembly, as we know, scornfully condemned the attempt of the South African racialists to justify, from this rostrum, the anti-human policy of apartheid.

84. During the discussion of this question in the Special Political Committee, not one of the seventy representatives who spoke—apart from the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs himself—supported the policy of racial discrimination pursued by the Government of the Republic of South Africa. In other words, the South African racialists—these champions of the policy of apartheid, which is a disgrace to our era—found themselves isolated at the present session of the General Assembly.

85. It is perfectly clear that the policy of brutal racial discrimination carried out by the South African Government is compatible neither with the Charter of the United Nations, nor with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, nor with the elementary standards of human dignity; it represents a threat to peace and security in Africa, and a definite end must be put to it.

86. The present session of the General Assembly now has the task of translating into concrete action its attitude of unanimous condemnation for apartheid, and of embodying in effective measures the wrathful verdict which it has, from this platform and in the Special Political Committee, passed upon this criminal policy.

87. There can now be no further doubt that the only real way of abolishing the barbarous racial laws and persecution operated in South Africa against that country's non-white population is by taking resolute action, since the South African Government has bluntly declared that it will never, of its own will, agree to change the policy of apartheid.

88. Consequently, if we really wish to put an end to this policy, we must compel the Government of the Republic of South Africa to take account of the view of the General Assembly and of world opinion; we must oblige it to abolish the slave-owning régime which prevails in that Republic. There is no other way of stopping the policy of apartheid in the South

African Republic; of this we are convinced by the official declaration made by the South African Government in defence of that policy. To confine ourselves to mere oral condemnation of the excesses of racialism in the South African Republic—to postpone, on any pretext whatsoever, to an indefinite future date the adoption of decisive measures against the policy of apartheid—would in such circumstances be tantamount to accepting in advance a situation in which further thousands of representatives of the indigenous population in South Africa were thrown into prison, would be tantamount to giving *de facto* approval to a continuation of the policy of barbarous racial discrimination, since all the appeals of the General Assembly would again be ignored by the Government of the Republic of South Africa, as all of us here present know only too well.

89. To bring moral pressure to bear on a Government which openly spurns all moral standards is no more than a fiction. Only realistic measures, only resolute action can really put an end to this policy, and it is the absolute duty of the United Nations to take such action.

90. The United Nations can no longer tolerate the glaring violation by the South African racialists and colonizers of the most important requirements of the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. The General Assembly must take realistic steps to put an immediate end to the practice of apartheid, which constitutes a disgrace to the whole civilized world.

91. The Soviet delegation is deeply convinced that the draft resolutions on apartheid, as approved by the Special Political Committee and submitted by it to the General Assembly, do really provide for the truly and extremely necessary measures whereby it would be possible, without further delay, to liquidate the effects of racial policy in the South African Republic on the non-white population and to put effective stop to the horrors and bloodshed prevalent in that country. It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet delegation fully supports both these drafts.

92. We appeal to all delegations to remember that on the results of the voting on the draft resolutions now submitted for consideration to the General Assembly will largely depend the fate of millions of people in South Africa, and peace and security throughout the African continent.

93. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We have now heard the five speakers who asked to explain their votes before the voting. The Assembly will now proceed to vote in turn on draft resolutions I and II in the report of the Special Political Committee [A/4968], which recommends their adoption.

94. Before putting draft resolution I to the vote, I should like to point out that the representative of the United Kingdom has requested a separate vote on operative paragraphs 5 to 7. Is there any objection to this motion for division?

95. Mr. COLLET (Guinea) (translated from French): The President has just informed us that a representative has proposed a separate vote on operative paragraphs 5 to 7 on draft resolution I.

96. It is obvious that these paragraphs are the very heart of this proposal, which provides among other things for sanction against South Africa, a country that

refuses to heed the many appeals the General Assembly has addressed to it year after year since 1952 to renounce its policy of apartheid and to take appropriate steps to promote the political, economic and social development of the non-white population of South Africa.

97. All delegations in the Special Political Committee denounced and condemned apartheid as an intolerable practice founded upon the separation of races living permanently in the same country and contributing jointly to its economic advancement.

98. The evil having been clearly diagnosed, it must now be cured, and the remedy is in fact indicated in operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of draft resolution I adopted in committee.

99. The non-white population of South Africa and of Africa generally, and the peoples of the world who support peace and justice can no longer tolerate a situation in which a white minority continues to deny eleven million persons the fundamental rights recognized by the United Nations Charter and by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

100. For this reason, and in accordance with rule 91 of the Rules of Procedure, my delegation formally opposes any separate vote on draft resolution I. It strongly appeals to representatives who have expressed such a desire, and in particular to the United Kingdom representative, to withdraw their request and to agree that a vote should be taken on the draft resolution as a whole, a vote which my delegation hopes will be an affirmative one.

101. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): An objection has just been made to the motion for a separate vote on operative paragraphs 5 to 7 of draft resolution I. I would recall that, under rule 91 of the Rules of Procedure, two speakers may speak in favour of a motion for division and two may speak against.

102. Mr. KANE (Senegal) (translated from French): Our intention in taking the floor is certainly not to prevent other representatives from expressing their views freely. Nor is it our intention to depart from well established procedure here in the Assembly. We wish simply to request the application of a provision contained in rule 91 of the General Assembly's Rules of Procedure. The representative of Denmark did so earlier, and my delegation did not object. In the present case my delegation considers that this rule offers two possibilities to each representative: either to request a separate vote on a proposal, or to request that the proposal should be voted upon as a whole. If, therefore, those who drafted the Rules of Procedure gave Members of the Assembly the possibility of choosing either alternative, my delegation holds that a representative does not in any way abuse his rights or restrict the free expression of others if he requests the application of a right which is available all. This is why my delegation has taken the floor to support the request of the representative of the Republic of Guinea that draft resolution I should be voted on as a whole.

103. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Two speakers have now spoken against the motion of the United Kingdom representative for a separate vote on operative paragraphs 5 to 7 of draft resolution I. As I have already mentioned, two further speakers may be heard in favour of the motion.

104. Since no one has asked to speak, I shall now put to the vote the motion for division introduced by the United Kingdom representative.

The motion was adopted by 47 votes to 42, with 4 abstentions.

105. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now invite the Assembly to vote on operative paragraphs 5 to 7 of draft resolution I. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Hungary, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti.

Against: Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Greece.

Abstaining: India, Iran, Laos, Lebanon, Mexico, Nepal, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela, Bolivia, Burma, Cambodia, Cyprus, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Guatemala, Honduras.

The result of the vote was 48 in favour and 31 against, with 22 abstentions.

Operative paragraphs 5 to 7 were not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

106. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on the representative of the Ivory Coast on a point of order.

107. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) (translated from French): During the discussions in the Special Political Committee, my delegation had the privilege of establishing the legality of draft resolution I, and of operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 in particular. First, we referred to Article 35 of the Charter in order to prove that we were legally entitled to bring the matter before the Committee. Secondly, we referred to Article 11 in order to prove that the Committee, and subsequently the General Assembly, were correct in asserting their competence to discuss the matter. With regard to the legality of operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, a comparative study of Articles 41 and 14 of the Charter leaves no room for doubt on that point.

108. My delegation is very well aware that since economic problems are involved, the implications are such that even those who wish to support us might suffer from that support. It voted for draft resolution I because it considered that it was only one that ought to be adopted.

109. On behalf of the sponsors of the original proposal, I should like to ask the Assembly for permission to withdraw draft resolution I, particularly since operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 have not been adopted. For what is the purpose, after asserting for ten years that the racial policy of South Africa is contrary to the Charter—which everyone knows—of noting with concern that the continuance of that policy endangers international peace and security? This is a truism to everyone aware of the resemblance between that doctrine and Nazism. What is the purpose of deploring, of deprecating, if nothing is done to end this catastrophic state of affairs?

110. That is why my delegation and those of the other countries which sponsored the original proposal have concluded that with the deletion of operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, the draft resolution in effect no longer exists.

111. It would, however, like to say that the African countries hope the white peoples of Europe and America will admit that when that same doctrine was enforced against them by the Nazis, the black peoples were not deterred by economic considerations but gave their lives in order to save the world. Nazism has appeared in Africa under the name of apartheid. We are patient. Next year we shall re-submit the same draft resolution complete with operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 and perhaps a majority of the Assembly will ultimately come to understand that it is more honourable to save the dignity of man than to cling to selfish material considerations. Our only regret is that in the meantime deaths will take place and men will be humiliated as human beings.

112. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the Assembly to vote on the motion presented by the representative of the Ivory Coast to withdraw draft resolution I. If there is no objection I shall take it that the motion is adopted by the Assembly.

The motion was adopted.

113. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We now come to draft resolution II. The representatives of Denmark and the United Kingdom have requested a separate vote on the first and second parts of operative paragraph 4 and on operative paragraphs 6 and 7. If there is no objection, I shall assume that the Assembly agrees to this procedure.

114. I put to the vote the first part of operative paragraph 4 of resolution II, which reads as follows:

"Calls the attention of the Security Council to the provision of Article 11, paragraph 3, of the Charter...".

The first part of operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 70 votes to 2, with 24 abstentions.

115. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now call upon the Assembly to vote on the second part of operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution II, which reads as follows:

"... and requests it to consider what measures should be taken against the Republic of South Africa for its persistent violations of the Charter of the United Nations".

A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Iran, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia.

Against: Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland.

Abstaining: Iran, Israel, Laos, Lebanon, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Guatemala, Honduras.

The result of the vote was 52 in favour, 30 against, and 18 abstentions.

The second part of the operative paragraph 4 was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

116. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now put to the vote operative paragraph 6. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Uruguay, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta.

Against: Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Uruguay, Austria, Burma, Ceylon, Cyprus, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Honduras, India, Iran, Israel, Italy, Laos, Mexico, Nepal, Philippines, Thailand.

The result of the vote was 50 in favour, 33 against, and 17 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 6 was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

117. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I put to the vote operative paragraph 7. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Canada, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon.

Against: Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil.

Abstaining: Canada, Ceylon, China, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Israel, Lebanon, Mexico, Nepal, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Austria, Bolivia, Burma.

The result of the vote was 47 in favour, 32 against, and 21 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 7 was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

118. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on the Assembly to vote on draft resolution II as a whole with the exception of the second part of operative paragraph 4 and operative paragraphs 6 and 7, which have not been adopted. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Cuba, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville).

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Guinea.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 97 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

119. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I shall now give the floor to those speakers who have asked to explain their votes.

120. Mr. ANDRESEN (Portugal) (translated from French): The Portuguese delegation voted against draft resolution II because, in its view, the very adoption of that resolution constitutes acceptance of the principle of intervention in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of a State. This position is based on Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations.

121. With regard to racial discrimination, I wish to reaffirm that my country's attitude has always been based on non-discrimination. That is why, when the Special Political Committee voted on draft resolution I, my delegation requested a separate vote on the first part of operative paragraph 2, which reads as follows: "Deprecates policies based on racial discrimination as being reprehensible and repugnant to the dignity and the rights of peoples and individuals ...".

122. Mr. COMAY (Israel): At the Committee stage my delegation voted for operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution I, but abstained on operative paragraphs 5 and 7 of that draft. Our vote at this plenary meeting on the three paragraphs taken together does not imply any change in the position taken by my delegation in the Special Political Committee on operative paragraphs 5 and 7.

123. Mr. CROWE (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom was glad to be able to give further expression to its abhorrence of apartheid by voting in favour of the finally amended form of resolution II, the second resolution before us. We were able to do this because certain portions of the draft, to which the objections of my delegation were expressed in Committee, were removed by today's voting.

124. It is our sincere hope that the overwhelming vote now cast in favour of this resolution, once again appealing to the South African Government, will really have effect.

125. Apart, however, from these objections to operative paragraphs 4, 6 and 7, my delegation had two reservations which we have expressed before and which I should now like briefly to recall. Under operative paragraph 5 of the resolution, the General Assembly:

"Urges all States to take such separate and collective action as is open to them in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations to bring about an abandonment of the racial policies referred to earlier."

126. Our difficulty in this paragraph is in the words "and collective". It is my delegation's view that in a matter of this kind each country should decide for itself what action is open to us. As the United Kingdom representative said in 1960,^{1/} speaking on a similar paragraph, if we find it hard to prescribe for ourselves the course of wisdom in this perplexing matter, how much harder it is to try to prescribe it for others.

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Special Political Committee, 242nd meeting.

127. Our second reservation is on the last half of operative paragraph 9, which declares that the continuance of these policies "seriously endangers international peace and security". We agree with the first part of the paragraph; these policies have led to international friction. But we should be most careful, before we go beyond this, to assert the existence of a threat to international peace and security. As was said in an earlier speech of my delegation to the Special Political Committee [274th meeting], this is a solemn phrase, one of the most solemn in the Charter, and we do this Organization no service if we invoke it for less than the most grave situations. My delegation does not believe that we can seriously claim this here. This was the attitude taken by the United Kingdom delegation at the time of the discussion of the Security Council resolution,^{2/} to which reference is made in the resolution before us, and we see no reason now to change our view.

128. Mr. GABRE SELLASSIE (Ethiopia): The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa has become a permanent feature on the General Assembly's agenda; and so this year we had discussed this at great length in the Special Political Committee and my delegation has fully expressed its views on the subject and I do not want at this late hour to go on further on this particular item.

129. However, the fact remains that the more resolutions the United Nations has passed, the more the situation has deteriorated in South Africa. The blind refusal of the South African Government to move with the times, as is seen here, has cost it a great many friends and the prestige it enjoyed in the eyes of the world.

130. This is not really an African issue; it should not be in any case. It is a genuine human problem. The Africans of course will take it up if it is left for them alone to fight the issue. But it should not be so. Moreover, as it is seen by the votes taken here in the General Assembly, even by the speech of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan, when he spoke on the winds of change, and the little incident that took place here even today, caused not by an African, but by a South African, obviously white: all these should really be signs for the South African to

think quite seriously that the time has come for them to reconsider the whole thing and to adopt a more genuine view that suits the present generation.

131. The role that my delegation has played here right from the beginning requires I think just a very short explanation. We did not really intend from the start to propose measures to be adopted by the United Nations which are purely punitive measures, as the honourable representative of South Africa said. We did not ask the United Nations to play the role of a court; but what we have done and what we have sought—right from the very beginning—was really to try to find ways and means by which we could actually persuade the South African Government to change its opinion and views.

132. Moreover, I do believe too—and have done right from the start—that when Article 6 of the Charter was adopted by those who were seriously discussing the matter in San Francisco in 1945, they never intended to make it an instrument for reducing the universality of the United Nations. What they have laid down in the Charter can only be interpreted to mean that although universality should be aimed at in every possible way, at the same time the primary purposes of the Organization are peace and security.

133. On the basis of this Article, therefore, we felt that a measure could be adopted this time which would focus the attention of the world even more on South Africa. This way we thought we might perhaps be more successful in achieving our objectives, in the hope that the Government would be persuaded to follow a different course and there would therefore be no question of expelling South Africa. The idea of discussing measures that entail expulsion of a Member State, moreover, is not novel. It was discussed in the League of Nations as early as 1939—I believe in connexion with the USSR and Finland.

134. That really is the whole purpose of our suggestion and we do not want it to be felt that we were only aiming at making the Assembly adopt a punitive measure. It was simply to persuade the South African Government to change its view, and we hope that next year we shall be in a position to congratulate the South African Government rather than condemn it.

^{2/} Official Records of the Security Council, Fifteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1960, document S/4300.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.