

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

EIGHTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**2nd
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 4 September 1981,
at 12.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rüdiger von WECHMAR
(Federal Republic of Germany).

AGENDA ITEM 3

Credentials of representatives to the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly (continued):

(b) Report of the Credentials Committee

1. The PRESIDENT: I invite the Assembly to turn its attention first to the report of the Credentials Committee [A/ES-8/6]. I now call on the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Rodolfo Piza Escalante, of Costa Rica, to present the report.

2. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica), Chairman of the Credentials Committee (*interpretation from Spanish*): The first report of the Credentials Committee is to be found in document A/ES-8/6. The report is, I think, self-explanatory. As can be seen, the Committee at its 1st meeting considered only the credentials of the three delegations which have so far submitted credentials for this emergency special session. They are the delegations of Guinea, South Africa, and Yemen. Paragraph 16 of the report accordingly states that:

“The Committee, by 6 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions, decided to reject the credentials of the delegation of South Africa for the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly.”

The report also states, in paragraph 17, that the Committee accepted the credentials of the other delegations which had submitted them. Accordingly, as paragraph 20 of the report states, the Credentials Committee recommends the adoption of this report as presented.

3. The PRESIDENT: The representative of South Africa has asked to speak on a point of order. I would recall that rule 29 of the rules of procedure provides as follows:

“Any representative to whose admission a Member has made objection shall be seated provisionally with the same rights as other representatives until the Credentials Committee has reported and the General Assembly has given its decision.”

4. In the light of that rule, I call on the representative of South Africa on a point of order. May I point out that, under rule 71 of the rules of procedure: “A representative rising to a point of order may not speak on the substance of the matter under discussion.”

5. Mr. EKSTEEN (South Africa): The report of the Credentials Committee...

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

7. Mr. BEDJAOUI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I have no need to express the respect we have for you or to state that it inspires, guides and constrains us. Nor do I need to say, since I am only too well aware of it, how complex and delicate are the tasks of the presidency. I have no wish to add to them, nor would I permit myself to do so.

8. Need I say, finally, that your personal devotion to all the sacred values that make the Organization great is sufficiently well known to assure you now and in the future of our confidence and support?

9. However, what is at stake today is not your personal commitment, Mr. President—for we are well aware of your respect for the ideals of peace and freedom, whose triumph we are working for in Namibia, South Africa and elsewhere. What is at stake is not your position either, which we know is burdensome and difficult, as I have just said. What is at stake today is, in the final analysis, first and foremost, the triumph of a lofty moral principle through respect for law and legality. It is in this decisive light that this present situation must be seen...

10. The PRESIDENT: I apologize to the representative of Algeria; there is another point of order by the representative of South Africa. Under rule 29, I shall give him the opportunity to speak on a point of order, as soon as the representative of Algeria has finished speaking on his point of order.

11. Mr. BEDJAOUI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation representing the racist régime of Pretoria is planning to use worn-out procedural manoeuvres in order to take the floor in the Assembly this morning, and in and of itself that fact adds insult to injury. Are we to allow South Africa to bend our will in this way, to violate our decisions and to impose on us here the loud voicing of its crimes? Are we to allow a system that has rebelled against international law as invoked here in the form of the rules of procedure of the Assembly and, therefore, a system that has rebelled against international law—a system whose very existence is an insult to the intelligence of us all and which negates all those values which give meaning and life to the Organization—to receive here from us a prize for murder and endorsement of its aggression? Are we to allow a régime which has trampled underfoot all the principles of the Charter of the United Nations to receive absolution from us and to be rehabilitated? Clearly, in that case the outrageousness of the situation would escape no one. The mere presence of this delegation is a profound cause for concern for all the African States, which feel as attacks on their own aspirations to freedom and peace...

12. The PRESIDENT: May I for a moment interrupt the representative of Algeria?

13. As I pointed out earlier in my response to the request of the South African delegation, a representative who wishes to speak on a point of order should, under the rules of procedure, not discuss the substance of the matter under discussion. May I therefore propose that the representative of Algeria move on to whatever motion he may wish to introduce.

14. Mr. BEDJAOUI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it will be as you have decided.

15. It will be recalled that a ruling of the President of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly¹—a ruling which, moreover, has been regularly applied at each subsequent session—resulted in the systematic rejection of the credentials of the delegation of the Pretoria régime. Under that ruling, the irregularity of the participation of the said delegation in the work of the General Assembly has been duly established and the legal consequences arising therefrom have been solemnly laid down. Today again the report of the Credentials Committee which has been submitted to us for adoption expressly invalidates the credentials of the representatives of the Pretoria régime. All the facts of the case are very clear: no equivocation, no ambiguity is possible. All the legal consequences must be calmly drawn and responsibly drawn from the situation as it stands at the moment. The chief of these legal consequences is quite clearly the inadmissibility of the request to speak that has just been made by the representatives of the racist régime of Pretoria.

16. As a consequence of this, Mr. President, if your decision on the basis of rule 29¹ is indeed to give the floor to the delegation of the racist régime of Pretoria then I sincerely regret that, on behalf of the group of African States and in accordance with the common position adopted by that group, I must appeal against the decision of the President in accordance with rule 71 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. In accordance with that same rule 71, I thus request you to submit immediately to the decision of the Assembly the appeal motion which I have just presented.

17. The PRESIDENT: The representative of South Africa has again asked to speak on a point of order.

18. First, I should say that I had originally indicated that I would again call on the delegation of South Africa on a point of order, and the representative of South Africa has again asked to speak on a point of order. However, I should like to recall to members that, under rule 71 of the rules of procedure, a representative may appeal against the ruling of the President, as has just been done, and the appeal shall be immediately put to the vote. Going by the rules of procedures and rule 71 in particular, I therefore put to the vote the appeal against my ruling. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba,

Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen.²

Abstaining: Burma, Chile, Fiji, Malawi, Portugal, Spain.

The appeal was sustained by 113 votes to 24, with 6 abstentions.²

19. The PRESIDENT: Several representatives have asked to explain their votes after the voting and I shall now call on them.

20. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): I should like to speak briefly, on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Community, in explanation of our votes in support of the President's original ruling.

21. As you made clear, Mr. President, rule 29 of the rules of procedure states:

“Any representative to whose admission a Member has made objection shall be seated provisionally with the same rights as other representatives until the Credentials Committee has reported and the General Assembly has given its decision.”

22. Accordingly, in the judgement of the 10 delegations, you were right in ruling that the representative of South Africa should have the opportunity to speak in accordance with the terms of rule 29.

23. Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): My delegation vigorously opposed the challenge to you, Mr. President. We do not believe that a procedure which denies to an affected party the right to speak is ever desirable. While there may be occasions when such an action is necessary, when such a large body must cut off debate after hearing many views in order to bring a key issue to the vote, that is clearly not the case here today, for we have not heard one speaker.

24. We consider this motion to challenge you, Mr. President, to have been inappropriate, in that it took place before the discussion has begun. In addition to opposing any move which is designed, not to expedite matters, but—and let us be clear about this—simply to prevent any discussion, we believe the motion is particularly objectionable in this case. Rule 29 of the rules of procedure is intended, among other things, to permit an explanation by the representative of a Member State whose credentials have been questioned. We believe it is always important to give all sides a full and a fair hearing. It is only in that manner that judicious decisions can be made and procedures respected.

25. For those reasons, we consider it particularly inappropriate to refuse to hear the views of the representative of a Member State because such views may be different from our own or even distasteful. No worthwhile cause can be advanced in such a manner. This does not meet our standards of equity or of fair play. For this reason, we voted against the challenge to you.

26. Mr. MORDEN (Canada): The rights of a Member State to participate in the Assembly pending a decision of the Assembly on the report of the Credentials Committee are dealt with in rule 29 of the rules of procedure. The right of provisional admission to a session is not qualified by the acceptability or unacceptability of the policies or actions of the Member State concerned.

27. Canada very strongly supports the principles of universality and of strict adherence to the provisions of the Charter and the rules of the General Assembly. We therefore feel that efforts to circumvent the principles and rules which govern the Organization run contrary to the responsibility of every Member to uphold the tenets and provisions of the Charter.

28. For those reasons, my delegation voted against the appeal against your ruling.

29. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I wish to assure the President that the affirmative vote, which has been interpreted as a challenge to him, is not a challenge at all. What it boils down to is a question of priority and orderly arrangement in implementing rule 29 of the rules of procedure.

30. What we had this morning—or rather, this noon—was the report of the Credentials Committee. We listened to it, and the first order of business that devolved upon us was either to endorse or not to endorse it. When the rules of procedure state that a country whose credentials are in dispute shall be provisionally seated, that does not mean that it shall be entitled to participate in the debate of the General Assembly. Otherwise, the entire examination by the Credentials Committee would be pointless and contradictory.

31. There was therefore no challenge to the President, for whom we all have the highest respect, but simply our interpretation of the order of priorities we should follow in implementing the meaning of rule 29 of the rules of procedure. It is for this reason that the General Assembly has voted to endorse the findings of the Credentials Committee.

32. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to the draft resolution recom-

mended by the Credentials Committee in paragraph 20 of its first report [A/ES-8/6].

33. I have the following speakers on my list: one speaker who wishes to speak in the debate on the report; one delegation which wishes to explain its vote before the vote; and six delegations which wish to explain their vote after the vote. As you will remember, explanations of vote will be made from your seats, while those who wish to participate in the debate are invited to the rostrum, unless they prefer to make their statements from their seats.

34. I call on the delegation of the United States, which wishes to participate in the debate.

35. Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): The United States opposes the denial of South Africa's right to participate in the General Assembly. My Government believes that South Africa's credentials should not be rejected. Questions of the procedure involved here have substantive implications of great import to the United Nations and to the possibility of resolving the seemingly intractable political and human problems of Namibia.

36. In 1974 the United States made plain its strong opposition to the ruling of the General Assembly: by rejecting the credentials of the delegation of South Africa, the General Assembly had, in effect, decided to refuse to allow the South African delegation to participate in its work. Today, the United States delegation reiterates that position. Involved here are the most fundamental questions of membership and the rights of membership. It is the Charter of the United Nations itself that is involved. The provisions and requirements of that Charter should be our only guide. Under the law of Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter, a Member State may be suspended or expelled from the United Nations only upon the recommendation of the Security Council as confirmed by the General Assembly. Yet denying a Member State the right to participate in the General Assembly is to deprive that State of the right to participate in the work of the only universal parliamentary organ of the United Nations. The right to participate can only be denied in accordance with Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter.

37. The Security Council has never recommended that the Assembly should suspend or expel South Africa. For that reason, the Assembly's action in 1974 was without legal foundation. On so fundamental a question as rights of membership, the passing of time has not given the General Assembly a better legal basis for doing in 1981 what it did improperly in 1974. No one has shown that South Africa's credentials fail to meet the requirements of the rules of procedure. To refuse to consider those credentials as required by the rules of procedure is to use the issue of credentials as a guise under which to try to accomplish a suspension that lies beyond the powers of the Assembly.

38. In addition, we must never lose sight of our principal objective, which is achieving an internationally acceptable settlement leading to full independence for Namibia. It is vitally important that the United Nations should be an effective participant in the process leading to Namibia's independence; if the United Nations is to be effective, it must be fair and even-handed.

39. My Government is fully aware that this is a most difficult process. Our concern is that the step taken this morning may make that process still more difficult. We need no new obstacles to a lasting settlement; there are enough obstacles already. For our part, we remain dedicated to working with the contact group and with all the parties concerned to reach the goal of independence for the people of Namibia.

40. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to the vote on the first report of the Credentials Committee. Before that vote, I shall call on those delegations that wish to explain their vote before the vote.

41. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to make clear, as we did in March of this year, our reasons for abstaining in the vote taken on the credentials submitted by the South African Government in the Credentials Committee yesterday, and why we shall abstain in the vote to be taken this morning.

42. First of all, I would reiterate that the Costa Rican delegation has condemned, and continues energetically to condemn, both the illegal and unacceptable occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the inhuman and racist régime of *apartheid* itself, which has been imposed by a minority on the indigenous majority population of South Africa. On those two points, we have voted in favour of all United Nations resolutions aimed at condemning that Government and have also advocated—and continue to advocate—that the General Assembly, and particularly the Security Council, should begin to take more effective measures to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia as well as to the régime of *apartheid*.

43. However, my delegation considers that, in regard to the problem of the credentials of the South African delegation, other important considerations should be taken into account, for this Assembly in particular. Those considerations require above all that a distinction be made between two different situations: one is the situation of the legitimacy or illegitimacy of the delegation and, generally speaking, of the Government of South Africa at the present time in representing that country in the Assembly; the other is the occupation of Namibia by the South African Government.

44. In the first case, we are dealing with the question of the participation or non-participation of the present South African Government in the activities of the General Assembly as the representative of a State Member of the United Nations. In the second case, it is a question of a Government—regardless of whether that Government is or is not a Member of the United Nations—which has committed serious violations against the laws of the international community.

45. In connection with the representativeness of the South African delegation or with the South African Government's capacity to accredit a delegation to the General Assembly—and that is the only question that can be discussed in connection with credentials—my delegation could not and cannot agree with the rejection of those credentials as recommended by the majority in the Credentials Committee. My delegation considers that rejecting the credentials of any delegation accredited by the Government of a State

Member of the United Nations would constitute a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, by creating penalties that are not provided for by means of the subterfuge of extending the interpretation of the law in a contentious case.

46. Rejecting the credentials of a delegation because the Government that issues them is illegitimate is tantamount to affirming that all those whose credentials have been accepted are legitimate, and that is something which my delegation does not and would not wish to affirm. We consider that the holding of a special session of the Assembly to consider the question of Namibia without the presence of the Government responsible for the situation and without hearing statements by it is tantamount to turning back international law to the primitive state when it was legitimate to condemn an offender without recognizing his fundamental rights to a hearing and to a defence.

47. As I have said, my delegation considers that the South African Government is illegitimate. We emphatically reject it, because it is explicitly based on blatant discrimination, and we invariably condemn it for its racist, imperialist and colonialist practices. However, we are abstaining on the question of credentials because we cannot agree to excluding it from its right to participate in the General Assembly, far less in a session of the Assembly when that Government is the main party in the dock. We could not cast a negative vote, although a negative vote should not be seen as an endorsement of the South African régime.

48. The PRESIDENT: We have now heard the last speaker both in the debate and in explanation of vote before the vote. That permits us to proceed to the actual vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Credentials Committee in its first report [A/ES-8/6, para. 20]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Costa Rica, Guatemala, Japan, Malawi, Spain, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 117 votes to 22, with 6 abstentions (résolution ES-8/1 A).

49. The PRESIDENT: We may now proceed to hear those delegations that wish to explain their votes after the vote.

50. Mr. KLESTIL (Austria): The negative vote Austria just cast on the report of the Credentials Committee is based only on the legal provisions of the Charter of the United Nations concerning the participation of Member States in the work of the General Assembly. It does not reflect the position that my Government has always taken and will continue to take on the policy of *apartheid* practised by the South African Government. The Austrian Government has repeatedly expressed its condemnation of the policy of *apartheid* and of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. However, my Government firmly believes in the basic principle of the universality of the United Nations, and it is for that reason that my delegation supports the acceptance of the credentials of the South African delegation. Our negative vote on the report of the Credentials Committee does not, however, reflect our position on the credentials of the delegations of Guinea and Yemen.

51. Mr. TRUCCO (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The position of the Chilean Government on the question of Namibia is well known, and our participation in the United Nations Council for Namibia from the time of its establishment until now is clear confirmation of our determined support for the people of Namibia in its just aspirations to control its own destiny in a free and sovereign manner.

52. Similarly, we have denounced in all international forums the illegality of South Africa's presence in that international Territory.

53. Accordingly our vote should be judged solely within a procedural and legal context. The Chilean delegation has always argued and continues to argue that the Credentials Committee must restrict itself solely to complying with rule 27 of the Assembly's rules of procedure—in other words, it must confine itself to establishing that the credentials of the various delegations meet the requirements clearly laid down in that rule.

54. However, to ensure full effectiveness of the principle of universality of the United Nations, which is one of its fundamental principles, it is necessary, in our view, that all Member States should have an opportunity to take part in each of its bodies, particularly when what is required is the co-operation of all parties involved with a view to solving problems threatening international peace and security.

55. Mr. ANDERSON (Australia): The Australian delegation voted against the motion that South Africa should not be heard and against the report of the Credentials Committee. In voting against the report, we were concerned only with that part of the report which rejects the credentials of South Africa. We agree with the Committee's acceptance of the credentials of Guinea and Yemen in paragraph 17 of the report.

56. Our position on the question of South Africa's being heard and on the credentials of South Africa is based on legal grounds and in particular on our long-standing support for the fundamental principle of universality of membership of the United Nations. I should add that Australia's vote in no way qualifies or detracts from its categoric rejection of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the Government of South Africa and its no less categoric rejection of the policy of *apartheid*.

57. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): New Zealand was not able to accept the Credentials Committee's report on South Africa. New Zealand has always upheld the principle of universality and the right of all Member States to be heard. Our vote on this issue in no way alters New Zealand's absolute rejection of the South African Government's racist policy of *apartheid*, nor does it alter New Zealand's opposition to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia.

58. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak again on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Community in explanation of our vote on the report of the Credentials Committee.

59. The attitude of the 10 delegations is based on legal considerations. We note that, in the absence of any other provision, the powers of the Credentials Committee are limited by the rules of procedure of the General Assembly to a verification of facts. The Committee therefore cannot pass judgement on the policies of the Government whose credentials are under consideration.

60. As the Committee has rejected the credentials of a delegation for reasons that are not those provided for in the rules of procedure of the Assembly, we had no choice but to vote against the report. The 10 delegations firmly believe that the principle of universality must be upheld. We fear that the very foundation of the Organization is weakened if its constitution is not respected. These considerations are a matter of principle to us. They do not imply any change in our rejection of the *apartheid* policy of the Government of South Africa. Neither do they mean that our conviction has become less strong that the occupation of Namibia by South Africa must cease.

61. Mr. KOLBY (Norway): On behalf of the Nordic countries—Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and Norway—I should like to state that our negative vote on the report of the Credentials Committee is based solely on legal principles. The Nordic countries wish to see all countries participating in and co-operating with the United Nations. It is well known that the Nordic countries have persistently condemned the policy of *apartheid* and South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. However, the question before the

Credentials Committee was whether the credentials of the South African delegation fulfilled the requirements of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. This was the case in the view of the Nordic countries, and to decide otherwise would be tantamount to a suspension of membership, which under Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter requires a recommendation of the Security Council and a decision of the Assembly. The Nordic countries strongly support the principle of universality in the United Nations. Since the requirements of Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter have not been met in the present case, the credentials should be accepted.

62. Let me add that the Nordic delegations of course support the acceptance of the credentials of the delegations of Guinea and Yemen.

63. Mr. LOĞOĞLU (Turkey): I wish to explain the affirmative vote we have just cast. Turkey's position vis-à-vis the policies of *apartheid* of South Africa is well known and needs no reiteration here. We have made our total rejection of those racist policies clear in all the statements we have made, as well as through all the votes we have cast so far in the Organization. Therefore, the affirmative vote we have just cast for approval of the recommendation of the Credentials Committee and the affirmative vote on the Algerian motion preceding it should be interpreted strictly in the context of the sense of protest we feel towards the policies of South Africa.

64. Mr. MORDEN (Canada): My delegation very much regrets the decision just taken by the Assembly with regard to representation of South Africa, which remains a full Member of the Organization. The Credentials Committee and the Assembly itself have exceeded their authority by refusing to accept credentials which have been legally submitted by that Government. That decision was tantamount to denying to a Member State the exercise of its fundamental rights and privileges—one of the basic principles of the Charter, which governs us all.

65. Canadian abhorrence of the policy of *apartheid*, which prevails in South Africa, is clear and has been made clear on many occasions. Similarly, as I stated on 29 August in the Security Council,³ Canada condemns the South African incursion into Angola. However, we continue to attach the greatest importance to the principles of universality and strict adherence to the distribution of powers between the Security Council and the General Assembly, as

provided for in the Charter, in particular in its Articles 5 and 6. What has just been decided is in direct contradiction of those principles. The question that was before us was not that of the nature of the régime in power in South Africa or its actions. It was a purely technical question regarding the credentials of a delegation of a Member State which were perfectly in order.

66. Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation would like to make a statement, not in explanation of vote, but on the procedure concerning the vote that took place at this emergency special session of the General Assembly and in connection with the statement of the Central African Republic at our last meeting. The delegation of the Soviet Union would like to confirm its position of principle as regards the application of Article 19 of the Charter, which has frequently been mentioned before. This position is based on strict observance of the Charter of the United Nations and concerns the fact that decisions on the application of Article 19 to a State Member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its contributions to the regular budget of the United Nations are taken exclusively by the General Assembly and not by arbitrary actions of the United Nations Secretariat.

AGENDA ITEM 4

Adoption of the agenda

67. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the provisional agenda [A/ES-8/2]?

The agenda was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

NOTES

1. See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2281st meeting.

2. The delegations of Bahrain and Yemen subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the appeal.

3. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year*, 2298th meeting.