

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records *



FOURTH COMMITTEE

23rd meeting

held on

Monday, 3 November 1980

at 3 p.m.

New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 23rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana)

CONTENTS

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

QUESTION OF BELIZE

AGENDA ITEM 87: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 84: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 85: QUESTION OF EAST TIMOR (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.4/35/SR.23

14 November 1980

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/C.4/35/4/Add.4-7)

1. The CHAIRMAN observed that the Committee had before it four requests for hearings on Namibia, which were reproduced in documents A/C.4/35/4/Add.4-7. He suggested that the Committee should grant the requests.

2. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

QUESTION OF BELIZE (A/C.4/35/L.8/Rev.1)

3. Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.8/Rev.1, said that the changes made in the original text were designed to take into account certain points made by members of the Committee. The first amendment, in the ninth preambular paragraph, was designed to make it clear that the negotiations between Guatemala and Belize, in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 34/38, had been conducted in good faith. In operative paragraph 2, the reference to the territorial integrity of Belize had been deleted, since it was not relevant in the context of that paragraph. The amendment to paragraph 4 contained a reference to the principle of the Charter that threats or the use of force should not be applied to prevent the people of Belize from exercising their inalienable right to self-determination. In paragraph 5, some repetitions had been deleted. Lastly, paragraph 9 had been added to take into account the geographical situation of Belize, particularly its proximity to Guatemala. The sponsors of the draft resolution, conscious of the need to create an atmosphere of peace and stability in the region, requested Guatemala and Belize to act in a spirit of conciliation. He hoped that, with the amendments he had just mentioned, the draft could be adopted by consensus.

4. Mr. CASTILLO-ARRIOLA (Guatemala) said that the Committee had displayed great wisdom in its consideration of the question of Western Sahara. It was acting quite differently, however, with regard to the question of Belize. The changes made in draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.8 did not go to the heart of the problem, and the text was merely a repetition of resolutions adopted in earlier years. Guatemala could not accept the validity of General Assembly resolutions which interfered with a process of negotiation between sovereign States and went beyond the mandate given to the Assembly by the United Nations Charter. Adoption of the draft resolution would constitute a violation of the rules of law governing relations between countries signatories of the Charter. No United Nations organ was entitled to interfere in the settlement of disputes and prejudge their possible solution, or advocate one particular solution.

5. As a general rule, General Assembly resolutions did not have binding force unless they were adopted by consensus, or unless they constituted declarations or conventions or were accepted by the parties concerned. Guatemala did not,

/...

(Mr. Castillo-Arriola, Guatemala)

therefore, accept as binding any resolutions which had been or might be adopted in violation of the indisputable rights of Guatemala to the territory of Belize. It also rejected the intervention of Governments whose acts violated the principle of non-intervention in the internal or external affairs of other States.

6. The revised draft resolution also contained some negative elements. In particular, it was stated in paragraph 2 that Belize should become an independent State before the conclusion of the General Assembly's thirty-sixth session. That irresponsible statement might cut short the process of negotiation, by imposing a deadline. It would also have the effect of establishing a State with indeterminate frontiers, which was not recognized by a neighbouring State and whose territory was contested by the latter State, and of disposing of the territory of a sovereign State, namely Guatemala. New paragraph 9 was totally unacceptable, since it went beyond the framework of negotiations between Guatemala and the United Kingdom.

7. Adoption of the draft resolution would jeopardize peace in the Central American region. For reasons which were not openly stated but were quite obvious, attempts were being made to aggravate the already tense situation in that region.

8. In accordance with rules 87 and 89 of the rules of procedure, his delegation requested that paragraphs 2, 3, 7 and 9 should be put to the vote separately, and that a recorded vote should be taken on the draft resolution as a whole.

9. Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution could not accept the Guatemalan representative's request, since the draft resolution constituted a single whole.

10. Mr. SORENSEN (Venezuela) supported the Guatemalan representative's request.

11. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait) said he was opposed to a separate vote on individual paragraphs.

12. At the request of the Guatemalan representative, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal for a separate vote on paragraphs 2, 3, 7 and 9 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/35/L.8/Rev.1.

In favour: Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Morocco, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Eyelorrussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic,

/...

Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, El Salvador, Finland, Honduras, Japan, Niger, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Somalia, United States of America, Venezuela.

13. The proposal for a separate vote was rejected by 100 votes to 21, with 16 abstentions.

14. Mr. RICARDEZ (Argentina), speaking in explanation of vote prior to the vote, said that Argentina would vote for the draft resolution which tried to reconcile the interests of all parties. The majority of the international community was convinced that the people of Belize should exercise its right to self-determination in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). In the negotiations between independent Belize and Guatemala, to which reference was made in paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, due account should be taken of the legitimate aspirations of Guatemala regarding its territorial, political, economic and other needs. However, his delegation had certain reservations regarding paragraph 7, which did not define the actions that might be appropriate and did not state which the relevant organs were. Consequently, if the paragraphs had been put to the vote separately, he would have abstained on paragraph 7.

15. Mr. SORENSEN (Venezuela), speaking in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.8/Rev.1, said that his delegation would have abstained on paragraph 7 if the paragraphs had been put to the vote separately, since paragraph 7 contained a premature decision regarding United Nations participation in matters which came within the competence of States. However, his delegation would vote for the draft resolution as a whole which affirmed the inalienable rights of the people of Belize to independence and was designed to eliminate the vestiges of colonialism. He also hoped that the negotiations would have a successful outcome.

16. Mr. MANGAL (Afghanistan) said that he would vote for the draft resolution as amended. Belize should have acceded to independence many years earlier, but the negotiations between the parties concerned had not achieved any tangible results, and Belize had thus been prevented from exercising its inalienable right to self-determination. His delegation was therefore pleased that a reasonable date had been fixed for the accession of Belize to independence. It hoped that fruitful negotiations would be held in the meantime. No State could have territorial claims

/...

(Mr. Mangal, Afghanistan)

on Belize. In his delegation's view, it was totally unacceptable to invoke an alleged dispute between certain countries.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that Sri Lanka wished to become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution.

18. At the request of the Guatemalan representative, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.8/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, 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, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Guatemala.

Abstaining: Bolivia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Honduras, Israel, Morocco, Paraguay, Uruguay.

19. Draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted by 130 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

20. Mr. RUDOFISKY (Austria), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had always supported General Assembly resolutions reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of Belize to self-determination and independence, and had also voted for draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.8/Rev.1.

21. Austria hoped that Belize would soon accede to independence, maintaining its

/...

(Mr. Rudofsky, Austria)

security and safeguarding its territorial integrity, which could be guaranteed only if all States in accordance with the United Nations Charter refrained from any action which might injure Belize.

22. Mrs. NEWSOM (United States of America) said that she had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.8/Rev.1, because her country supported the principle of self-determination which was affirmed in the draft. In the past, her delegation had abstained on draft resolutions on the question of Belize, in order to encourage a negotiated solution; but now it believed that measures must be taken to speed up the independence of Belize.

23. She was pleased to note that the revised version of the draft resolution recognized the efforts of the Governments of the United Kingdom, Guatemala and Belize to reach a negotiated solution of the problem.

24. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) said that his country had always recognized that the right of colonial peoples to self-determination and independence, as affirmed in the United Nations Charter and numerous United Nations resolutions, applied also to Belize; and his delegation had therefore voted for draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.8/Rev.1. It had also voted for the Guatemalan representative's proposal for a separate vote on paragraphs 2, 3, 7 and 9, since it would have liked to abstain on those paragraphs which did not contribute to the solution of the bilateral problems that the Governments of Guatemala and the United Kingdom were at present trying to settle.

25. Mrs. de RIBADENEIRA (Ecuador) said that she had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.8/Rev.1 because her country supported the negotiations now being conducted by the Governments of Guatemala and the United Kingdom with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the problem - a solution that would take into account the right of the people of Belize to self-determination and independence and the legitimate rights of all parties concerned.

26. Mr. RODRIGUEZ MEDINA (Colombia) said that the creation of a State, the recognition of its independence and its admission to membership of the United Nations made memorable events which strengthened the principles and ideals affirmed in the United Nations Charter; and his delegation had therefore voted for draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.8/Rev.1.

27. However, he had reservations concerning certain passages in the draft resolution which went beyond the scope of the negotiations and could be interpreted as an attempt to bring pressure to bear on the parties concerned. If the draft resolution had been put to the vote paragraph by paragraph, his delegation would have abstained on paragraph 4, which was not very clearly worded, and on paragraph 7.

28. Colombia hoped that the tripartite negotiations now in progress would result in recognition of the aspirations and the rights of the peoples of Belize and Guatemala.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 87: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/C.4/35/L.3)

29. Mrs. LUCAS (New Zealand) said that her delegation would vote for draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.3 because it agreed with the basic objectives of the text. However, it had reservations about some aspects of the draft resolution; in particular, it could not subscribe to the view that the South West Africa People's Organization was the "sole and authentic representative" of the Namibian people, as it did not wish to prejudice the outcome of the elections yet to be held in accordance with the provisions of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

30. Her delegation also had reservations about operative paragraph 5 with respect to the criticism of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, both of which were independent bodies.

31. Mr. de ALBUQUERQUE (Portugal) thought that the specialized agencies and other United Nations institutions had made a positive contribution to the elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism and the implementation of the Declaration on Decolonization. For that reason, he had reservations concerning operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, in which the General Assembly criticized the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund for not having taken the necessary measures towards the full and speedy implementation of the Declaration. The wording of that paragraph was neither balanced nor fair. His delegation would, however, vote for draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.3, because it accepted the substance of the text.

32. Mr. REMEDI (Uruguay) said that his delegation would vote for draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.3.

33. Uruguay considered that the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations played an extremely useful role, particularly in the field of decolonization. However, it rejected any effort to politicize the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in particular, since they were purely technical organizations and should play a totally independent role within their respective fields of competence.

34. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.3.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica,

/...

Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahariya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Luxembourg, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

35. Draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.3 was adopted by 128 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

36. Mr. SEZAKI (Japan) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution but had reservations regarding operative paragraphs 5, 6, 10 and 14.

37. Mr. LINDAHL (Sweden), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway, said that though the Nordic delegations had reservations concerning operative paragraph 5, which did not take into account certain practical and constitutional difficulties, they had voted for the draft resolution, because they actively supported the provision of increased economic, humanitarian, technical and other assistance to the peoples of colonial territories who were fighting for self-determination, and particularly the Namibian people. They recognized that the specialized agencies and other United Nations institutions had a special responsibility in that respect.

38. Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.3. However, with regard to operative paragraph 5, the sponsors of the draft resolution should have taken into account the statement made to the Committee by the representative of the World Bank.

39. Miss BASTIAN (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the nine countries members of the European Economic Community and Greece, and referring to the seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 14, reaffirmed her belief that the Namibian people should be given the opportunity as soon as possible to choose their representatives by free and open elections, organized under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in accordance with the plan adopted by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978). All Namibian parties and organizations wishing to participate in the elections should be able to do so on an equal footing.

/...

(Miss Bastian, Luxembourg)

40. The nine countries of the European Economic Community and Greece had serious reservations regarding the wording of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.3, and did not agree with the criticism levelled against the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

41. Mr. RUDOFISKY (Austria) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.3 because it agreed with the principles underlying it; in accordance with the spirit of resolution 1514 (XV) all United Nations bodies should grant whatever assistance was needed by the peoples of the territories that were still under the colonial yoke.

42. However, he had some reservations about the references to SWAPO in the seventh preambular paragraph and paragraph 14 of the draft resolution, which might be interpreted as being an obstacle to the democratic process planned for Namibia.

43. His delegation continued to advocate a peaceful transition to independence for Namibia, as provided in the relevant resolutions of the Security Council.

44. Mr. JAMES (Australia) said he had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.3 although he had some reservations about paragraph 5, according to which the General Assembly regretted that the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund had not yet taken the necessary measures towards full and speedy implementation of the Declaration on Decolonization. Those two agencies operated independently in accordance with the agreements they had concluded with the United Nations and with their Statutes, and it was not for the Fourth Committee to give them directives about the policy they should follow.

45. While unreservedly supporting the principle of the right of colonial peoples to self-determination, the Australian delegation was of the view that decolonization should proceed in accordance with the desires of the peoples concerned and that it was not for the United Nations to decide arbitrarily when a people should exercise its right of self-determination.

46. As to Namibia, his delegation recognized the important role played by SWAPO as a national liberation movement, but it did not accept the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution or paragraph 14, which stated that SWAPO was the "sole and authentic representative" of the Namibian people.

47. He wondered whether it might not be possible to make a slight change in the wording of paragraph 14 so that the General Assembly would "invite" the specialized agencies and other United Nations organizations to extend substantial material assistance to the Governments of the front-line States.

48. Mrs. NEWSOM (United States of America) said that her delegation had been obliged to abstain on draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.3, for it was opposed to the increasing politicization of the specialized agencies and other United Nations bodies. In its view, that was a trend which undermined the effectiveness of those organizations in carrying out the technical and humanitarian functions for which they were designed.

/...

(Mrs. Newsom, United States)

49. Her delegation also had reservations about some other aspects of the draft resolution that had just been put to the vote. Although the United States delegation subscribed to the idea that the United Nations system should give humanitarian and economic assistance to colonial peoples, in its view, the granting of such assistance to and through national liberation movements conflicted with the statutes governing the activities of some United Nations bodies.

50. The United States did not recognize SWAPO as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, since the Namibians had not yet had an opportunity to choose their representatives by exercising their right of self-determination. Neither did the United States recognize the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legitimate administering authority of the Territory; it therefore did not think that the organizations of the United Nations system should grant the Council for Namibia full membership.

51. Mr. TEIXERA SOARES (Brazil) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.3. In connexion with paragraph 1, he recalled that when resolution 34/92 C had been adopted in 1979, the Brazilian representative had said that paragraph 1 of that resolution should not create a precedent and that he was in favour of giving the Council for Namibia full membership in the specialized agencies and other United Nations organizations in view of the special position of Namibia.

52. Mr. ABDELWAHAB (Sudan) said he had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.3, but he had some reservations about the wording of paragraph 5 regarding the role of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund.

53. Mr. de ALBUQUERQUE (Portugal) said that, owing to a technical error, his delegation's vote had been recorded as abstaining, whereas it had voted for the draft resolution.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that the Portuguese representative's statement would appear in the summary record of the meeting and in the Committee's report, but that Portugal's vote would continue to be recorded as an abstention.

AGENDA ITEM 84: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/C.4/35/L.6)

55. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.6.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti,

/...

Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, 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, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None

Abstaining: Bolivia, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

56. The draft resolution was adopted by 135 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

57. Mr. SEZAKI (Japan) said that his country had always supported the aims of the draft resolution; he had therefore voted for it although he could not accept all the implications of paragraph 2.

58. Mr. HASLUND (Denmark) said he had voted for the draft resolution. He recalled however the reservations that his country had always made with respect to the principle underlying paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, namely, that the General Assembly alone had the power to decide whether Article 73 e of the Charter no longer applied to a Non-Self-Governing Territory.

59. Mr. TUROT (France) said that he had abstained in the vote for a reason which was well known: France did not recognize the power of the General Assembly or of the Special Committee of 24 to decide whether or not a territory had reached full independence.

60. Mr. MACLAY (United Kingdom) said he had abstained on the draft resolution and he expressed the same reservations as the representative of France with regard to paragraph 2. The United Kingdom had supplied the Secretary-General with all the information on the Non-Self-Governing Territories for which it was responsible in compliance with Article 73 e of the Charter and had always co-operated with the Committee of 24.

AGENDA ITEM 85: QUESTION OF EAST TIMOR (continued) (A/C.4/35/L.9)

61. Mr. FLITTNER (Federal Republic of Germany), explaining his vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.9, said he would abstain as he had always done.

/...

(Mr. Flittner, Federal Republic
of Germany)

The Federal Republic of Germany judged any proposal relating to East Timor in the light of its usefulness to the island population. He had followed with interest the debate in the Committee and the statements made by the petitioners. Being aware of the sufferings of the population of Timor since the events of 1975, he could not but rejoice at the progress that had been achieved with respect to humanitarian assistance for East Timor. He was happy to note that the Indonesian Government was now seeking to co-operate with the humanitarian organizations and to promote East Timor's economic development. As to the proposal made by the Council of Ministers of Portugal, he welcomed the idea of negotiations between the Administering Power and Indonesia, which would, he hoped, lead to positive progress on the humanitarian, cultural and political level.

62. Mr. LINDAHL (Sweden) said that Sweden had always supported the right of self-determination. But that did not seem to be the attitude of Indonesia. The world had been faced with a de facto situation; the population of East Timor was the prey of political rivalries and the innocent victim of a distorted idea of decolonization. What must be done immediately was to alleviate the sufferings of the population; he urged the international community to contribute, with Sweden, to the laudable work being done by humanitarian organizations, and he expressed the hope that the authorities which were in de facto control of the Territory would co-operate with them.

63. In the long run, the well-being of the inhabitants of East Timor would depend, however, on the protection of their cultural heritage, the solution of the existing problem of the refugees by guaranteeing them free access to the island, and the organization of fair and free elections. With all those things in mind, Sweden would abstain.

64. Mr. POUDADE (France) expressed the view that the draft resolution was somewhat unrealistic. Many countries in the region of East Timor had taken note of the situation prevailing in the Territory, as France was inclined to do. The draft resolution mentioned the recent initiative of Portugal, an ally of France. The opening of a dialogue between the Administering Power and Indonesia would be a step forward towards a settlement between the interested parties, but it would deprive the United Nations of any power to decide with respect to East Timor. Therefore, desirous of leaving all options open, France would abstain in the vote.

65. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.9.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, Iran, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Portugal, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Togo,

/...

Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Maldives, New Zealand, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

66. The draft resolution was adopted by 58 votes to 35, with 42 abstentions.

67. Mr. SALONEN (Finland), explaining his vote after the vote, said he had abstained as he always had. The exacerbation of the political controversies surrounding East Timor could only aggravate the sufferings of the population.

68. He said he would follow with great interest the results of the Portuguese Government's recent initiative, which, the representative of Portugal had said, took account of the legitimate interests of all the parties concerned and provided for consultations at various levels. For the time being, however, the important thing was to relieve the sufferings of the inhabitants of East Timor. In that connexion, he commended the work done by the different humanitarian organizations, to which Finland would continue to contribute.

69. Mr. KABIA (Sierra Leone) said that if his delegation had been present when the draft resolutions in documents A/C.4/35/L.3, L.6 and L.9 had been put to the vote, it would have voted for them all.

70. The CHAIRMAN said that Singapore had joined the sponsors of the draft resolutions on the question of Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands and Montserrat (A/C.4/35/L.13) and on the question of American Samoa (A/C.4/35/L.15).

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.