

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records



**83rd
PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 5 December 1983,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Jorge E. ILLUECA (Panama).

AGENDA ITEM 119

Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East (concluded):*

(b) United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon: report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) (Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly for consideration the report of the Fifth Committee on sub-item (b) of agenda item 119, concerning the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon [UNIFIL]; this report is contained in document A/38/678.

2. The recommendation of the Fifth Committee appears in paragraph 7 of the report and consists of two draft resolutions, A and B, which were both adopted in the Committee by 94 votes to 12, with 6 abstentions.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Albania for an explanation of vote before the vote. I remind representatives that explanations of vote should be limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

4. Mr. PAPAJOGEJI (Albania): The Albanian delegation will vote against the draft resolutions on the financing of UNIFIL, recommended to the General Assembly for adoption.

5. Our delegation wishes to reiterate that our negative vote is in keeping with the stand always adopted by us in voting on the financing and the dispatch of various United Nations forces to various parts of the world. The Albanian delegation has always explained its position clearly in the General Assembly or in the Fifth Committee and will not do so in detail again today.

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The recommendations of the Fifth Committee appear in paragraph 7 of its report [A/38/678]. Draft resolutions A and B were considered jointly in the Committee and will be put to the vote in the same way at this plenary meeting. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden,

Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Burundi, Cape Verde, Congo, Iraq, Maldives, Yemen.

Draft resolutions A and B were adopted by 80 votes to 11, with 7 abstentions (resolutions 38/38 A and B).¹

7. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, who wishes to explain his vote.

8. Mr. TEEBAR (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would like to reaffirm its position on the question of the existence of the so-called United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Arab region. Our position may be summed up as follows. First, the peace-keeping forces changed nothing when the Zionist entity invaded Lebanon last year. These peace-keeping forces did not deter the Zionist entity from committing continued acts of aggression, and thus proved their ineffectiveness. Secondly, the presence of these forces cannot possibly resolve the problem in the region. The true solution would be for the aggressor to put an end to that act of aggression. Thirdly, the aggressor and the Power supporting it must shoulder the responsibility for their acts. For the reasons I have stated, my delegation did not participate in the vote on the draft resolutions in document A/38/678.

AGENDA ITEM 32

Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa (concluded):*

- (a) Report of the Special Committee against Apartheid;**
- (b) Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports;**
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General**

9. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Mozambique to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.20 and Corr.1.

10. Mr. dos SANTOS (Mozambique): The abhorrent and abominable policies and practices of *apartheid* are too well known to the General Assembly and to the world at large to need a special presentation. For decades now, the world has condemned those policies and practices, and the people of South Africa have lived, or rather vegetated, under them. Daily, about 200,000 people are in prison, within the prison that the whole of the territory of South Africa constitutes. Yes, South Africa is a big, ugly prison. Thousands of people languish in prison for long periods of time or for life, for ever. Thousands of

*Resumed from the 79th meeting.

*Resumed from the 71st meeting.

others are physically or mentally maimed or treated brutally in other ways. Still thousands of others are sent to forced labour. Many prisoners lose their lives at the hands of the police or in jail. South Africa today is in the unenviable position of having the largest prison population in the whole world.

11. Inferior education is ministered to black children. Black workers get much less pay for the same work as their white counterparts. Although white workers enjoy the right to form and belong to labour unions, this same right is denied to their black counterparts. Black workers in the white areas cannot be joined by their families. The whole black population, constituting over 70 per cent of the total population of South Africa, is being mercilessly and brutally uprooted from its ancestral lands to be resettled in remote, overcrowded and barren lands, hardly constituting 13 per cent of South African territory, thus forcing them to lose what they have painstakingly been building for decades: houses, shops, schools, churches, water supplies, and other infrastructures. This policy has continued even after the November farce carried out by racist South African authorities. Even churches do not escape the merciless and brutal action of the God-fearing *apartheid* bulldozer.

12. Under these circumstances, it is only appropriate that the General Assembly should first reiterate its abhorrence and condemnation of *apartheid*; secondly, reaffirm the right of the people of South Africa to use all necessary means at their disposal for the eradication of *apartheid*; thirdly, commend the people of South Africa and their national liberation movements for their achievements in their struggle, as well as other bodies, trade unions and organizations for their relentless campaign to isolate South Africa; fourthly, appeal once again to international financial institutions and corporations to cease and desist from propping up the *apartheid* régime; and fifthly, appeal for all-round assistance to the people of South Africa in their struggle for peace, equality, freedom, justice, and social and economic progress.

13. A vote for draft resolution A/38/L.20 and Corr.1, on the situation in South Africa, would go a long way to comfort the orphans, the widows, the widowers, the oppressed and the dispossessed. I favourably commend this draft resolution to the Assembly.

14. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Guinea to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.21 and Add.1.

15. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the sponsors, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.21 and Add.1, entitled "Programme of Action against *Apartheid*". The purpose of this draft resolution is to promote conditions which will make it possible rapidly to eliminate the crime of *apartheid*, in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

16. The draft resolution contains five preambular and three operative paragraphs. The first preambular paragraph expresses serious concern over the grave situation in southern Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid* and the criminal acts of the racist régime of South Africa. The second preambular paragraph expresses the desire of the Assembly to promote more effective action by the international community to secure the speedy eradication of *apartheid* and the establishment of a non-racial democratic State in South Africa. The third preambular paragraph recognizes the importance of concerted action by Governments, as well as intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals for this purpose. The fourth preambular paragraph takes note of the proclamation of the Second Decade to Combat Racism

and Racial Discrimination, beginning on 10 December 1983. The fifth preambular paragraph refers to the Programme of Action against *Apartheid* adopted by the Special Committee against *Apartheid* on 25 October 1983.

17. Paragraph 1 commends the Programme of Action against *Apartheid* to the attention of all Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and individuals. Paragraph 2 invites all Governments, organizations and individuals to take effective action in light of that programme, in close co-operation with the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the Centre against *Apartheid*. Paragraph 3 requests the Secretary-General, through the Department of Public Information, to ensure widest publicity to the Programme of Action and to instruct all United Nations offices to take appropriate action to promote its implementation.

18. We believe that unreserved support for the spirit and letter of this draft resolution is the very minimum which democratic Governments that cherish peace, justice and freedom can do to show solidarity with the victims of the crime of *apartheid*. We accordingly now submit the draft resolution for adoption by the General Assembly, and we hope that it will be adopted unanimously.

19. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Uganda to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.22 and Add.1.

20. Mr. BIGOMBE (Uganda): The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa continue to pose a threat to peace in the region of southern Africa, in particular, and indeed to international peace and security.

21. Alarmed at the growing resistance to its policies, the racist régime has adopted treacherous tactics of internationalizing the conflict. A bloody campaign of destabilization of the independent neighbouring States has been unleashed by South Africa. In the past year, the African States of the region have been victims of acts of aggression committed by the racist régime. Instead of responding to the injunctions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, South Africa has stepped up its military attacks and acts of destabilization against the front-line States.

22. In December 1982, the racist forces mounted their biggest massacre in Lesotho, leaving many South African refugees and Lesotho nationals dead. In May of this year, the racist régime of South Africa launched yet another unprovoked air raid against Mozambique. A similar attack was reported last month. South Africa continues to occupy the southern part of Angola. Furthermore, the racist régime has been engaged in other acts of destabilization, including economic sabotage and the arming and financing of dissident groups in the region. The objective is to frighten the Governments of those independent States so that they will not support the liberation struggle, or ultimately to replace them with puppet Governments. Another objective is to increase their economic dependence on South Africa. It is therefore no wonder that economic installations have been the object of acts of sabotage.

23. The impact of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa continues to grow with the perpetuation of *apartheid* in southern Africa. This situation has disrupted the economic life of the States concerned. The front-line States are paying a heavy price for their commitment to the liberation of southern Africa. We call on the international community to give them all possible assistance.

24. It is in this context that I introduce, on behalf of the sponsors, draft resolution A/38/L.22 and Add.1, entitled "Effects of *apartheid* on the countries of southern Africa". The draft resolution:

"1. *Condemns* the acts of aggression by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa against Angola, Lesotho and Mozambique and its threats against independent African States in southern Africa;

"2. *Demands* that all troops of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa be immediately and unconditionally withdrawn from Angola and that South Africa respect fully the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent African States;

"3. *Fully supports* the measures taken by the Government of Angola in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations in order to guarantee and safeguard the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of Angola;

"4. *Expresses* its full support for the people and Government of Mozambique in their struggle to preserve their national independence and sovereignty and urges all States to provide political, diplomatic and material support to Mozambique;

"5. *Further strongly condemns* the racist minority régime of Pretoria for its acts of destabilization, armed aggression and economic blockade against Lesotho and strongly urges the international community to extend maximum assistance to Lesotho to enable it to fulfil its international humanitarian obligations towards refugees and to use its influence on the racist régime to desist from its terrorist acts against Lesotho;

"6. *Demands* that the racist régime of South Africa pay full compensation to Angola, Lesotho and other independent African States for the damage to life and property caused by its acts of aggression;

"7. *Calls upon* the international community to provide assistance to independent African States in the subregion to enable them to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity and to counter the hostile South African acts of aggression and to rebuild their economies;

"8. *Urges* the Security Council to consider, as a matter of urgency, the means to ensure peace in southern Africa."

25. It is the duty of the United Nations to ensure that peace and security are maintained in southern Africa. We therefore appeal to all members of the Assembly to support this draft resolution.

26. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.23 and Corr.1.

27. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania): Draft resolution A/38/L.23 and Corr.1 addresses the question of sanctions against South Africa. In introducing it, I am privileged to speak on behalf of the sponsors.

28. This is not the first time the Assembly has considered punitive measures against the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. South Africa is guilty of the most heinous crimes imaginable. The Assembly has already declared that *apartheid* is a crime against humanity. South Africa's record outside that country is as worthy of condemnation. The aggression against the black peoples neighbouring South Africa has been intensified, not to mention the fact that the black people inside South Africa are even denied citizenship of their own country. The draft resolution therefore aims to underline the concern of the international community about the comfort South Africa is being given by some Members of the United Nations. We are all aware that in the Security Council the three permanent members have prevented the Council from adopting comprehensive sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

29. Throughout the debate on this item, most of those who have spoken have deplored the continued trade links between some Members of the United Nations and the racist régime. The same concern has been expressed about the extensive involvement of many transnational corporations with South Africa, in contravention of numerous United Nations resolutions. It is for this reason that in the draft resolution we have deplored the attitude of some of the Member States concerned.

30. The operative paragraphs of the draft resolution are aimed at alerting the Security Council to the deteriorating situation in South Africa and the threat that the Government of South Africa poses to the neighbouring States. The Council is therefore asked to consider taking appropriate measures against the *apartheid* régime of South Africa.

31. Since most of those who give comfort to South Africa have never supported the use of force against South Africa, it is the belief of the sponsors of the draft resolution that those Member States will have no problem in supporting the text, whose purpose is to force South Africa by peaceful means to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations.

32. By the same token, it is the belief of the sponsors, including my delegation, that this draft resolution will receive the overwhelming support of the international community.

33. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Nigeria to introduce draft resolutions A/38/L.24 and Add.1 and A/38/L.26 and Corr.1.

34. Mr. FAFOWORA (Nigeria): I have the honour to introduce, on behalf of the sponsors, draft resolutions A/38/L.24 and Add.1 and A/38/L.26 and Corr.1.

35. The Nigerian delegation is particularly happy to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.24 and Add.1, on the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. Nigeria is a founding member of the Special Committee and has had the privilege of serving as its Chairman for several years. The Government and the people of Nigeria, fully committed to the struggle to eradicate the crime of *apartheid* from the African continent, have high regard for the work of the Special Committee and greatly appreciate the dedicated service of the Centre against *Apartheid*.

36. The Special Committee against *Apartheid* observed its twentieth anniversary this year, and it was most encouraged by the numerous tributes received from Governments, organizations and individuals, and especially from the oppressed people of South Africa and their liberation movements. These commended the untiring efforts of the Special Committee in the discharge of its mandate to mobilize Governments and organizations for sanctions and other actions against the *apartheid* régime and also for assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa, and the Special Committee's particular emphasis on promoting action by world public opinion in support of United Nations resolutions.

37. We may recall that at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, in 1962, many Member States, including all the Western States, voted against or abstained on resolution 1761 (XVII), calling for sanctions against *apartheid*. Today, the overwhelming majority of Member States, including the majority of Western States, support, at least in principle, mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Only a handful of Western Powers—regrettably, the major Powers—continue to oppose any sanctions against South Africa.

38. The persistent efforts of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* were instrumental in securing a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. The Special Committee has promoted funds for humanitarian and educational assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa, and those funds now receive several million dollars a year in voluntary contributions from Member States. The Special Committee has promoted the sports and cultural boycotts of South Africa, the campaign for the release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, and many other campaigns, which have received wide response from people all over the world and have contributed greatly to the international campaign against *apartheid*. It has taken initiatives to promote action by trade unions, students, women and religious groups.

39. In countries where Governments have failed to co-operate in taking effective action against *apartheid*, the Special Committee has encouraged action by local authorities. We are gratified by action taken by many states and cities in the United States, and many cities and local authorities in the United Kingdom. I should like to express particular satisfaction at the fact that very soon, on 9 January 1984, Greater London will be proclaimed as an anti-*apartheid* zone. The Special Committee has taken many imaginative steps in support of United Nations resolutions, such as the most successful international Art against *Apartheid* exhibit, which opened in Paris a few days ago.

40. The Special Committee can be proud of its work and achievements, but it is only too conscious—painfully conscious—that its task is not done and that, in fact, the situation in South Africa is graver than ever. There is need for much greater effort by the international community.

41. The Special Committee has proposed a realistic programme of work for 1984 in the light of the present situation. It deserves the unanimous support of all Governments that are truly committed to the elimination of *apartheid*.

42. In view of some statements made in the Fifth Committee, I must say a few words about the financial implications of the programme of work of the Special Committee. Despite the grave situation in South Africa and the need for greater activity by the Special Committee and by the Centre against *Apartheid*, no increase—I repeat, no increase—in the budgetary appropriation has been proposed this year. The Special Committee and the Centre against *Apartheid* have been most prudent and most economical in their expenditure of United Nations funds. Because of their prudence they have been able to receive generous co-operation in all their activities from many Governments and organizations which are genuinely committed to work against *apartheid*. And yet we are surprised to find that four delegations voted against the budget estimates in the Fifth Committee and that seven delegations abstained. I should like to repeat that the Special Committee has been most prudent in its expenditures. Every penny, including the special allocation, is accounted for. If any delegations have any doubts, let them approach the Special Committee or the Secretariat and they will receive full information, but let them not advance so-called budgetary situations to oppose United Nations activities against *apartheid*.

43. I said that my delegation was pleased to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.24 and Add.1. I cannot say the same of draft resolution A/38/L.26 and Corr.1, on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa. In the three decades during which the United Nations has considered the grave situation in South Africa, and despite the innumerable crimes of and acts of aggression by the *apartheid* régime, the only mandatory action taken by

the Security Council has been the arms embargo instituted by the Council on 4 November 1977 in resolution 418 (1977). That action followed the Declaration of the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid*, held at Lagos from 22 to 26 August 1977.² It is shocking that even that arms embargo—a minimum mandatory measure—is being violated by some Member States and that some States are condoning violations by their nationals and their transnational corporations.

44. Since the 1977 Security Council resolution, the South African régime has greatly expanded its military budget. It has been able to obtain substantial military equipment, and even weapon systems, and an enormous amount of military technology. It has been able to escalate its acts of aggression against neighbouring States and is now threatening the entire region. The racist régime even continues to receive assistance in the nuclear field, though it refuses to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex]. In the case of South Africa, we reject totally any distinction between nuclear co-operation for military purposes and co-operation for peaceful purposes.

45. Several powerful Governments, when confronted with evidence of military supplies to South Africa, claim that they are so-called dual-purpose items. In their logic, even bombs can be civilian items because they can kill mosquitoes. Several other Governments, including some that profess strong support for the arms embargo, have failed to provide to the United Nations full information on violations by their nationals and have covered up the culprits who are engaged in secret and illegal arms supplies to South Africa. The Committee established by the Security Council under resolution 421 (1977) to monitor the arms embargo has been paralysed.

46. My delegation considers that urgent steps must be taken to ensure effective monitoring of the arms embargo, both because any military co-operation with the *apartheid* régime is a crime against Africa and peace and because any violation of the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa undermines the authority and credibility of the United Nations.

47. It gives us no pleasure to condemn anyone. We seek the co-operation of all Governments, organizations and individuals, irrespective of their ideological or other differences, in the efforts to eliminate *apartheid*. But we cannot be blind to the activities of those who persist in supplying weapons of murder to the *apartheid* criminals. It is in this context that my delegation is introducing draft resolutions A/38/L.24 and Add.1 and A/38/L.26 and Corr.1.

48. Draft resolution A/38/L.24 and Add.1, on the programme of work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, begins by congratulating the Special Committee for its efforts in promoting the international campaign against *apartheid*, and also commends the work of the Centre against *Apartheid* in assisting the Special Committee. It endorses the report of the Special Committee and requests the Secretary-General to take all appropriate steps to enable the Centre against *Apartheid* to provide more effective services to the Committee. The draft resolution authorizes the Special Committee to organize or co-sponsor conferences as it may deem necessary in the discharge of its responsibilities, and decides to make a special allocation of \$400,000 to the Special Committee in 1984 for the cost of special projects to be decided upon by the Committee in order to promote the international campaign against *apartheid*. Finally, it requests Governments and organizations to make voluntary contributions or provide other assistance for the special projects of the Special Committee.

49. Draft resolution A/38/L.26 and Corr.1 deals with the vexed question of military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa—an issue which has assumed growing importance and aroused growing concern in view of its implications for the stability of the region, as well as for international peace and security. In July of this year, the Special Committee devoted a conference at Vienna to this specific issue, as part of its efforts to promote an international campaign against the *apartheid* régime [see A/38/22, paras. 63-73].

50. The draft resolution begins by reaffirming the various resolutions of the General Assembly on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, in particular its resolution 37/69 D of 9 December 1982, and recalls resolutions concerning the denuclearization of Africa, and, in particular, Security Council resolution 418 (1977), which determined that the acquisition by South Africa of arms and related *matériel* constituted a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security. Having invited attention to the reports of the Special Committee on several conferences on *apartheid*, including the International Conference on the Alliance between South Africa and Israel, held at Vienna, the draft resolution urges the Security Council to take mandatory decisions, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to ensure the total cessation of all military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa. It condemns the action of those Member States which, in defiance of the Security Council's arms embargo resolution, continue to provide the racist régime with an enormous arsenal of military equipment and technology. Finally, the draft resolution calls on all Member States to reinforce the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, to prohibit all military and nuclear co-operation with South Africa and to take all necessary measures for preventing any such collaboration with South Africa.

51. The draft resolutions that I have introduced are designed to respond to the collective concern of the General Assembly, as well as of the international community, regarding the growing menace which the policies of the *apartheid* régime present to world peace and security. I submit these two draft resolutions to the Assembly in the hope that they will receive its broadest possible support.

52. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to introduce draft resolutions A/38/L.25 and Corr.1 and A/38/L.30 and Add.1.

53. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I have the honour to introduce, on behalf of the sponsors, draft resolution A/38/L.25 and Corr.1, on relations between Israel and South Africa, and draft resolution A/38/L.30 and Add.1, on the oil embargo against South Africa.

54. Draft resolution A/38/L.25 and Corr.1 has been drawn up in the light of the special report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [A/38/22/Add.1] and the discussions that took place in the Committee, and on the basis of information obtained on the relations between the racist régime of South Africa and the Zionist entity, in particular the information submitted to the International Conference on the Alliance between South Africa and Israel, held at Vienna from 11 to 13 July 1983. The text is drafted very specifically to reflect the existing effective co-operation between those two régimes, co-operation which in the past few years has proven to be a true alliance against the black majority in South Africa and against the people of Namibia—indeed, against the African continent as a whole. The draft resolution is a modest attempt to put an end to this impious alliance

and to lend support to the peoples of South Africa and Namibia in their struggle to eliminate the policy of *apartheid*.

55. In the draft resolution, the General Assembly takes note of the declarations of the International Conference on the Alliance between South Africa and Israel and of the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. It considers that the collaboration between South Africa and Israel is a serious hindrance to international action to eradicate *apartheid*, as well as a hostile act against the oppressed people of South Africa and the entire African continent. Under the draft resolution, the Assembly again strongly condemns the continuing and increasing alliance between Israel and the racist South African régime, especially in the military and nuclear fields. It demands that Israel desist forthwith from all forms of collaboration with South Africa, particularly in the military and nuclear fields, and abide scrupulously by the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. It calls upon all Governments and organizations to exert their influence to persuade Israel to desist from such collaboration; and it requests the Special Committee against *Apartheid* to publicize, as widely as possible, information on the relations between Israel and South Africa, and especially the Declaration of the International Conference on the Alliance between South Africa and Israel. It requests the Secretary-General to render, through the Department of Public Information and the Centre against *Apartheid*, all possible assistance to the Special Committee in disseminating information relating to the collaboration between Israel and South Africa.

56. The second draft resolution—A/38/L.30 and Add.1—was prepared in the context of international action to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the *apartheid* régime and that régime's policy of defying United Nations resolutions, and in the light of the measures which have so far been adopted to strengthen the embargo against the supply of oil to South Africa, an embargo imposed against the *apartheid* régime. Among those measures I should mention the creation of the Group of Experts on the question of the supply of oil to South Africa. The Group met twice in New York and prepared a report which was submitted to the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had the honour of participating in those meetings.

57. The sponsors of this draft resolution are convinced that it represents a commendable effort which might contribute towards weakening the racist régime and limiting its acts of oppression and of aggression against neighbouring countries.

58. In the preamble of the draft resolution, the General Assembly expresses its conviction that these measures have become imperative because of the intensification of repression and acts of aggression by South Africa. It condemns the activities of corporations and other interests which clandestinely supply South Africa with oil from countries which have imposed an oil embargo.

59. In paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the Assembly again recommends to the Security Council to consider urgently a mandatory embargo on the supply of petroleum and petroleum products to South Africa, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. In paragraph 3, the Assembly asks all States concerned to take effective action against corporations and tanker companies involved in the illicit supply of oil to South Africa. In paragraph 6, the Assembly renews its authorization to the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and in the light of

the conclusions reached at the meetings of permanent representatives to the United Nations of the oil-producing and oil-exporting countries committed to the oil embargo against South Africa, to organize an international conference on an oil embargo against South Africa for the purpose of considering national and international arrangements to ensure the implementation of embargoes imposed or policies declared by oil-producing and oil-exporting countries with regard to the supply of oil and oil products to South Africa.

60. Adoption of the two draft resolutions will reaffirm the international community's commitment in respect of problems relating to freedom, justice and peace. The sponsors of the two draft resolutions hope that they will be adopted by an overwhelming majority and that all Member States will support their implementation.

61. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call upon the representative of Norway to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.27 and Add.1.

62. Mr. KOLBY (Norway): On behalf of the sponsors I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.27 and Add.1. The United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa was established in 1965 in order to provide legal and other assistance to persons prosecuted under the repressive and discriminatory legislation of South Africa and to provide aid to their dependants. Since its inception, the Fund has been able to give assistance to a great number of persons suffering under the system of *apartheid*. The international community has responded positively to the growing need for such assistance. However, there is a continuing need for contributions, and we would like to appeal to all Member States to contribute to the Fund. The sponsors hope that the Assembly will again this year demonstrate its solidarity with the victims of *apartheid* by adopting this draft resolution unanimously.

63. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call upon the representative of Sweden to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.28 and Add.1.

64. Mrs. SÖDER (Sweden): On behalf of the sponsors, my delegation has the honour to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.28 and Add.1, regarding investments in South Africa.

65. During its previous sessions, the General Assembly has adopted with an increasing majority resolutions urging the Security Council to consider steps to achieve the cessation of further foreign investments in South Africa through economic sanctions aimed at putting pressure on the Government of South Africa to dismantle its *apartheid* system. The need for further concrete sanctions against South Africa has also been underlined with the support of a broad range of countries at international governmental conferences, as well as by meetings of non-governmental anti-*apartheid* organizations and movements all over the world. In this context, let me just mention the final document of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983.³ We note with regret, however, that the Security Council, while being seized of the question of South Africa, has so far been unable to reach agreement on steps to achieve the cessation of further foreign investments in, and financial loans to, South Africa.

66. Since the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 37/69 H, the motives for taking steps in this direction have become even more pressing. A diminishing inflow to South Africa of capital for investments and other purposes would be an effective means of pressing the South African régime to change its racial and

aggressive policies. Among other things, it would make it more difficult for that country to fulfil the increasingly costly buildup of its military and nuclear capacity. The sponsors of the draft resolution therefore consider it urgent to strengthen efforts to stem the flow of resources to South Africa for the purpose of investments.

67. Some countries may find the scope of the draft resolution too limited. However, as was the case in previous years, the sponsors have formulated the operative part of the draft resolution in such a way as to make it possible for the widest range of countries to vote for it. The broadest possible support for this kind of action would be a clear signal to South Africa that the world community as a whole is reacting strongly against its *apartheid* policy.

68. The draft resolution should be seen as one element in a broad and joint international effort to bring an end to the *apartheid* policies, and it is in this spirit that we commend it for adoption by the Assembly.

69. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call upon the representative of Barbados to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.31 and Add.1.

70. Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados): On behalf of the sponsors, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.31 and Add.1, on *apartheid* in sports. It is the hope of the members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports and the expectation of the sponsors of this draft resolution that the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee will be completed during the coming year. The only significant outstanding matter relates to the question of the third-party principle, that is, how to deal with those countries, sports organizations, teams and individual sportsmen that persist in breaching the boycott against *apartheid* sports.

71. During 1983 we have come very close to finding an acceptable basis on which to settle this delicate and difficult question. The year 1984 should be the year in which those of us that genuinely desire an effective convention should be able to overcome our differences and arrive at an acceptable solution. It would be particularly appropriate if the draft Convention, which should enshrine the Olympic principle of non-discrimination in sports, were to be completed in an Olympic year when the games are scheduled to be held on this continent.

72. The draft resolution has been framed with those objectives in mind. After reference in the only preambular paragraph to the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, the General Assembly, in paragraph 1, renews the Committee's mandate and authorizes it to continue consultations with representatives of Governments, sports organizations and experts on *apartheid* in sports in pursuance of that mandate. In paragraph 2, it requests the *Ad Hoc* Committee to continue its work with a view to submitting the completed draft Convention to the Assembly's thirty-ninth session.

73. On behalf of the sponsors, I commend the draft resolution for favourable consideration by the Assembly.

74. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Uganda wishes to introduce an amendment to draft resolution A/38/L.22 and Add.1.

75. Mr. BIGOMBE (Uganda): On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/38/L.22 and Add.1, I should like to make the following slight amendment to the text, which should meet the fears expressed by a few delegations. Paragraph 3 would be revised to read as follows:

"Fully supports the right of the Government of Angola to take measures in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations in order to guarantee and safeguard the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of Angola."

76. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on any or all of the 11 draft resolutions. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their votes after all the votes have been taken. I should like to remind the Assembly that, under rule 88 of the rules of procedure:

“The President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment.”

77. Mr. MANOLATOS (Greece): Speaking on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Community, the Ten strongly condemn the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. The entire system of *apartheid* must be eliminated and must give way to a system based on genuine representative democracy. The Ten believe that the United Nations has a role of primary importance to play in the efforts exerted to eliminate the inhuman system of *apartheid*.

78. The debate on this item has demonstrated the unanimous opposition in the Assembly to *apartheid*. Against this background, the Ten think that a greater effort should have been made in the draft resolutions before us to give expression to the Assembly's total rejection of *apartheid* in a way which could have been supported by all. They regret that once again divisive elements have been introduced into certain draft resolutions.

79. The Ten maintain that, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the division of competences between the General Assembly and the Security Council must be respected.

80. The Ten wish to reaffirm their commitment to the principle of the universality of membership of the United Nations. The specialized agencies should also retain their universal character, and their statutes should be taken into consideration.

81. The Ten believe that opposition to *apartheid* is not a struggle against a colonial situation. It is aimed at establishing a society based on the principles of democracy and social justice, irrespective of race or colour.

82. The Ten have condemned the use of violence from any quarter to solve the problems of southern Africa, including the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States neighbouring on South Africa. They are deeply concerned about the plight of refugees who have been obliged to leave South Africa.

Mrs. Jones (Liberia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

83. The attitude of the 10 States members of the European Community towards the endorsement of armed struggle in resolutions of the General Assembly is well known. The Ten are conscious that the continued existence of *apartheid* policies in South Africa suggests to many that those policies will only be ended through armed struggle. However, they believe that the United Nations has, above all, the obligation to encourage peaceful solutions.

84. The Ten do not support demands to cut off all relations with South Africa. They believe that existing channels of communications should be used to permit free expression of views on all political, social and economic matters of concern to the people of South Africa.

85. The Ten remain dedicated to the Olympic ideal of non-discrimination and reject any form of *apartheid* in sports. They must point out, however, that sport is organized on a private basis in their countries. Sporting organizations in those countries are aware of their Government's opposition to sporting contacts in violation of the Olympic ideal. The Governments of the Ten will firmly continue to discourage sporting contacts involving racial discrimination.

86. The Ten reject all arbitrary and unjustified attacks on Member States.

87. The Ten regret that, for these reasons, it will not be possible for them to support all of the draft resolutions on this item before the Assembly. The Ten reaffirm their commitment to continue their endeavour to bring about the ending of the abhorrent system of *apartheid* in South Africa.

88. Mr. van der STOEL (Netherlands): The Netherlands Government unequivocally condemns the institutionalized practice of racial segregation in South Africa. Repeatedly, my Government has called upon the South African authorities to abandon their policies of *apartheid* and to allow for the creation of a democratic society in which no distinction is made on the basis of race, colour, sex or creed. Only a few days ago, the Netherlands called upon the Government of South Africa to desist from the forced resettlement of the black village of Mogopa. This is the latest instance of a ruthless policy aimed at depriving the black majority of its most elementary human rights.

89. This year's debate on *apartheid* has allowed the international community to express once again its abhorrence of the racial policies of the South African Government. Indeed, all States Members of the United Nations that spoke here were unanimous in their rejection of *apartheid*. One would have expected this to have translated itself into concrete action by the General Assembly based on consensus. We regret that this is not the case. The focus should continue to be directed at ways and means to eradicate *apartheid*. To engage in mutual recrimination will not serve that cause.

90. Together with its partners of the European Community, the Netherlands has defined a number of principles underlying its voting pattern on *apartheid*. The representative of Greece has just enumerated them in his statement in the name of the 10 States members of the European Community. Those principles will serve to underline why my delegation will vote against draft resolution A/38/L.20. The frequent accusations levelled against friendly States, the support for armed struggle and the call for the imposition of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions and the isolation of South Africa are not in line with my Government's policy. Neither do we recognize the national liberation movement of South Africa as the authentic representative of the people. We do not think that the situation in South Africa is a colonial one. The Netherlands does, however, support the efforts of the African National Congress of South Africa [ANC] and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania [PAC] as anti-*apartheid* movements. We have further reservations about the applicability of prisoner-of-war status under the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949⁴ and Additional Protocol I.⁵

91. Some of the same considerations prompt my Government to vote against draft resolution A/38/L.23. As I had occasion to explain in the course of the debate [70th meeting], my Government follows a two-pronged approach. On the one hand, it is seeking to increase political and economic pressure on the South African Government. As part of that policy, the Netherlands does not rule out the possibility of taking further unilateral measures. On the other hand, we are trying to keep open those channels of communication through which contacts can be established and maintained in order to stimulate forces of peaceful change in South Africa. This approach does not allow for the scope of action proposed in draft resolution A/38/L.23. Comprehensive sanctions, we fear, will exacerbate tensions, lead to increased hardships for the local population and cause damage to neighbouring

countries. For this reason also, the Netherlands had to enter reservations with respect to the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa.⁶ With regard to the enumeration of selective mandatory measures in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, I wish to state that they constitute, on the whole, an important field for increased pressure on the South African Government. I will refer to them again in the course of this statement.

92. Another framework is the Programme of Action against *Apartheid*, adopted by the Special Committee against *Apartheid* on 25 October 1983 [A/38/539]. Draft resolution A/38/L.21 asks for effective action in the light of this Programme and recognizes the important contribution that can be made by non-governmental organizations and individuals. The Netherlands Government believes that its policy is in consonance with this draft resolution. Rather than cast a negative vote on account of the same unacceptable formulae in the Programme of Action that I have already mentioned, we will therefore abstain.

93. I now turn to the draft resolutions each dedicated to selective measures against South Africa. We regret that a positive vote on the draft resolution concerning military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa—A/38/L.26—will again be impossible. Central to my Government's anti-*apartheid* policy is strict compliance with the mandatory arms embargo contained in Security Council resolution 418 (1977) and the denial to South Africa of any nuclear capacity in the military field. The Netherlands will exert all possible efforts to strengthen and expand the arms embargo, notably by a mandatory ban on the imports of any military equipment or components from South Africa, as proposed also in paragraph 1 (c) of draft resolution A/38/L.23. But rather than asking for the termination of all nuclear co-operation with South Africa, my Government would have preferred a call on South Africa to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex] or, alternatively, to accept full-scope safeguards on all its nuclear activities. In this context, paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/38/L.26 is, in our view, unjustified because the nuclear installations involved are monitored by the IAEA. I would also point to the competence of the Committee established by Security Council resolution 421 (1977) to determine if violations of the embargo have occurred. The operations of that Committee need to be reinvigorated.

94. The Netherlands supports the draft resolutions on investments—A/38/L.28—and on an oil embargo—A/38/L.30. Draft resolution A/38/L.23 also refers to action by the Security Council in those fields in its paragraphs 1 (e) and (f). In consultation with employers' organizations and trade unions, my Government intends to consider in what way investments by Dutch companies in South Africa could be influenced as effectively as possible. With regard to the oil embargo, our positive vote on draft resolution A/38/L.30 is, among other things, inspired by the recommendation, in paragraph 1, to the Security Council to consider mandatory sanctions in this field. I also wish to reiterate my Government's support for the oil-exporting and oil-producing countries in their determination to ensure the implementation of their voluntary embargoes on the supply to South Africa. We hope that their consultations will lead to practical recommendations acceptable to all. But it should be clear that oil supplies to South Africa, much as they are to be regretted, cannot be labelled illicit or clandestine as long as they are not prohibited by the Security Council. This remark also pertains to paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/38/L.23.

95. My delegation will vote for draft resolution A/38/L.22, in spite of the opinion voiced in the eighth preambular paragraph of that draft. My Government's views on the so-called linkage problem have been detailed during the consideration of the question of Namibia [79th meeting]. But we value the improved wording of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. Equally, we will vote for draft resolution A/38/L.24, even though we have certain reservations about the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

96. Finally, the Netherlands will abstain once again on the draft resolution concerning *apartheid* in sports—A/38/L.31. By imposing visa requirements, my Government is now in a position to restrict, *inter alia*, the admission of South African sportsmen and sportswomen wishing to participate in events in our country. But the proposed International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports infringes upon certain constitutionally guaranteed freedoms and is therefore not acceptable to the Netherlands.

97. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): The Irish Government's condemnation of *apartheid* was most recently expressed in our statement on 18 November [62nd meeting]. In keeping with the views set out in that statement, the delegation of Ireland proposes to support six of the eleven draft resolutions before us today, on two of which we have been pleased to be a sponsor. We are, however, unable to support the other draft resolutions since, unfortunately, they contain formulations and ideas which are not consistent with the approach of my Government to the *apartheid* issue. We find ourselves, therefore, obliged to abstain on four of the draft resolutions before us and to cast a negative vote on one of them. I would also say that we share the reservations held in common by the member States of the European Community which were set out by the representative of Greece in his statement on behalf of the 10 members of the Community.

98. I turn first to the draft resolutions which we will support. My delegation will support draft resolution A/38/L.22. We are concerned at the dangerous situation emerging in southern Africa and the implications which it has for international peace and security. We deplore South Africa's continued acts of aggression against its neighbours, in persistent violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the basic norms of international behaviour. Our support for this draft resolution, however, is accompanied by some reservations about the formulation of the eighth preambular paragraph.

99. We will also support draft resolution A/38/L.24. However, our attitude to the recommendations in the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* must be understood in accordance with the general policy of my Government on *apartheid*, outlined in this and previous statements of our position.

100. Ireland will support draft resolution A/38/L.27. We feel that it is important to promote humanitarian and legal assistance to those who suffer under South Africa's discriminatory legislation, and to give assistance to their families and to refugees from South Africa.

101. The policy of my Government in relation to *apartheid* rests on the belief that if peaceful change in South Africa is to be possible, fundamental change is required without delay. We believe that the international community has a vital part to play by selecting and implementing, on a collective basis, measures against the South African Government that will be effective in bringing pressure to bear on it to abandon its *apartheid* policies. We will, therefore, support two of the draft resolutions dealing with sanctions. We will support draft resolution A/38/L.28, which once again urges the Security Council to take effective steps to achieve the cessation

of further investments in, and financial loans to, South Africa. We will also vote in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.30. We support consideration by the Security Council of an oil embargo. We have reservations, however, about some provisions of draft resolution A/38/L.30, such as paragraphs 2 and 3, which appear to pre-empt such consideration by the Council.

102. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.31, which requests the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports to continue its work with a view to submitting a draft Convention to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session. We will, of course, examine with interest the terms of this draft Convention. It is our hope that they will not give rise to problems of a legal or constitutional nature for my Government.

103. I turn now to resolutions on which my delegation will abstain. We will abstain on draft resolution A/38/L.20. In deciding to do so, we have as usual balanced the positive elements in the draft resolution against other formulations which we consider inappropriate, in particular the explicit endorsement of armed struggle, the call for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions and the arbitrary naming and condemnation of certain States in the preambular and operative paragraphs of the draft resolution. We hope that at the Assembly's next session the general resolution on the situation in South Africa will be drafted in such terms as to be able to command the support of all Members of the United Nations.

104. My delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/38/L.21. While we favour many aspects of the Programme of Action against *Apartheid*, we will regrettably be obliged to abstain in view of a number of inappropriate proposals in the Programme, including, for example, those which could give rise to legal or constitutional difficulties for my Government and those which do not take into account the status of the specialized agencies, or which are aimed specifically at some permanent members of the Security Council.

105. We will abstain on draft resolution A/38/L.23. As indicated earlier, Ireland supports the application by the Security Council of certain selective measures against South Africa, and we would have been able to support many of the specific measures itemized in paragraph 1 of this draft resolution, which are in accord with the policy of sanctions favoured by us. However, we have doubts about the wisdom of calls for comprehensive sanctions at the present juncture. We continue to believe that the right policy for the international community is one of steady and graduated pressure for change through carefully chosen, selective sanction measures, which will be properly implemented by all.

106. As in the past, my delegation would have wished to have been able to vote in favour of a draft resolution calling for an end to military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa. We are, however, reluctantly obliged to abstain on draft resolution A/38/L.26 in view of the unfair, selective and arbitrary singling out for criticism of a number of States.

107. Ireland, as in previous years, will vote against the draft resolution on relations between Israel and South Africa. In our view, draft resolution A/38/L.25 singles out one Member State of the Assembly for selective condemnation in an inappropriate manner.

108. Mr. MONTEIRO (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): Opposition to any form of racism or racial discrimination and rejection of the principles inherent in the establishment of a society based on racial inequality constitutes the very foundation of the Portuguese position on the question of *apartheid*.

109. My delegation has constantly repeated, in the course of this session of the General Assembly, its support for any initiative aimed at promoting the structural modifications essential to the creation of a just and truly democratic South African social order which would remove the tensions created by the repressive system of *apartheid*. We believe, indeed, that mere changes in the present system are inadequate and that fundamental changes in South Africa are not only necessary but inevitable. This point was made a few weeks ago by the representative of Portugal [*56th meeting*], who declared that Portugal could not support so-called partial solutions which would try in vain to avoid the overall problem, one that has an undeniable human dimension.

110. My delegation has also repeatedly made clear its conviction that change in South Africa must be peaceful and that, to this end, we must preserve the channels of communication which can facilitate constructive political initiatives. Appeals for the use of force and the total isolation of South Africa do not seem likely to contribute to the achievement of a consensus, which must be the basis of effective international pressure to allow the majority of the population of South Africa fully to exercise its lawful rights.

111. Faithful to these basic principles, when it comes to the voting my delegation will not fundamentally change the position that it has so often taken in the Assembly. Therefore, we cannot give our support to certain elements of verbal violence, discriminatory references and imprecise language contained in draft resolutions A/38/L.20, L.23 and L.26.

112. Furthermore, we shall abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/38/L.21, bearing in mind that the Programme of Action against *Apartheid* contains language that my delegation considers unacceptable in the light of the principles I have mentioned. We shall also abstain on draft resolutions A/38/L.25 and L.30.

113. In spite of some reservations about certain aspects of the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.24. We shall also support draft resolutions A/38/L.27, L.28 and L.31, which we consider likely to contribute in a balanced way to the elimination of the intolerable system of *apartheid*.

114. My delegation also reaffirms its traditional solidarity with the peoples of Angola and Mozambique, the main victims of the instability and tension prevailing in southern Africa. Portugal remains profoundly committed to the efforts aimed at finding a solution to the problems which jeopardize the peaceful development of a region to which my country is so closely linked by historical and cultural ties. In this context, while expressing a reservation about its last preambular paragraph, my delegation will vote for draft resolution A/38/L.22, because it flows from the affirmation of the universally recognized right of all peoples to take the necessary measures to defend their sovereignty and national independence.

115. My delegation hopes that realism and moderation will not fail to lead to a lasting, just and peaceful solution to the burdensome problems of southern Africa and one which takes account of the legitimate hopes and rights of those who live there, so that they can devote themselves freely and with dignity to the efforts to achieve the development and progress to which they aspire.

116. Mr. ALI (Singapore): The Government of Singapore has always declared its abhorrence of policies of racial discrimination and has consistently condemned the *apartheid* policies of the Government of South Africa. My delegation has done so in this year's debate on this

agenda item [69th meeting] and will support the draft resolutions.

117. However, my delegation must express regret at the practice of selective condemnation of certain States by name which has crept into United Nations resolutions and which we believe does not help the cause that we espouse. Accordingly, we register our reservations on the relevant paragraphs in the draft resolutions which make such selective condemnation.

118. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): The Australian delegation was pleased to note that, in the course of the debate on this item, a number of African delegations offered congratulations to the Government of Australia on the recently announced changes in its policies towards South Africa, including those in the field of sporting contacts. These changes were outlined in my statement [62nd meeting] in the course of the debate on this item. The policies that I enunciated, and of which appreciation was expressed, indicate that the Australian Government is determined to do whatever it can of a practical nature to help bring about the eradication of the system of *apartheid*. We prefer practical measures of this kind to extravagant rhetoric, which on its own does not assist in bringing about an end to the system of *apartheid*.

119. For these reasons, it is disappointing to my delegation that it can support only five of the 11 draft resolutions, in addition to the resolution already adopted under this agenda item [resolution 38/11] on the so-called constitutional changes in South Africa. This level of support is a reflection not of our policies but of the draft resolutions themselves. One aspect which particularly concerns my delegation in the consideration of this item is that little attempt is made to engage in a process of consultation on the drafting.

120. Australia fully supports the thrust of draft resolution A/38/L.22 and will vote for it. Our public statements in the past when neighbouring States have been attacked indicate that the draft resolution contains provisions which we unreservedly endorse. But, until amended, it contained provisions which, although not vital to the main thrust of the draft resolution, we should have had difficulty in supporting.

121. We are opposed, as a number of other delegations have said they are, to the selective naming of States, particularly in instances in which those States are accused of doing things which are either unproved or which they have categorically denied. In this context, we should have preferred different wording in the last preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/38/L.22, although we shall vote for that draft resolution. We lay the blame for the increased armed resistance within South Africa at the door of the *apartheid* régime itself, and we understand the frustrations which have led to such resistance. At the same time, the Australian Government is not able to endorse the concept of armed struggle.

122. Many of the draft resolutions before us contain the sort of extravagant rhetoric which I described earlier as doing little or nothing to advance the cause of the eradication of *apartheid*. We regard the draft resolutions which contain such language as that much less effective.

123. We consider that some of the draft resolutions contain provisions which go beyond the division of responsibilities provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

124. The fight against *apartheid* must continue, but my delegation hopes that in future the General Assembly will have before it a more balanced set of draft resolutions.

125. Mr. CHETTY (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka will vote in favour of all 11 draft resolutions—A/38/L.20 to L.28,

L.30 and L.31. Also, we were happy to be among the sponsors of draft resolutions A/38/L.27, L.28 and L.31.

126. In accordance with the position maintained by Sri Lanka, we would, however, have preferred it if it had been possible for draft resolutions A/38/L.20, L.22, L.23 and L.26 to have avoided condemnation by name of countries with which we have diplomatic relations. Sri Lanka has already spoken in the debate on this item [61st meeting] and has reiterated its unequivocal commitment to the struggle for the eradication of *apartheid*.

127. Mr. HARLAND (New Zealand): New Zealand is totally opposed to *apartheid*. As I said in the debate on this item [62nd meeting], we regard *apartheid* as an unjust and inhuman system, and we want to see it ended. Many countries have oppressive governments, but only South Africa has legalized racial discrimination and made it the basis of a whole social order.

128. Now, instead of moving to dismantle the system, the South African Government is in the process of changing the country's constitution in such a way as further to entrench racial discrimination. New Zealand supported General Assembly resolution 38/11, adopted on 15 November, which declared that the South African constitutional proposals are contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

129. New Zealand is willing to co-operate with other countries in working out how to end the *apartheid* system in a way that will permit the growth of a multiracial society based on equality, non-discrimination and mutual respect. Measures directed towards that end are most likely to be effective when they are workable and when they can be accepted and carried out by all the countries directly concerned. Unfortunately, this approach is not reflected in all the draft resolutions now before us. The increasing tendency to single out individual countries for criticism and to make extravagant assertions about their policies—to imply even that it is they rather than the South Africans who are responsible for *apartheid*—limits the effectiveness of the draft resolutions concerned and may even make them counter-productive. For this reason, New Zealand is unable to support several of the proposals before us.

130. On draft resolution A/38/L.21, my delegation will have to abstain. Although there is much in the Programme of Action against *Apartheid* that we support, my Government is unable to go along with the calls for legislative and other action in some parts of it.

131. Similarly, we have reservations about some aspects of draft resolution A/38/L.24, but to demonstrate our support for the objectives of the work of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, we will vote in favour of that draft resolution.

132. New Zealand will continue to demonstrate its opposition to *apartheid* in practical ways. We contribute to the various trust funds set up to help the victims of *apartheid*, and we shall support draft resolution A/38/L.27.

133. This year, as on previous occasions, we are among the sponsors of the draft resolution on investments in South Africa—A/38/L.28. We systematically enforce the arms embargo against South Africa, as we did long before it became mandatory, and we would have wished to support a call for its stricter enforcement. In the First Committee, my delegation has supported the call for the cessation of any nuclear collaboration that could facilitate the development by South Africa of nuclear weapons. Draft resolution A/38/L.26, however, includes paragraphs that are not justified and that do not well serve the purposes of the draft resolution.

134. Finally, New Zealand deplores the violent actions taken by South Africa against its neighbours. We fully

support Security Council resolution 539 (1983) on the situation in Namibia. We have some reservations about the language of one of the preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/38/L.22, but we shall vote in favour of that draft resolution.

135. Mr. ULRICH (Denmark): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries: Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark. The Nordic countries' condemnation of *apartheid* in all its forms and manifestations has been voiced in this Assembly on many occasions. We have also voiced our rejection of the increased oppression of and restrictions on South Africa's black majority, a recent manifestation of which is the Orderly Movement and Settlement of Black Persons Bill, which is at present before the South African Parliament.

136. This rejection is based on the traditional Nordic concepts of justice, freedom and democracy and on our belief in the equality and dignity of every human being. Our commitment to these goals is demonstrated by the measures taken by the Nordic countries in accordance with the joint Nordic Programme of Action against South Africa.

137. The Nordic countries will again support a number of the draft resolutions introduced under this item. In view of the attitude of our countries towards the *apartheid* system, we regret that we shall not be able to vote in favour of all of them. Some of the draft resolutions have again caused us substantial difficulties. These difficulties concern questions of principle, some of them encountered in several draft resolutions. I shall briefly describe them.

138. First, the Nordic countries consider universality one of the basic principles of international organizations, and we cannot therefore accept any formulation that, in one way or another, seems to put that principle in doubt.

139. Secondly, the United Nations was established in order to promote peaceful solutions to international problems. Therefore, we cannot accept endorsement by the United Nations of the use of armed struggle.

140. Thirdly, the Nordic countries deplore the inappropriate and arbitrary singling out of individual countries and groups of countries. We believe that procedure is both unfair and unwise. It makes it more difficult than before to maintain the international consensus in the struggle against *apartheid*.

141. Fourthly, because of the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account that only the Security Council can adopt decisions binding on Member States.

142. Fifthly, the implementation of some of the draft resolutions would encroach upon the constitutional freedoms and rights of Nordic citizens and private organizations.

143. Sixthly, the Nordic countries consider that only a free democratic process, based on universal suffrage, can determine who can represent the South African people.

144. These are the considerations on which most of our reservations are based. They apply in particular to draft resolution A/38/L.20 but also to a certain degree to draft resolutions A/38/L.23 and L.26.

145. The Nordic countries regret that the unanimous rejection of *apartheid* expressed in the debate on this item has not found expression in draft resolutions which could have been supported by all Member States.

146. The Nordic countries, in many connections, have underlined that increased and effective pressure should be brought to bear on the Government of South Africa

through peaceful means, in order to bring an end to the *apartheid* system. Humanitarian assistance to the refugees from and victims of *apartheid* also form an important part of the measures taken by the Nordic Governments, in accordance with the joint Nordic Programme of Action against South Africa. Again this year, we have introduced draft resolutions reflecting those policies. By that we have shown that our commitment actively to combat the evil of *apartheid* remains firm.

147. Mr. SEARS (Bahamas): The Bahamas delegation wishes to reiterate its unequivocal support for all effective measures that would lead to the eradication of the evil policies of *apartheid* in South Africa. My delegation, however, has strong reservations about singling out individual countries for condemnation, as is done in certain paragraphs of draft resolutions A/38/L.20 to L.26. My delegation sincerely believes that this practice will not enhance the chances of achieving the elimination of *apartheid*, the goal which we all share and which we would all like to see attained at the earliest opportunity.

148. Nevertheless, while the Bahamas delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/38/L.25, it will vote in favour of all the other draft resolutions.

149. Mr. TANÇ (Turkey): My delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions—A/38/L.20 to L.28, L.30 and L.31. Also, we are pleased to co-sponsor draft resolutions A/38/L.27 and L.28.

150. The views of my Government concerning the policies of *apartheid* and racial discrimination of South Africa, as well as our strong commitment to the efforts being exerted to eradicate those policies, were expressed in detail in our statement on 17 November [61st meeting].

151. Our firm support for the draft resolutions before the Assembly is a reflection of our commitment to the efforts of the international community to ensure the elimination of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. I should like, however, to express our reservations with regard to several paragraphs in the draft resolutions to which I have referred.

152. In draft resolution A/38/L.20, my delegation is of the view that the ninth, tenth and eleventh preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 12 and 22 (b) have not been drafted in a balanced manner, and therefore we do not agree with the contents of those paragraphs.

153. With regard to draft resolution A/38/L.22, we do not think that the last preambular paragraph reflects accurately the statement made at the most recent Security Council meetings by the representative of the country mentioned. Therefore, we do not agree with that paragraph.

154. In draft resolution A/38/L.23, my delegation has a reservation with regard to the reference made by name to a particular group of countries in the seventh preambular paragraph. Also, my delegation believes that the eighth and tenth preambular paragraphs have not been drafted in a balanced way, and we therefore do not agree with their contents.

155. With regard to draft resolution A/38/L.26, my delegation is of the opinion that the seventh, eighth and tenth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 2 and 3 also have not been drafted in a balanced way, and we do not agree with these paragraphs.

156. On the other hand, a few exceptional provisions in these draft resolutions may not conform entirely to existing Turkish laws. Therefore, we support and accept these exceptional paragraphs to the extent that they are compatible with Turkish laws and regulations.

157. Mr. JELONEK (Federal Republic of Germany): The representative of Greece, speaking on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Community, has

already commented on the draft resolutions we are about to vote on; he recalled essential political principles shared by those 10 countries, including my own. The Federal Republic of Germany, as is well known, strongly rejects the *apartheid* policy of South Africa, as an institutionalized system of racial discrimination, and endorses fully the statement made on behalf of the European Community. Peaceful change in favour of the oppressed majority of South Africa is urgent and necessary, indeed mandatory, for the benefit of all parts of the population of that country. The Federal Republic of Germany, hence, agrees with the main thrust of the draft resolutions before the Assembly. It is therefore with great regret that, because of certain formulations in the draft resolutions, my delegation is not in a position to vote in favour of them.

158. My delegation has regularly voiced its opposition to singling out individual Member States as is done in draft resolutions A/38/L.20 to L.23 and L.26, as well as in the Programme of Action against *Apartheid* [A/38/539]. In particular, however, we fail to understand and we strongly reject the unfounded criticism in those draft resolutions directed against Western countries, suggesting that they encourage South Africa to undertake criminal acts against its neighbouring States, assist South Africa in its pursuit of its *apartheid* policy, and are responsible for South Africa's lack of co-operation.

159. With regard to draft resolution A/38/L.20, my Government regrets that again efforts are being made to interfere with the work of independent international institutions.

160. As to draft resolution A/38/L.22, on which we shall abstain, my Government has particularly strong reservations concerning the last preambular paragraph and paragraph 3.

161. It goes without saying that the Federal Republic of Germany agrees in principle with the aims of draft resolution A/38/L.24. We feel that the Special Committee against *Apartheid* is entrusted with carrying out a most important task and should be supported in its valuable efforts in so far as they aim at peaceful change in South Africa. However, we have strong reservations about certain formulations in the Special Committee's report [A/38/22]. Therefore, and because of the considerable financial implications of the whole draft resolution, my delegation is obliged to abstain.

162. Finally, let me express the firm hope of my delegation that the General Assembly will be able at its thirty-ninth session to deal with draft resolutions which will eventually enable all members of the Assembly to support them.

163. Mr. BLUM (Israel): As we stated in the course of the debate on the agenda item before us [61st meeting], Israel categorically and unequivocally rejects racism, racial discrimination, bigotry and intolerance in any form. This position has been made clear by us on numerous occasions to the Assembly. It has also been repeatedly communicated by us to the Government of South Africa. Nevertheless, the sponsors of draft resolution A/38/L.25, as well as of some of the other draft resolutions before us, have intentionally ignored official communiqués from my Government, which are contained in official documents of the United Nations, and have preferred to rely on mendacious, tendentious and unsubstantiated allegations, based upon speculative press reports and previous one-sided resolutions. In so doing, the sponsors of these draft resolutions have sought to divert attention from the real problems of *apartheid*, thus gravely undermining the purpose of the debate on this subject and subverting the genuine concern for the victims of bigotry and racial prejudice.

164. Those who have been entrusted with leading the legitimate struggle against *apartheid* have betrayed that trust. The United Nations bodies established in order to confront the problem of *apartheid* in its entirety have instead abused their responsibilities and with malicious intent indulged in slanderous allegations against my country. They must surely know, even if they will not admit this, that in so doing they are contributing to the hijacking of the United Nations by external interests which manipulate it in pursuance of their own nefarious partisan goals.

165. It is high time that a serious assessment of the relentless perennial incantations against my country take place and that a single, honest and impartial standard be set and applied with regard to the just struggle against racism and racial discrimination in all its manifestations.

166. Israel has once again been singled out in this agenda item as the only country in the world for specific condemnation, based on patent falsehoods. Not content with this travesty, the Special Committee against *Apartheid* was also instrumental in the convening of the recent Vienna Conference, thus further compounding its already notorious record of bias and dishonesty with regard to my country. My delegation will therefore not participate in the voting on this item. We wish this non-participation and its reasons to be reflected in the record.

167. Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): My delegation will vote for draft resolution A/38/L.20 but will not be able to endorse paragraphs 13 and 14. Equally, the geopolitical circumstances in which my country finds itself in southern Africa dictate that we must abstain on draft resolutions A/38/L.21, L.23, L.28 and L.30.

168. Mr. VELLA (Malta): My delegation will support all the draft resolutions under this agenda item. Our vote is to be interpreted as favouring the general thrust of the draft resolutions, which is condemnation of the abhorrent policies of *apartheid*, a condemnation which my Government supports without reservations.

169. Our vote does not necessarily imply, however, that we fully subscribe to each paragraph in the draft resolutions. We believe that the widest possible support should be sought for these draft resolutions, because only through such support can the cause of eradicating this evil and inhuman political system be advanced. It would seem, however, that greater efforts are required to develop an acceptable language which would harness the co-operation of a larger number of Member States.

170. Mr. SEIFU (Ethiopia): At the outset, I should like, on behalf of the Ethiopian delegation, to commend the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the Centre against *Apartheid* for their laudable efforts in mobilizing international public opinion against South Africa's institutionalized form of racism.

171. Racism, with its attendant evils of political oppression and economic exploitation, today reigns over South Africa, where more than 22 million blacks are denied not only the citizenship of their own country but, indeed, the fundamental rights and the elementary dignity of human beings. That *apartheid* is a crime against humanity, that it is a challenge to the human conscience and that it is a threat to international peace and security has been repeatedly asserted, without, unfortunately, commensurate action being taken for its total elimination.

172. Most of the countries of the world, of course, have already severed all relations with the racist régime of South Africa. Yet the most important ties that régime has with the Western world are still intact. We all know that, despite the repeated calls by the General Assembly for the total isolation of South Africa, the Western world continues to collaborate with the *apartheid* régime in the

political, economic and military, as well as the nuclear, fields. That it is this multifaceted and wide-ranging collaboration that is sustaining the *apartheid* régime and contributing to the continued oppression and exploitation of the masses of South Africa is, for most of us, an established fact.

173. It is based on this fact that Ethiopia attaches particular importance to draft resolutions A/38/L.23, L.25 and L.26. These draft resolutions clearly underline the imperative need for the early imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as for the strengthening of the arms embargo.

174. As regards economic sanctions, we have time and again been told—by none other than those with extensive economic interests in South Africa—that sanctions would only hurt the oppressed. If only one could listen to the authentic voice of the masses, one could easily recognize the ulterior and self-serving motives behind this position. The fact is that the activities of transnational corporations not only mercilessly exploit the human and natural resources of South Africa but, more important, strengthen in more ways than one the political, economic and military machine of the racist régime.

175. My delegation is, furthermore, convinced that draft resolutions A/38/L.23, L.25 and L.26, as well as L.20, are factual in their comments regarding the collaboration of certain explicitly cited countries or group of countries with the racist régime. Even though the countries that collaborate with Pretoria prefer not to be cited by name, they must understand that it is their own conduct which provides the compelling political reason for such explicit references. Ethiopia hopes that, instead of lamenting this fact or objecting to such candour, those countries will undertake a long overdue soul-searching to recognize how unwise, unjust and, indeed, immoral their policy towards Pretoria is.

176. The Ethiopian delegation furthermore wishes to underline its country's strong commitment to the objectives of draft resolution A/38/L.22. Ethiopia pays a special tribute to and reaffirms its full solidarity with the peoples and Governments of the front-line States for their unflinching support of the liberation struggle in both Namibia and South Africa.

177. Draft resolution A/38/L.20 also deserves special mention inasmuch as it reflects adequately both the prevailing situation in South Africa and the desired course of action for the elimination of *apartheid*.

178. It is to be noted in this regard that the oppressed people of South Africa, indeed the entire international community, have all along hoped for the peaceful eradication of *apartheid*. In fact they still do. But unfortunately the bitter history of South Africa has proved beyond doubt that *apartheid* can be neither reformed nor peacefully eliminated. The results of all the peaceful attempts at resisting *apartheid* are all too fresh in our minds to need an elaborate exposition here on my part. All those who seek to question the legitimacy of and the need for the armed struggle should, therefore, study the recent history of South Africa. A call on the masses of South Africa to give up the option of the armed struggle, especially when the avenues for peaceful change have already been blocked, cannot but be a call for the continued subjection of the majority of South Africans to the indignities as well as the oppression and exploitation of the racist system of *apartheid*.

179. In this regard, we find the provisions of draft resolution A/38/L.20, particularly paragraph 4, appropriate and timely. The Ethiopian delegation, as a result, will

give its full support to that draft resolution and indeed to all the draft resolutions now before us. Furthermore, Ethiopia wishes to become a co-sponsor of all the draft resolutions that have been reviewed by the African Group—that is, draft resolutions A/38/L.20 through L.26.

180. Mr. BARRINGTON (United Kingdom): In his statement on behalf of the 10 members of the European Community, the representative of Greece has already reflected the views held by my Government. Therefore, I need explain only briefly why the United Kingdom cannot support most of the draft resolutions before us.

181. In our comparable statement at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly [97th meeting], my delegation expressed the hope that in future years the Assembly would be able to tackle the question of *apartheid* in a more realistic and effective manner. There is, after all, no difference among us on *apartheid*. Not a single participant in this debate would in any way defend or justify *apartheid*. Therefore, the problem confronting the Assembly is how to express its unanimous opposition so that it will have the greatest possible impact on the Government and the people of South Africa. My delegation deeply regrets that, instead of promoting this unanimous view, certain of the draft resolutions on *apartheid* have once again been so worded as to set Member States at odds with one another.

182. It is impossible for the United Kingdom, as a long-standing and committed opponent of *apartheid*, to endorse the extravagant language and extreme proposals in several of the draft resolutions, notably A/38/L.20, L.23, L.25 and L.26. Such debasement of the currency of the United Nations only makes it easier for the proponents of *apartheid* to refuse to take account of the Assembly's views. Like a great many members, the United Kingdom deplores the growing practice of inserting inaccurate, selective and offensive references to other Member States into resolutions of the Assembly.

183. Not only in their words but in their deeds, successive British Governments have attached the highest importance to the eradication of *apartheid*. We are convinced that the best means of achieving this objective lies not through isolation and other measures which would entrench the South African Government's stance and would have serious consequences for other countries in the region, still less through violence, but through the maintenance of dialogue and channels of communication. Through these channels we can and do impress upon the South African Government our unwavering refusal to tolerate *apartheid*.

184. My Government also attaches very great importance to the United Kingdom's close and friendly relations with the front-line States, Lesotho and the other States of southern Africa. We seek to provide practical assistance to those countries in the difficult situation which confronts them. We should have liked to express this support by voting in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.22. We regret that the draft is so worded as to oblige my delegation to abstain. There are specific aspects of the draft resolution, in both its preambular and its operative paragraphs, which we cannot endorse. In particular, I must emphasize that my delegation cannot accept the inaccurate, one-sided and unjustified reference to one Member State, that is, the United States, in the last preambular paragraph. Our vote applies to the specific form of this draft resolution. It in no way diminishes our long-standing support for the countries of southern Africa or our condemnation of any acts which violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States in the region.

185. I know that my delegation's abhorrence of *apartheid* and also our fervent desire for peaceful change in

South Africa are widely shared in the General Assembly. We continue to believe that a more constructive approach to the Assembly's annual debate on *apartheid* would assist in the attainment of our common objective. We continue to believe that *apartheid* is far too important a subject to be treated as a political football. To do so betrays the responsibility which we all have to assist the people of southern Africa and to uphold the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

186. Mr. LOUET (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation would like to add the following points to the statement made on behalf of the 10 countries of the European Community by the representative of Greece.

187. As everyone knows, France unreservedly condemns the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. It has made this abundantly clear here, and it has proved this by its deeds.

188. My country gives firm support to all those working for the establishment of justice and recognition of the dignity of all the people in South Africa. It is in this spirit that France fully supports the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, whose outgoing Chairman, Mr. Maitama-Sule, has just paid a further visit to Paris on the occasion of the inauguration of an important art exhibition in opposition to *apartheid*. In a desire to give specific expression to the excellent relations which the French authorities maintain with the Special Committee, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.24, which endorses its programme of work, although France does not approve of all the points therein.

189. For the same reasons, and also because the non-binding terms of draft resolution A/38/L.21 leave my Government free to act on certain judicious proposals and to refrain from acting on a number of others that it deems unacceptable, my delegation will vote in favour of that draft resolution.

190. Furthermore, while reserving its position on the substance of any future draft convention, the French delegation will support draft resolution A/38/L.31, in order to demonstrate its repudiation of all discrimination in sports.

191. Although France rejects the singling-out by name of a specific country in the last preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/38/L.22 and although it deplores the excessive or inaccurate language to be found in a number of paragraphs of that text, particularly the inappropriate use of language that comes properly within the competence of the Security Council, my delegation will vote in favour of that draft resolution. France intends by this vote to demonstrate its solidarity with the countries of the region which have so frequently had to face the use of armed force by South Africa, and also its wish to see Pretoria modify its attitude towards its neighbours.

192. In conclusion, I should like, as the representative of Greece has already done on behalf of the 10 countries of the European Community, to express the firm hope that the sponsors of draft resolutions on *apartheid* will find themselves able at the Assembly's next session to take account of the comments made by other delegations and will agree to eliminate certain excessive, inaccurate or unfair language which weakens a number of draft resolutions and also the support they enjoy.

193. *Apartheid* has been unanimously condemned in this Assembly. Let us together try, whenever possible, to find language which will permit the reflection of this unanimity in our votes. My delegation is convinced that this is possible, and the impact of the resolutions will only gain therefrom.

194. Mr. SUAZO TOMÉ (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Honduras will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions before us, in conformity with our consistent international policy both against this evil practice in human relations and against any recourse to violence, nationally or internationally, including aggression, terrorism and subversion and any threat to the security of refugees anywhere in the world. However, we should like to clarify the import of our vote, which does not signify support for specific references to or accusations against States other than South Africa. This has already been stated in our explanation of vote [79th meeting] with regard to the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia.

195. Nor can we support the call for violent struggle, dismissing any possibility of a peaceful solution and also disregarding the duty of the international community to promote the exercise of the right of all peoples to self-determination by means of a process of peaceful change leading to representative democracy. It is in the light of these considerations that the Honduran vote must be viewed.

196. Mr. MIZERE (Malawi): Malawi, as an African country, a member of the Organization of African Unity and of the southern African group in the United Nations, associates itself with the concern expressed by other Member States about the impact of the policies of *apartheid* on blacks in South Africa and the humiliation suffered by them as a result of those policies.

197. In other international forums and in the General Assembly, the Malawi Government has categorically rejected the policies of *apartheid*. This rejection and opposition has been articulated publicly and privately in the following terms. First, Malawi rejects any policy based on colour, race or creed and therefore uncompromisingly rejects the policies of *apartheid*. Secondly, in 1976, on the eve of independence for one of the homelands in South Africa, the Malawi Government issued a public statement rejecting the policy of bantustanization and asserting that no recognition would be extended to such independence. Thirdly, Malawi rejects the use of force or the threat of the use of force in solving disputes that affect southern Africa. Fourthly, the Malawi delegation cannot accept a constitutional dispensation that is one of the methods used deliberately to exclude the blacks from political participation and relegate them to a position of inferiority, where they are expected to fade into the limbo of political oblivion in the country of their birth.

Mr. Illueca (Panama) resumed the Chair.

198. While my delegation supports the general thrust of the draft resolutions before us, it will abstain on draft resolutions A/38/L.20, L.22, L.23, L.25, L.26, L.28 and L.30 and will support the remaining ones. But our abstentions should not be construed as indicating indifference to the humiliated people of South Africa or as giving support to or conniving in the policies of *apartheid*; far from it. Malawi would never sacrifice its principles on the altar of expediency. Malawi's abstentions are simply the result of some difficulties experienced in regard to some demands or language formulations contained in some of the draft resolutions, as already indicated.

199. Having stated this position, my delegation would like to remind Member States, however, that what the peoples of South Africa need from all of us today is a genuine commitment to support them in finding a political solution to the problem, so that all South Africans—blacks, whites, Asians and Coloureds—can share political power and live in peace as equal South Africans. Member States have the moral duty to avoid promising one thing in international forums and then renege on

their promises once they are outside the conference halls. That is a disservice to the suffering people of South Africa.

200. In conclusion, allow me to reiterate the Malawi Government's position towards South Africa, which was stated in this Assembly some years ago by the head of the Malawi delegation:

"My Government remains resolutely averse to the policy of *apartheid* and the methods used to enforce it, including the establishment of the homelands. This is a stance that is well known to the Government of the day in South Africa. But my Government remains equally convinced that the best way to induce the white people to the south of us to change is by contact and example, by engaging with them in a dialogue."

201. Mr. CARLSON (Canada): The opposition of the Canadian Government and people to *apartheid* and the abuses which it entails is well known and has been expressed many times in this Assembly. Canada has joined in condemnation of South Africa's human rights practices on many occasions and, in conjunction with other Commonwealth members, has undertaken as a solemn and urgent duty vigorously to combat the evil of *apartheid* and to adopt effective measures to eradicate it. Some of the measures taken have been mentioned in previous Canadian statements and include the boycott on sporting contacts, the removal of official support for bilateral trade and the imposition of a special code of conduct for Canadian companies operating in South Africa. These are means by which we have signalled to South Africa that it cannot be business as usual until the majority of its citizens are brought into the political process on an equal basis.

202. We have at the same time expressed a willingness to support any measures which can effectively contribute to peaceful change. Consistent with this approach, we have contributed to many local self-help projects involving private groups, particularly in rural areas. We have provided training assistance to black trade unions. We plan to introduce additional educational support for non-white South Africans.

203. Given Canadian opposition to *apartheid*, it is with regret that my delegation must provide this present explanation in order to clarify several votes. A consensus against *apartheid* has developed in the international community. If the United Nations has not been able to do more to build upon this international consensus, it is in part because some Member States continue to introduce extraneous political considerations into the Assembly's resolutions. In reality, there should be no need to call for a vote against *apartheid* when the opposition is unanimous. We note in the draft resolutions before us an unfortunate tendency to single out and condemn certain Member States whose opposition to *apartheid* is unequivocal.

204. The conclusion may be drawn that those responsible for the introduction of such extraneous elements are, in effect, putting their own political or ideological concerns ahead of the anti-*apartheid* struggle. We urge that the sponsors of these draft resolutions reconsider this aspect in future debates and focus instead on collective measures to oppose *apartheid* which are broadly acceptable to the membership.

205. Among the elements of the draft resolutions which we cannot support are the calls for armed struggle, the condemnation of particular Member States, and recommendations that go beyond the competence of the Assembly, such as those involving mandatory economic sanctions, or the exclusion of South Africa from multilateral organizations. We do not agree with the tactics advocated

in these draft resolutions and do not believe they are consistent with the policy of promoting peaceful change.

206. For these reasons, my delegation is obliged to abstain on three of the draft resolutions and to vote against draft resolutions A/38/L.20, L.23, L.25 and L.26. In the case of the last draft resolution, I wish to state for the record that Canada does not itself favour, or take part in, military or nuclear collaboration with South Africa.

207. At the same time, Canada's vote in favour of a number of the draft resolutions must also be clarified, as certain elements require comment or give rise to reservations on our part. Thus, although we will vote in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.22, we do not wish to associate ourselves with the criticism of certain Member States contained in the last preambular paragraph of that draft resolution.

208. We also join the majority in endorsing, in draft resolution A/38/L.24, the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, although we strongly question the procedure and good sense of making a special allocation from the regular budget of the United Nations without having previously examined the priority and merits of the issue within the programme and budgetary mechanisms which have been created by Member Governments for that purpose. I would note finally that our vote in favour of carrying forward the international effort to draft a convention against *apartheid* in sports is based on the fact that Canadian policy largely accords with the principle underlying the attempt to draft an international convention. However, national, legal and constitutional obstacles may preclude Canada's adherence to such a convention.

209. The General Assembly may be divided on the best tactics to remove *apartheid* but we are united both in our opposition to it and in our resolve to encourage change.

210. We would conclude by renewing Canada's commitment to provide assistance to the victims of *apartheid* and to use the means at our disposal to hasten peaceful change.

211. Mr. ZUMBADO JIMÉNEZ (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Costa Rica expressed its position on *apartheid* in the statement which we made during the debate on this item [69th meeting]. Our criticism expressed at the time with regard to the odious régime imposed by South Africa on the majority of that country's inhabitants was clear, as was our appeal to the international community to exert all possible pressure to bring about a change in attitude on the part of the racist Pretoria régime.

212. The delegation of Costa Rica, nevertheless, has reservations on some of the paragraphs of the draft resolutions before us. My delegation has particular difficulty with draft resolution A/38/L.20, the cornerstone of the position of the General Assembly on the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. Costa Rica will vote in favour of this draft resolution, but we regret the inclusion of certain specific references which may be discriminatory. We appreciate other elements in the draft resolution which, because of their importance, make us view this draft with favour in spite of the doubts we have mentioned. We deem inappropriate the singling out of certain countries, which is the case with most of the draft resolutions, because, we repeat, this could be discriminatory.

213. Moreover, in some of the paragraphs of the draft resolutions before us, the General Assembly calls upon the Security Council to adopt sanctions. In the view of our delegation, the Assembly, although it is a sovereign

body, may urge the Council to consider a situation, but it is really up to the Council itself, as part of its own responsibilities, to determine the course which it wishes to follow when it considers the question.

214. My country is of the view that we should not miss the opportunity of sending a clear message from all the members of the Assembly to South Africa. Unfortunately, the specific references which I have mentioned prevent the consensus necessary for sending such a message. In our view, nothing should divert our attention from the main point before the Assembly, namely, the elimination of this racist anachronism and the replacement of the odious *apartheid* régime by a system which will democratically reflect the aspirations of the entire population and not of just a small minority.

215. Mr. KAM (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The policy of *apartheid* of the racist régime of South Africa has been categorically condemned and rejected by my country, both in the United Nations and in all other international forums. We have not hesitated to call *apartheid* a crime against humanity, strongly repudiated by the Panamanian nation.

216. At this time, we should like to reaffirm our support and solidarity with the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movements in their just struggle to eliminate *apartheid* and establish a non-racist, democratic society which will guarantee human rights and fundamental freedoms for the entire population.

217. In this context, we wish once again to express our support of the ANC and PAC in their heroic struggle against the racist minority régime for the total eradication of *apartheid* and the transformation of South Africa into a democratic society free from racism and discrimination.

218. We reaffirm our solidarity with the front-line States and express our recognition of their valuable contribution to the struggle against the *apartheid* régime and for the eradication of colonialism in Africa.

219. We believe that the repeated acts of aggression of the racist régime of South Africa against neighbouring countries, and its persistent policy of oppression against the South African and Namibian people, constitute serious threats to international peace and security, and we must put an end to those policies.

220. Taking into account what I have just stated, my delegation will vote in favour of 10 of the draft resolutions, which, by and large, are in keeping with my country's foreign policy in this matter. Nevertheless, we would like to express reservations on some of the paragraphs, which have been so drafted as to condemn selectively and by name countries with which Panama maintains diplomatic relations. In view of these reservations, my delegation will not be able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/38/L.25, and we shall, therefore, abstain.

221. However, these reservations and our abstention must not be construed in any way as agreement with or approval of the co-operation of many States with the racist régime of South Africa, which supports and encourages it in its policy of *apartheid* and oppression.

222. Mr. QUIÑONES-AMÉZQUITA (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Guatemala is opposed to the policy of racial discrimination and to policies and principles which are contrary to humanism, such as *apartheid*, which we therefore condemn. We shall therefore vote in favour of five of the draft resolutions—A/38/L.21, L.24, L.28, L.30 and L.31. However, we shall abstain on the others, because we regard them as selective, in that they mention certain States by name, and because the language of certain paragraphs is not suitable and could be improved.

223. Mr. KOLBY (Norway): I should like to explain Norway's vote on draft resolution A/38/L.30.

224. It is Norway's declared policy not to sell oil to South Africa. This policy is being adhered to by the companies producing oil on the Norwegian shelf.

225. In line with Norway's consistent policy against the *apartheid* régime of South Africa and our policy concerning oil exports in particular, the Norwegian Government took the initiative in 1981 to organize a conference of oil-producing and oil-exporting countries which had declared it their policy not to sell oil to South Africa. This initiative was endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 37/69 J of 9 December 1982.

226. Although Norway therefore strongly supports the overall objective of draft resolution A/38/L.30—namely, to see to it that oil exports to South Africa are effectively curtailed—we shall not be in a position to vote in favour of it. As the consultations regarding the modalities for such a conference are at present taking place, in accordance with resolution 37/69 J, Norway finds it inappropriate that a draft resolution which interferes with the ongoing consultations and prejudices the outcome of such a conference is introduced. This is even more the case as the draft resolution speaks of the illicit transport of oil to South Africa, although there is no binding decision by the Security Council in that connection.

227. Mr. KHOJANE (Lesotho): The delegation of Lesotho will vote in favour of seven of the draft resolutions, but wishes to register its reservations about paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 of draft resolution A/38/L.20. These reservations are consistent with Lesotho's position on sanctions against South Africa.

228. For the same reason, we shall abstain on draft resolutions A/38/L.21, L.23, L.28 and L.30.

229. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu): On instruction from my Government, Vanuatu will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions.

230. Once again some members of the General Assembly have expressed, and others undoubtedly will express, reservations and lack of agreement with all the thrust and language of all the draft resolutions. We, too, might have placed a somewhat different emphasis and would have preferred to use different language in some sections. However, we believe that the questions of emphasis and language are relatively minor in the total context of the crime—yes, the crime—of *apartheid*.

231. While we might choose different words to articulate our own feelings were we the direct victims of *apartheid*, the fact remains that mild and non-specific appeals to the collective conscience of South Africa and its professed friends appear to have fallen on deaf ears. Unfortunately, those willing to embrace South Africa put more effort into protesting about candid appraisals of their misbehaviour than into protesting about South Africa's continued refusal to bring that sick society into the last quarter of the twentieth century and into the family of civilized nations in substance as well as in form.

232. We regret that there will not be a consensus on all the draft resolutions. However, it is even more regrettable that there is no consensus of action outside this Hall when it comes to *apartheid*. We are not pleased with everything said in the draft resolutions, but we are far less pleased with the facts which continue to confront South Africa's people each and every minute of each and every day. Furthermore, we are also far less pleased with the words used by some to justify their continued intimate relations with the *apartheid* régime.

233. As a nation, Vanuatu believes in moderation, reason, and patience. However, we certainly acknowledge

that, although all of us here are in fact also victims of *apartheid*, none of us can in good conscience counsel the direct victims, the people of South Africa, the people of Namibia or the people of neighbouring African States, to be any more moderate or any more reasonable or any more patient than they have already been. We believe that it is still not too late to avoid a major conflagration in southern Africa, if the world is willing to listen and to act. However, let us not deceive ourselves by talking of peaceful change in South Africa. By its very nature *apartheid* is not peaceful, and it was not peaceably imposed. When this odious doctrine is eradicated, then, and only then, will peaceful change be possible in erasing its many, many effects from the fabric of South African society. We eagerly await that day.

234. In the mean time, let us not be distracted from the task at hand. Let us clearly and definitively state with deeds as well as with words our complete rejection of any social system which values human beings because of their race, their religion, their sex or their assigned station in life. With those who feel that there are other, more effective ways to combat *apartheid* we agree; there are other ways, and we urge those with the ability to lead the way and to show us how—again, in deeds and not only in words.

235. In the mean time, we know of no other way of giving a signal to South Africa and its beleaguered people than by joining the majority of the nations of the world in supporting these draft resolutions.

236. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now take decisions on the 11 draft resolutions before it. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/38/L.20, L.21, L.24, L.25, L.30 and L.31 is contained in document A/38/654.

237. We turn first to draft resolution A/38/L.20 and Corr.1, entitled "Situation in South Africa". A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 12 of this draft resolution. If there is no objection, I shall put that paragraph to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia,⁷ Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Burma, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Greece,

Guatemala, Haiti, India, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Zaire.

Paragraph 12 of the draft resolution was adopted by 71 votes to 22, with 44 abstentions.

238. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote draft resolution A/38/L.20 and Corr.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Malawi, Spain, Sweden.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 124 votes to 16, with 10 abstentions (resolution 38/39 A).

239. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/38/L.21 and Add.1, entitled "Programme of Action against *Apartheid*". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's

Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 128 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions (resolution 38/39 B).

240. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We turn now to draft resolution A/38/L.22 and Add.1, entitled "Effects of *apartheid* on the countries of southern Africa", as orally revised by the representative of Uganda. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Paraguay, United States of America.

Abstaining: Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Malawi, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 146 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions (resolution 38/39 C).

241. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We turn now to draft resolution A/38/L.23 and Corr.1, entitled "Sanctions against South Africa". Separate votes have been requested on the eighth and the tenth preambular paragraphs. If there is no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

242. I first put to the vote the eighth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Burma, Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Malawi, Mauritius, Morocco, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Zaire.

The eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was adopted by 71 votes to 22, with 40 abstentions.

243. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): A recorded vote has been requested on the tenth preambular paragraph. I now put that paragraph to the vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands,

New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Solomon Islands, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Zaire.

The tenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was adopted by 72 votes to 22, with 40 abstentions.

244. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/38/L.23 and Corr.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Botswana, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Lesotho, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 122 votes to 10, with 18 abstentions (resolution 38/39 D).

245. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote draft resolution A/38/L.24 and Add.1, entitled "Programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist

Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 149 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions (resolution 38/39 E).

246. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/38/L.25 and Corr.1, entitled "Relations between Israel and South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay,⁸ Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Bahamas, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Guatemala, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Malawi, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain.

The draft resolution was adopted by 106 votes to 18, with 17 abstentions (resolution 38/39F).

247. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/38/L.26 and Corr.1, entitled "Military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa". Separate votes have been requested on the tenth preambular paragraph and on paragraph 3. If there are no objections, I shall put to the vote those two paragraphs.

248. I first put to the vote the tenth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Malawi, Mauritius, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Togo, Turkey, Uruguay, Zaire.

The tenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was adopted by 79 votes to 23, with 33 abstentions.

249. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote paragraph 3. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia,

Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burma, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Zaire.

Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution was adopted by 72 votes to 23, with 39 abstentions.

250. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/38/L.26 and Corr.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Paraguay, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 122 votes to 9, with 17 abstentions (resolution 38/39 G).

251. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now proceed to take action

on draft resolution A/38/L.27 and Add.1, entitled "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa". May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 38/39 H).
252. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/38/L.28 and Add.1, entitled "Investments in South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Botswana, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Ivory Coast, Lesotho, Malawi, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 140 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions (resolution 38/39 I).

253. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/38/L.30 and Add.1, entitled "Oil embargo against South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali,

Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Luxembourg, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Botswana, Canada, Greece, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Swaziland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 130 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions (resolution 38/39 J).

254. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/38/L.31 and Add.1, entitled "Apartheid in sports". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of Iceland, Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 145 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions (resolution 38/39 K).

255. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes. I would remind the General Assembly of the rules.

256. Mr. NASHID (Maldives): Maldives voted in favour of all the draft resolutions because of our strong belief that such measures as are contained in them are necessary and most appropriate in order to eradicate *apartheid* and to help the legitimate struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa.

257. My delegation's affirmative vote on draft resolution A/38/L.23 does not, however, indicate our approval of the tenth preambular paragraph, in which references have been made to certain friendly countries. As stated before, we support the general thrust in all the draft resolutions and believe that such effective measures are necessary to bring an end to the policies of *apartheid* of South Africa and fulfil the aspirations of its majority black population.

258. Mr. PAVANARIT (Thailand): My delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions, in conformity with my Government's strong opposition to the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. The Government of Thailand reaffirms its commitment to international efforts to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination and persecution in South Africa. My Government has in the past strongly condemned that abhorrent practice of racial discrimination and will continue to do so until that practice is eliminated. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Thailand has stated that

"The cruel and inhuman policy and practice of *apartheid* stands in contradiction to the principles of justice and moral values. The systematic persecution of African leaders is unwarranted and deplorable, and constitutes a gross and persistent violation of human rights."

259. Thailand is convinced that South Africa must belong to all its people and that all its people must enjoy equal rights and human dignity under the law. The alternative is an atmosphere of persistent tension and of escalating conflict, with grave consequences for international peace and stability.

260. Although we voted in favour of all the draft resolutions, we have reservations on parts of certain draft resolutions, particularly paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/38/L.20 and the eighth and tenth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/38/L.23, which make specific references to some countries with which my country enjoys diplomatic relations. My delegation earnestly believes that the General Assembly should present a collective stand in dealing with the issue at hand. By the naming of countries on a selective basis, division has been created, which is not to the benefit of positive action. Otherwise, the draft resolutions would have enjoyed the broadest consensus which they fully deserve.

261. Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria): Austria has consistently rejected the policies of *apartheid* of the South African Government and maintained—most recently during the debate on this item [60th meeting]—that an institutionalized policy of racial discrimination can never be the basis of a viable democratic society. This firm conviction found expression in Austria's positive vote on a number of the draft resolutions which have just been put to the vote. There are, however, several draft resolutions which Austria could not support, mostly for reasons arising from the Austrian internal legal system, which would prohibit their implementation at the national level, as well as for reasons which my delegation has already explained in some detail [79th meeting] with regard to similar provisions that were contained in the draft resolutions adopted by the Assembly on the question of Namibia.

262. I specifically wish to reaffirm once again that in Austria's view the United Nations should concentrate

all its efforts on bringing about political and social change by peaceful means, as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations, and should not endorse or support armed struggle or the use of force as instruments of change. I also wish to reiterate once again Austria's position that the arbitrary singling out of Member States or groups of States for condemnation or otherwise in General Assembly resolutions is unjustified and counter-productive, and does not serve to enhance the cause of the oppressed people of South Africa.

263. Furthermore, we have serious objections to any interference with the due process of consideration by the Security Council and will not support any prejudging of its prerogatives and decisions. With regard to draft resolution A/38/L.22, I should like to add that the Austrian delegation voted for this draft resolution because of our strong support for its general thrust. We do, however, have reservations concerning its last preambular paragraph, for reasons similar to those I have mentioned.

264. Mr. DUQUE (Philippines): The Philippines has always supported the cause of the oppressed people of South Africa and therefore has consistently voted in favour of all resolutions against *apartheid* in South Africa. It again voted in favour of the draft resolutions on *apartheid* just adopted.

265. However, my delegation has reservations on certain paragraphs in some of the draft resolutions. My delegation therefore abstained on those paragraphs when separate votes were taken, because they selectively condemned certain States by name, a practice which may not take us nearer to our goals. More acceptable and less selective formulations would have been preferred to ensure adoption by consensus.

266. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Uruguay voted in favour of draft resolutions A/38/L.20 to L.28, L.30 and L.31.

267. At successive sessions of the General Assembly these resolutions and their predecessors have taken on the significance of a decisive political statement about *apartheid*. Above and beyond the context of the drafts, their texts and their recommendations, there is expressed in political terms the need for an unequivocal and categorical statement regarding *apartheid* and the need for action to combat it. Uruguay's affirmative vote should therefore be interpreted as a clear reply to that call. It is, above all, a decisive expression of condemnation and repudiation of a particularly odious form of discrimination, one which sets up injustice as a doctrine and translates it into a policy.

268. Together with this position of principle, we wish to express our very strong feelings of solidarity with all the peoples, particularly in Africa, that are fighting to eliminate *apartheid*. This position is, of course, consistent with the policy that my country has steadfastly adopted, in conformity with international norms and with its domestic legislation, of opposing all forms of discrimination among human beings anywhere in the world.

269. As at past sessions, my delegation would like to express reservations concerning some of the language contained in the draft resolutions that have been adopted, particularly the following. First, the application of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations comes within the jurisdiction of the Security Council. Secondly, all peoples must determine their own representation in accordance with the principle of self-determination. Thirdly, we cannot accept references to specific Member States or their selective condemnation unsupported by proved facts. Fourthly, the actions of the bodies concerned with international economic co-operation

must be free of political considerations. Fifthly, it is my delegation's understanding that none of the resolutions adopted institutionalizes recourse to armed struggle, a point made in paragraphs 4 and 5 of Security Council resolution 473 (1980).

270. These reservations are similar to those put forward by various other delegations. This fact, together with the lack of success in attempts to change the *apartheid* situation and the pattern of votes at previous sessions of the General Assembly, provides food for thought. As my delegation has previously stated, the lack of consensus is certainly not due to differences of opinion on the need to eradicate *apartheid*, but on various aspects of the resolutions themselves.

271. We should perhaps consider the desirability of having resolutions on this subject concentrate primarily on defining a clear political objective, one which could receive the unconditional and unreserved support of the international community. The starting-point may be found in paragraph 4 of Security Council resolution 473 (1980) and in paragraph 23 of General Assembly resolution 37/69 A, and is partially included in paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/38/L.20 just adopted. I refer to a clear determination that the collective efforts are aimed at eradicating *apartheid* from South Africa and creating a democratic society without discrimination of any kind, in which the people may freely decide their own destiny.

272. Furthermore, it is necessary to reorganize the measures with regard to South Africa in such a way as to attract broader support and thus make them more effective in achieving the final goal. In this connection, the Security Council resolutions form a basic pattern which could be expanded and strengthened, but this should be done on the basis of harmonious co-operation between the General Assembly and the Security Council and in accordance with the Charter. Within the framework of the Charter, it should be possible to agree on a set of appropriate measures which would receive the necessary political support of the international community. If that is done, we should truly be moving towards our goal.

273. Mr. JANNUZZI (Italy): Italy has always made very clear its firm and consistent stand against *apartheid*. In this regard, I wish to confirm our full agreement with the views expressed in this debate by the representative of Greece on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community.

274. It is therefore with deep regret that we have not been able to support all the draft resolutions. Although in full agreement with the thrust of many of the proposals, once again, as noted by the representative of Greece, we have found that they contain some divisive elements and unjustified and unproved references which certainly do not help the case against *apartheid* but, on the contrary, result in limiting the necessary consensus concerning it.

275. In this framework, I should like to reaffirm that Italy does not and will not co-operate with South Africa in the military and nuclear fields. Thus, it is with regret that we were bound to vote against the proposals contained in draft resolution A/38/L.26, because, in addition to the reservations on other parts of the text, on which we had abstained in the past, we could not agree with the unacceptable references made in the tenth preambular paragraph and in paragraphs 2 and 3 to States Members of the United Nations.

276. We are well aware of the hardship currently faced by the countries neighbouring upon South Africa and we have therefore given high priority to our programme of

co-operation with them. We endorse the basic aim of draft resolution A/38/L.22, and that is why we supported it. However, I wish to put on record our strong reservations concerning the wording and provisions of several of its parts and especially the unacceptable reference made in the last preambular paragraph to a Member State, namely, the United States, a reference which we totally reject.

277. Finally, I wish to reiterate our well-known reservations on recourse to armed struggle and to mandatory measures as proposed in several of the draft resolutions.

278. Mr. NISHIMURA (Japan): Japan is firmly and consistently opposed to the practice of *apartheid* and extends maximum co-operation to United Nations efforts for the elimination of *apartheid*. Accordingly, my delegation has consistently tried to take a positive stance on the various draft resolutions proposed on this item. It is in this spirit that my delegation supported five draft resolutions—A/38/L.22, L.24, L.27, L.28 and L.31. Indeed, we were a sponsor of draft resolution A/38/L.27, on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, whose efforts we value highly. Unfortunately, however, just as in previous years, there are some draft resolutions which my delegation could not support because they are excessively confrontational and unproductive.

279. My delegation voted against draft resolution A/38/L.20 because it contains many elements, such as those in paragraphs 4, 7 and 12 to 15, which my Government cannot support.

280. With respect to draft resolution A/38/L.21, it is regrettable that the Programme of Action against *Apartheid* was proposed without having been discussed in depth and despite the fact that a programme of action to combat *apartheid* was adopted, after painstaking negotiations, at the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, held at Geneva from 1 to 12 August 1983.⁹ However, as my delegation appreciates the fundamental philosophy of the draft resolution and some elements of the Programme of Action against *Apartheid*, we did not vote against it but abstained.

281. With respect to draft resolution A/38/L.22, my delegation voted in favour of it because we can support its general thrust that the international community should strengthen its support of the neighbouring countries of South Africa. However, my delegation wishes to register its strong reservations on the singling out of a particular country for accusation in the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, and some other extraneous elements.

282. With regard to draft resolution A/38/L.23, which seeks comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, my country does not believe that such measures would in fact constitute an effective and expeditious means for achieving a peaceful solution of the question of *apartheid*. Moreover, the draft resolution would preempt decisions of the Security Council, which alone has the authority to impose mandatory sanctions. Also, paragraph 1 of the draft contains some elements whose implementation my country cannot ensure. For these reasons, my delegation voted against the draft resolution.

283. As my delegation stated in the debate on this item [63rd meeting], Japan has been taking various concrete measures against South Africa. On this occasion, I wish to emphasize in particular Japan's strict enforcement of the arms embargo and its prohibition of direct investment in South Africa.

284. Paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/38/L.24 endorses the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [A/38/22]. Although my delegation voted in favour of

that draft resolution, we cannot accept some parts of the conclusions and recommendations contained in paragraphs 227 through 371 of the Special Committee's report. My delegation is also concerned about paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/38/L.24, which gives the Special Committee against *Apartheid* an excessively wide margin of discretion. We earnestly hope that the Special Committee will manage efficiently the budget that has been appropriated.

285. In conclusion, my delegation regrets that in the draft resolutions just adopted there is a heightened tone of accusation against certain Member countries. We should like to point out that differences of opinion on how to combat *apartheid* should be reconciled through dialogue and that mutual accusations serve no purpose at all.

286. Mr. GUERREIRO (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil voted in favour of all the draft resolutions. We did so as an expression of our strong condemnation of the abhorrent policies of *apartheid* and of our support for effective action, with a view to the eradication of those policies and to the promotion of majority rule in South Africa. We do, however, have some reservations about the language included in some of the draft resolutions, which does not seem to us to be conducive to the achievement of our common goals in respect of South Africa.

287. Mr. PÉREZ (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of the majority of the draft resolutions as a reaffirmation of our condemnation of all forms of racism and racial discrimination, and of *apartheid* in particular.

288. In its Constitution, Chile has very clear principles opposing racial discrimination. These principles emerged virtually at the time of my country's independence more than a century ago. That is why we very much wanted to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions that have just been adopted. Unfortunately, that was not possible. It is a fact clear to any impartial observer that draft resolutions on *apartheid* have been used to introduce elements which are quite at variance with the basic principle that should guide us—namely, combating *apartheid* in all its forms and wherever it appears.

289. Singling out certain States when dealing with collaboration with South Africa is a clear example of the arbitrary and selective approach to the drafting of some paragraphs. This selectivity, which does not contribute to the support of the international community in the struggle against *apartheid*, is a clear demonstration of the politicization of this question, and it undermines the credibility of the resolutions that the Assembly has just adopted. This is not the best way to make an effective contribution to the struggle of the peoples against *apartheid*.

290. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): The members of the Assembly have heard my Government's policies on the issues of southern Africa explained a number of times, most recently on 18 November [63rd meeting]. We all abhor *apartheid*. We are all morally obliged to pursue policies that encourage its elimination.

291. Given this broad, common ground among the members of the Assembly, we are disappointed that, once again, these draft resolutions were presented without any serious attempt to negotiate their content and language, which specifically impugns the good faith of the United States and other Members of the United Nations on this issue. Moreover, they appear to us to be based upon a general approach to the task of eliminating *apartheid* that will make that task more difficult and more violent.

292. Further, we must object this year, as in previous years, to the continuing attempt to politicize in this manner such technical bodies as the IMF and the IAEA. We particularly note paragraph 15 in draft resolution A/38/L.20, which requests the IAEA to refrain from extending to South Africa any facilities which may assist it in its nuclear plans and, in particular, to exclude South Africa from all IAEA technical working groups. We consider this to be an unwarranted intrusion into the internal affairs of the IAEA, an independent international organization with its own statutory requirements. Perhaps more significant, we do not understand how the attempt to keep southern Africa free of nuclear weapons can be advanced by barring South Africa from any contact with the organization especially charged with assisting in this effort. In this respect, the draft resolution is a paradigm of much that we find unhelpful, indeed, seriously damaging to a realistic effort to address the problems of South Africa.

293. Finally, we cannot but find objectionable the strident criticism of my Government and a few others which a number of the draft resolutions contain. Why have the authors of these draft resolutions ignored the facts that are before them and disregarded the consideration that normally prevails among friendly Governments in this forum? In this respect, I cite as an egregious, but not unique, example the charges contained in draft resolution A/38/L.26, and especially the accusation referring to the approval by the United States Government of bidding by United States companies on a contract to provide advice and technical services to a South African firm whose commercial nuclear reactors provide electricity to a nation-wide power grid. The approval represents not the slightest infringement of the arms embargo.

294. This issue was addressed by us in this Hall on 14 October [33rd meeting]. No one has since attempted to challenge the information provided at that time. The fact that the United States alone has been cited, although, as the Assembly has been informed, companies from a number of Member States bid on the same contracts, forces us to conclude that the paragraph in question was not inserted as a contribution to the anti-*apartheid* effort, but as an unjustified attempt to single out the United States for criticism. We are encouraged by the numerous statements by delegations which have also rejected the practice of unjustly singling out Member States for criticism in these resolutions.

295. In closing, I wish to express our desire to continue to co-operate with all those of good will in positive efforts to bring about an end to *apartheid*. We look forward to the day when resolutions framed in a truly constructive spirit will deserve and obtain the unanimous support of all who, like ourselves, are committed to the promotion of justice in South Africa.

296. Mr. LOULICHKI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): The Moroccan delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions. This vote reflects the total rejection by the Kingdom of Morocco of any policy of racial discrimination, whatever its basis or motivation, and especially the most abject form of racism, *apartheid*. This vote also reflects Morocco's condemnation of all measures taken by the South African régime to perpetuate its policy of enslavement and humiliation of the oppressed majority of the people of South Africa. This vote, finally, confirms the unconditional support which the Kingdom of Morocco gives actively and consistently to the brother people of South Africa in the heroic struggle which they continue to wage to ensure the establishment of a free and democratic society.

297. Since the elimination of *apartheid* is a collective responsibility of the international community, the role

of the United Nations and its specialized agencies in this respect is decisive, in order to hasten the emancipation of the majority of the people of South Africa and its liberation from the degrading, merciless policy of the racist South African régime.

298. The resolutions which the Assembly has just adopted—and for which we would like to pay a very well-deserved tribute to the Special Committee against *Apartheid*—thus reflect the unanimous position of principle of the international community against South Africa's policy of *apartheid*, which has rightly been called an international crime. Nevertheless, some of the resolutions contain certain paragraphs in which particular language was used to single out certain countries by name, and we consider that such language is not always justified, and certainly is not likely to facilitate the rapid and complete implementation of these resolutions. This is the case, in particular, with regard to draft resolutions A/38/L.20, L.23 and L.26, of which the Moroccan delegation was therefore unable to be a co-sponsor.

299. Mr. BAYONA MEDINA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with our long-standing position of condemnation of *apartheid*, the delegation of Peru voted in favour of all the draft resolutions. We should like to enter reservations, however, on certain parts of the resolutions that have been adopted which condemn certain Member States by name. This could be interpreted as selective and, therefore, discriminatory.

300. Furthermore, the delegation of Peru does not think that solutions to international problems should be sought by violent means. Therefore, we have reservations on the parts of those resolutions that encourage armed struggle. We feel that that is not in keeping with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

301. Mr. KO (Burma): Burma has consistently rejected the policies of *apartheid* of the South African Government, and this firm conviction found expression in our positive votes on all the draft resolutions which have just been put to the vote. My delegation, however, has reservations with regard to the language and formulation of some paragraphs in draft resolutions A/38/L.20, L.25 and L.26, in which there is selective singling-out of specific countries.

302. Mrs. CARRASCO MONJE (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Bolivia supports any resolution on the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa because we agree with the international community in condemning those policies. That reprehensible system of racial segregation and oppression violates the most fundamental principles of human rights and fundamental freedoms as set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In addition, South Africa has ignored the constant appeals of the international community that it take suitable action to eliminate those policies and to allow all the peoples of South Africa to take part freely in the determination of their future. However, my delegation abstained in the vote on certain paragraphs of the draft resolutions which mention some States by name, as we feel this to be contrary to the friendly relations which the Government of Bolivia maintains with those States.

303. Mr. ALI (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of Oman has always supported all resolutions condemning the policies of *apartheid* practised by South Africa. My delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions that were before us for decision today, but at the same time wishes to record its reservations on those paragraphs which condemn specifically some friendly States with which we have diplomatic relations.

304. Mr. KNIPPING VICTORIA (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): A basic part of our foreign policy is condemnation of the odious system of *apartheid*. For a country like the Dominican Republic, whose society is made up of a rich and varied mixture of races, any form of discrimination—racial, cultural, economic, social or political—is a violation of the most sacred principles of our nationhood. Consequently, in view of the multiracial character of our people, of which we are very proud, my Government must consider *apartheid* as a crime against humanity and a negative element operating against international peace and security. Thus, we completely reject *apartheid*.

305. Having clearly stated that inviolable principle of our foreign policy, we wish to explain our delegation's votes on the paragraphs in various draft resolutions which were voted on separately. My delegation abstained from voting on those paragraphs because, as we have stated on previous occasions, we feel it is not constructive to single out certain countries for criticism. That only introduces extraneous factors that could work against the aims of the resolutions concerned; moreover, the drafting of those paragraphs robs the spirit and the letter of the resolutions of balance and objectivity. This course is also at variance with the principle of universality which should inspire the Organization's decisions.

306. For the same reasons we abstained from voting on draft resolution A/38/L.25—the only resolution on which we did so.

307. By this explanation of vote my delegation wishes to put on record its position of principle. We also wish to make it clear that we support all draft resolutions that are consistent with our unreserved rejection and total condemnation of the odious and absurd—that is the only word that can be used to describe it—practice of *apartheid*.

308. Mr. NGUAYILA MBELA KALANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation voted in favour of 10 of the 11 draft resolutions; it did not take part in the vote on one draft resolution. Nevertheless, my delegation would like to record its reservations on those paragraphs in which certain States which maintain diplomatic relations with my country are referred to by name.

309. Mr. GARCÍA-MORENO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Colombia has traditionally repudiated the policy of *apartheid*, which we consider a crime against humanity. This is consistent with my country's unwavering policy of opposition to any form of discrimination, with its support for the fight for fundamental freedoms in all countries of the world, regardless of race, colour or creed, and with its devotion to peace and justice.

310. Although the delegation of Colombia agrees with most of the considerations and principles set forth in the draft resolutions, and with the categorical condemnation of *apartheid*—which we have always emphatically denounced in various international bodies—we believe that some of the draft resolutions contain paragraphs which rob them of objectivity, balance and restraint. We do not agree with the singling out for condemnation of countries with which Colombia maintains diplomatic relations, and we believe that those paragraphs are not likely to bring us closer to the solutions that we are all anxiously seeking.

311. For these reasons, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/38/L.25, and voted for all the others.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council

(a) Report of the Council;

(b) Reports of the Secretary-General

312. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Costa Rica, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/38/L.16, on the International Year of Peace.

313. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I am very pleased to address the General Assembly with you presiding.

314. It is a great honour for me to speak to the Assembly on the subject of the International Year of Peace, which, as members know, will be celebrated in 1986, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 37/16 of 16 November 1982.

315. The significance of the International Year of Peace, and the appropriateness of proclaiming it on 24 October 1985, the date of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, cannot be underestimated, especially in view of increasing international tension and the need for the international community to redouble its efforts to support the purposes and principles of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security.

316. It is quite clear that the present world situation demands that we all dedicate ourselves to the promotion and strengthening of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the objective of which is the attainment of that cherished goal. Peace and security have always been, throughout the history of mankind, an aspiration, an ideal, but it has always been a fragile and fragmentary ideal. That is why there is now a critical need to promote joint activities by the international community to create a climate favourable to a general awareness of the need for co-operation in working for genuine peace in the world. Interdependence and the political will to recognize it will play a preponderant role.

317. In his inspired appeal to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences on 13 November 1983, His Holiness Pope John Paul II stated, in the section entitled "The building of lasting peace"—*Pax perpetuo aedificanda*:

"The work of building peace can never end. Peace is a continuing effort, and it is your responsibility, it has been entrusted to your research, to the technical applications which you must guide with your authority, to promote justice with freedom—that freedom of thought which makes it possible to make other choices when certain choices have been violated, and to use your researches and discoveries for justice and peace.

"The scientific community, more than any other, is a community of peace, because your vigorous search for truth in the field of nature is independent of ideologies and therefore of the resultant conflicts. Your activities demand sincere co-operation and free participation in the results of your research."

318. I should like to introduce, on behalf of the sponsors, draft resolution A/38/L.16. The draft resolution will make it possible to proceed with preparations for the International Year of Peace. The text of the draft resolution is procedural and sets out the various stages that must be carried out in accordance with the report of the Secretary-General [A/38/413 and Add.1], which was submitted in compliance with resolution 37/16.

319. The draft resolution takes note with appreciation of the Secretary-General's report. It recognizes that the Year will be especially important and will be devoted to concentrating the efforts of the United Nations and its

States Members on promoting the ideals of peace as evidence of their dedication to peace by all possible means. One such means, but not the only one, is the celebration of the Year, but in addition there is the organization of preliminary activities, including regional seminars to promote the support that will make the Year significant and productive.

320. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution are self-explanatory. Paragraph 3 requests the Secretary-General to establish a voluntary fund for financing the programme of the Year and urges all States to contribute generously to that fund. In paragraph 4 the Secretary-General is requested to carry out during 1984-1985 the preparations necessary for the observance of the Year, including the organization of regional seminars devoted to promoting the objectives of the Year. My delegation believes that it is not asking too much to request the General Assembly to approve the modest allocation needed to hold such seminars as specified in the Secretary-General's report [A/38/413, annex V], the administrative and financial implications of which are given in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/38/658].

321. In paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, the Secretary-General is asked to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session on the draft programme for the International Year of Peace and on the arrangements for financing it. Finally, in paragraph 6, the Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-ninth session an item entitled "International Year of Peace".

322. My delegation and the other sponsors hope that this draft resolution will be adopted without a vote, and to that end we appeal to the good will of all delegations.

323. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call upon the representative of the United States of America, who wishes to introduce the amendment in document A/38/L.41 to draft resolution A/38/L.16.

324. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): A year ago, at the Assembly's thirty-seventh session [69th meeting], my Government joined in the consensus on resolution 37/16, which declared 1986 to be the International Year of Peace. However, at that time my delegation, as well as others, called for fiscal responsibility on the part of the Secretariat in drafting a programme for the year. We emphasized that we had every expectation that the Secretary-General would ensure that the financial requirements conformed to the guidelines laid down by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1980/67 and adopted by the General Assembly in its decision 35/424, especially the following:

"A year should not be proclaimed before the basic arrangements necessary for its financing have been made and such financing should in principle be based on voluntary contributions."

325. My Government has been deeply disturbed by the statement by the Secretary-General on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution [A/C.5/38/60], which called for conference-servicing costs of \$445,400 for five regional seminars and an additional appropriation of \$84,000 for travel and subsistence of the substantive staff of the Secretariat and experts. This last figure was subsequently reduced to \$70,000 in the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and in the Fifth Committee [see A/38/658].

326. In order to be able to join in a consensus on this item this year we therefore have submitted an amendment—A/38/L.41—to paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/38/L.16, in which we have inserted the words "to utilize the voluntary fund" after the words "the Secretary-General"

and prior to the words “to carry out during 1984-1985”. The paragraph, as amended, would therefore read:

“*Also requests* the Secretary-General to utilize the voluntary fund to carry out during 1984-1985 the preparations necessary for the observance of the International Year of Peace, including the organization of regional seminars devoted to promoting the objectives of the Year”.

We respectfully request serious and favourable consideration of this amendment by the Assembly.

327. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation fully understands the reasons for the amendment to paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/38/L.16 proposed by the representative of the United States. He suggests the insertion of the words “to utilize the voluntary fund” to finance the regional seminars.

328. With great regret, my delegation, which has not had time to consult all the other sponsors because the amendment has only just been put forward, cannot accept this proposal. First of all, the Fifth Committee has already reached a decision on this matter by a wide margin this morning. Secondly, the financing of regional seminars is in keeping with the guidelines on the holding of international years, an example being International Youth Year, for which \$850,000 was allocated. Thirdly, since pledges to the fund, which will be used to promote the Year, have not yet been announced, we do not believe that the fund should bear a burden which would take money away from the Year and make it less significant than it should be.

329. We urge the representative of the United States to consider a modification to his proposal in document A/38/L.41. We propose that we should not amend paragraph 4 by inserting the words “to utilize the voluntary fund”. Instead, at the end of the paragraph, after the words “of the Year”, we would replace the semicolon by a comma and add the words “and that these be financed as far as possible out of existing funds in accordance with the Fifth Committee’s decision”. If this is acceptable to the United States delegation, perhaps we could adopt this draft resolution without a vote. The wording “as far as possible” was accepted by the United States delegation in the Second Committee.

330. As we were told in the Fifth Committee, the extra amount involved for the seminars is only \$70,000, not \$84,000, as stated in paragraph 9 of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions [A/C.5/38/60]. This is a very small amount, and it might even be less, depending on where the regional seminars are held. For example, the regional seminar for Latin America costs a certain amount if held at Santiago,

Chile, the headquarters of ECLA. My country has offered to host this seminar, and the cost would then be less, because the distance between New York and San José, the capital of Costa Rica, is less than the distance between New York and Santiago, the capital of Chile. The same kind of thing could apply to other regional seminars.

331. I have consulted the representative of the United States, and it appears that we shall not be able to reach a decision immediately, as I have not been able to confer with all the other sponsors of the draft resolution. For these reasons, I respectfully ask you, Mr. President, to be kind enough to postpone the vote on draft resolution A/38/L.16 to give everyone a chance to evaluate the new situation and, if possible, to agree on a formulation agreeable to all. If, after consultations, that is not possible, then the day after tomorrow, or whenever you deem it appropriate, we could vote either on the United States amendment or on our counter-proposal.

332. We are still optimistic. We still hope that the programme for the International Year of Peace will be adopted without a vote.

333. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): If there is no objection, in view of the request made by the representative of Costa Rica, I propose that we suspend further consideration of this item and return to it at a future meeting—some time this week, if possible.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7.50 p.m.

NOTES

¹ The delegations of Burma, Malawi, Morocco, Qatar, Solomon Islands, Togo and Zaire subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolutions; the delegation of Viet Nam, that it had intended to vote against.

² See *Report of the World Conference for Action against Apartheid* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.77.XIV.2 and corrigendum), vol. I, chap. X.

³ See *Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence* (A/CONF.120/13), part three.

⁴ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, Nos. 970-973.

⁵ A/32/144, annex I.

⁶ See *Report of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, Paris, 20-27 May 1981* (A/CONF.107/8), sect. X.A.

⁷ The delegation of Bolivia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

⁸ The delegation of Uruguay subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

⁹ See *Report of the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.XIV.4 and corrigendum), chap. II, sect. A.