



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 9th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ROA-KOURI (Cuba)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 98: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued)

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

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 96: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

- (a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (b) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

AGENDA ITEM 97: QUESTION OF EAST TIMOR

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

/...

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week 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.4/37/SR.9
1 November 1982

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONTENTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 99: 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

(a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM 100: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 101: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 98: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (A/37/23 (Part II)/Add.1 and (Part III)/Add.1; A/C.4/37/L.3) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it the recommendations of the Special Committee of 24 in documents A/37/23 (Part II)/Add.1 and (Part III)/Add.1. In that connection, he drew attention to a statement submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly (A/C.4/37/L.3) concerning administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/37/23 (Part III)/Add.1.
2. He invited delegations wishing to do so to explain their vote before the vote.
3. Mr. LINDAHL (Sweden) said that, in view of the vulnerability of colonial Territories and their peoples as compared with the strength of many foreign economic interests, the Members of the United Nations clearly had a special responsibility to protect the rights of those peoples. His delegation joined in condemning the activities of foreign economic interests which impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Territories under colonial domination. The main thrust of the draft resolution in document A/37/23 (Part III)/Add.1 was the serious situation prevailing in southern Africa. The Nordic countries had adopted a programme against South Africa which advocated among other measures the prohibition or discouragement of new investments in South Africa and Namibia. Sweden had also passed a law against investments in South Africa and Namibia by firms under Swedish jurisdiction.
4. His delegation noted with satisfaction that the draft resolution made no mention of individual countries, which in previous resolutions had often been included on arbitrary grounds. It also noted that not all foreign economic activities in colonial Territories were seen as necessarily negative, but only those which impeded decolonization. Sweden believed that foreign economic investment could often be important in promoting industrial development and providing employment in those Territories. However, the language of the draft resolution was still far too sweeping and in some cases touched upon Sweden's traditional reservations with regard to the division of competence between the main organs of the United Nations. Sweden would therefore have to abstain in the vote, even though it fully shared the deep concern expressed in the draft resolution about conditions in southern Africa and supported the general considerations behind it.
5. Miss LUCAS (New Zealand) said that her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution; New Zealand had consistently maintained that it was wrong for foreign economic interests to impede development and self-determination in

(Miss Lucas, New Zealand)

Non-Self-Governing Territories and Namibia, and believed that it was the responsibility of the administering Powers to ensure that the interests of the people in those Territories were not harmed or subordinated to foreign interests.

6. Her delegation had had difficulty in supporting resolutions on the item in the past because of the unqualified assertion that foreign economic interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories were always detrimental to the interests of the people. That assertion was clearly insupportable in the light of the experience of many Non-Self-Governing and newly independent countries. Under reasonable control, foreign investment and trade were keys to development; it was regrettable that so many speakers had disregarded logic and experience and had taken a dogmatic and ideological approach.

7. New Zealand welcomed the efforts to introduce more balance in the draft resolution but remained concerned about its condemnatory tone, particularly in respect of Western countries, and its calls for action, which were unrealistic. Moreover, the paragraphs, referring to the Pacific region, particularly the seventeenth preambular paragraph, drew conclusions which were not justified by the facts. The thirteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 3 were open to similar objections.

8. New Zealand's administration of Tokelau was subject to United Nations scrutiny; in the light of the report of the United Nations visiting mission in 1981, the criticism of administering Powers in the draft resolution unquestionably did not apply to New Zealand's administration of Tokelau.

9. Mr. HASLUND (Denmark) said that he wished to reaffirm Denmark's long-standing support for any realistic step compatible with the Charter to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa. The main thrust of the draft resolution (A/37/23 (Part III)/Add.1) was the serious situation prevailing in southern Africa; the Government of South Africa bore the principal responsibility for the explosive situation in that area. Denmark did not hesitate to condemn the activities of those foreign economic and other interests which impeded decolonization both in Namibia and in Non-Self-Governing territories. However, the draft resolution did not recognize that such activities could be beneficial to the development of the Territories in question. His delegation also had reservations of principle with regard to a number of paragraphs which failed to take into account the provisions of the Charter concerning the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council. It would therefore abstain in the vote. At the same time, his delegation noted with satisfaction that the draft resolution did not condemn individual member countries by name.

10. Speaking on behalf of the 10 members of the European Economic Community (EEC), he said that they wished to express concern on the proposal to vote upon the draft decision in document A/37/23 (Part II)/Add.1, which dealt with military activities, a subject not contained in the list of items assigned to the Committee by the

(Mr. Haslund, Denmark)

General Assembly. In particular they saw no justification for voting on the draft decision under item 98; moreover, there had been no formal introduction of the text under item 98 and no substantive discussion in the Committee.

11. Mr. LEVITTE (France) said that his delegation had major reservations about the draft resolution. It opposed the underlying philosophy of equating two very different situations, and it could not accept the general condemnation of activities of foreign companies in the remaining dependent Territories. Although in certain cases such activities could be harmful when natural resources were exploited without concern for the living and working conditions of the labour force, the environment and the economic situation of the Territory, that state of affairs was not widespread and, moreover, could also be found in some independent States. The real problem was not the status of Territories but the organization of markets and the inequitable relations between developing and industrialized countries. Thus one of the major objectives of his Government's foreign policy was to establish a new international economic order which was more just for the underprivileged.

12. His delegation was pleased to note some improvements in the draft resolution and in particular the omission of selective condemnations. Thus, despite its reservations, and although it had previously voted against draft resolutions on the subject, his delegation would abstain.

13. With regard to the draft decision (A/37/23 (Part II)/Add.1), his delegation fully associated itself with the remarks made on behalf of EEC by the representative of Denmark: it had been surprised at the way the draft decision had been included in the Committee's deliberations; it found it regrettable that a chapter from the report of the Special Committee of 24 had been arbitrarily detached from its context and wondered at the motives behind that procedure manoeuvre. Furthermore, the Committee was being asked to decide upon a text without having had a discussion of its substance. Thus, without taking any position on substance, his delegation would vote against the text.

14. Mr. JELONEK (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation wished to contribute to the process of decolonization within the framework of the United Nations; as a member of the Western contact group his Government was sparing no effort to bring about a speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). He welcomed the efforts of the Special Committee of 24 over the past year to accommodate some of his delegation's reservations about the draft resolution, particularly in respect of unfounded individual condemnations. Moreover, the draft resolution, particularly paragraph 4, had been limited to only those foreign economic interests which were in fact detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants of the Territories in question and to their right to self-determination. Yet the draft resolution still lacked the balance necessary to acquire unanimous approval and a new effort on all sides in a spirit of co-operation and mutual respect would be necessary to reach agreement. In view of the improvements in the text of the draft resolution, his delegation would now abstain in the vote.

(Mr. Jelonek, Federal Republic
of Germany)

15. As to the draft decision, his delegation associated itself with the statement made by the representative of Denmark on behalf of EEC.

16. Mr. KURPERSHOEK (Netherlands) said that his Government continued to attach great importance to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In respect of Namibia, it supported the efforts of five Western countries aimed at an early implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). His delegation was convinced that the administering Powers responsible for the few remaining dependent Territories would continue to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of those Territories and, in co-operation with the United Nations, would enable the peoples to freely determine their political status.

17. His delegation had serious reservations about item 98 as such. There was a regrettable tendency to use the item as a vehicle to pillory all foreign economic activities. His Government objected to the drawing up of a register of the profits of transnational corporations by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations. Furthermore, it took exception to the wording in the draft resolution which equated the apartheid system with a colonial situation. Although the draft resolution no longer contained unwarranted criticism of individual countries, his delegation still had reservations about its unbalanced wording and hostile tone towards foreign economic interests in general and the Western countries in particular. It did not believe that those interests necessarily had adverse affects on the economic development and well-being of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories, and would therefore be unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution. That did not mean that his Government opposed its underlying philosophy or rejected all elements of the draft resolution. In that connection he recalled that the Netherlands recognized the competence of the Council for Namibia to issue Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.

18. The representative of Denmark, speaking on behalf of EEC, had already expressed the serious reservations of its members, including the Netherlands, about the discussion of military activities under item 98. If procedural irregularities of that nature were allowed to pass, the Committee's credibility would suffer. Whatever the intentions of those responsible for the surreptitious introduction of the subject, the consideration of the draft decision would only serve to lend an air of ever greater artificiality to the Committee's work.

19. His delegation also had reservations about the substance of the draft decision, (A/37/23 (Part II)/Add.1), some elements of which were unacceptable. The wording of paragraph 2 went beyond the consensus language used in previous years. His Government had on numerous occasions expressed its abhorrence of apartheid but in its view that system did not reflect a colonial situation. His Government believed that selective economic sanctions would prove more effective in changing the policies of the South African Government than the complete isolation of South Africa called for in paragraph 11. In paragraph 8, the condemnation of "certain Western countries" for their alleged violation of the mandatory arms

(Mr. Kurpershoek, Netherlands)

embargo against South Africa was completely unwarranted and selective. His delegation also dissociated itself from any explicit or implicit endorsement of armed struggle; the Charter obliged the United Nations to settle disputes by peaceful means. Thus, his delegation would vote against the draft decision. His Government did not believe that a campaign of publicity directed against military activities would contribute to the implementation of the Declaration.

20. Mr. HUTCHINSON (Ireland) said that his country condemned without reservation the exploitation of the human and natural resources in Non-Self-Governing Territories without regard for the long-term interests of the inhabitants. It supported the general thrust of the sections of the draft resolution relating to the activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia. However, it felt that the draft resolution did not adequately address the complex range of issues confronting the remaining small Non-Self-Governing Territories for which carefully promoted economic development remained an important factor in achieving independence. The objective of economic activities in those Territories should be the enhancement of the long-term interests of the inhabitants and not merely the exploitation of cheap labour markets and natural resources for profit. However, the text represented some improvement over General Assembly resolution 36/51, as it did not contain selective condemnation of particular countries - which Ireland viewed as counterproductive, especially when in some cases the countries concerned had denied the specific allegations. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote.

21. Ireland fully associated itself with the statement made by the representative of Denmark on behalf of EEC concerning the draft decision on military activities (A/37/23 (Part II)/Add.1) and, for those and other reasons, would abstain in the vote on it.

22. Mr. ROWE (Australia) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution; although it had substantial problems with the text it believed that it was much improved compared with earlier versions. Even so it could not accept the proposition that all foreign economic interests were inimical to the interests of peoples in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Australia had participated in the consensus adoption of the draft resolution in the Special Committee of 24 and would maintain its vote; yet, the draft resolution stretched its tolerance and at the next session of the General Assembly it would be unable to support a text which went any further.

23. The draft decision on military activities was the outcome of a process from which Australia had dissociated itself in the Special Committee of 24. It had rather reluctantly agreed to the new arrangements for the transmission to the Committee of texts agreed on by consensus in the Special Committee of 24, but had explicitly dissociated itself from the arrangement in respect of texts not approved by consensus. In the Special Committee of 24 it had abstained in the vote on the draft decision and it would maintain its abstention. The way in which the draft decision had been transmitted to the Committee in the absence of an agenda item on the subject was a breach of United Nations practice, and circumvented the competence of the General Committee to allocate items to Main Committees.

/...

24. Mr. HYASHI (Japan), referring to the draft resolution in document A/37/23(Part III)/Add.1, said that his delegation believed that the activities of foreign economic and other interests should be regulated so as not to deprive the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories of their right to self-determination and independence or prejudice their economic, social and cultural development. It understood the genuine concern expressed in the general debate over the harmful effects of such activities, but found it difficult to subscribe to the assertion that all activities of foreign economic and other interests were necessarily prejudicial to the interests of the people in the Territories. Whether or not such activities were harmful depended on the situation in the particular Territory and the nature of the activity. Many members of the Committee considered that, if properly guided, such activities could make valuable contributions to the social and economic development of Non-Self-Governing Territories, as in the case of the transfer of technology and managerial skills and the creation of job opportunities.

25. With regard to Namibia, Japan had consistently upheld the view that the South African administration was illegal and that the United Nations should assume responsibility for the administration of the Territory pending the attainment of independence. His Government therefore fully supported the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971. Japan maintained no diplomatic relations with South Africa.

26. His Government prohibited direct investment by Japanese nationals or bodies corporate under Japanese jurisdiction in South Africa and Namibia. No Japanese national took part in the management of any enterprise in Namibia and no Japanese national or enterprise had a mining concession there. The Government did not extend co-operation in the form of grants, loans or technical assistance to the authorities in Namibia. Furthermore, recognizing the political significance of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Government of Japan had taken measures in May 1975 to publicize the Decree. It had also been making annual contributions to such funds and programmes as the United Nations Fund for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia.

27. The draft resolution was an improvement on that of the previous session on the same items, and contained much that his delegation could support. However, his delegation found it difficult to support the view expressed in it which over-generalized the nature of activities of foreign economic and other interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories, emphasizing their negative aspects of those activities and ignoring the positive contributions. His delegation would abstain in the voting.

28. Mr. TANG (Turkey) noted with satisfaction the improvements made in the text of the draft resolution in document A/37/23(Part III)/Add.1, as compared with the corresponding resolution of the previous session, on which his delegation had abstained. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, in keeping with Turkey's strong commitment to decolonization, the elimination of apartheid in southern Africa and the liberation of Namibia; however, it had reservations concerning certain condemnatory references in the draft resolution to a specific region.

(Mr. Tang, Turkey)

29. In the light of the strong commitment to which he had referred, his delegation would have liked to support the draft decision on military activities (A/37/23(Part II/Add.1), but, in view of the procedural situation - to which preceding speakers had referred in detail - it would abstain.

30. Mr. Thomson (Canada), referring to the draft resolution in document A/37/23(Part III)/Add.1, said that the Government and people of Canada had frequently expressed their abhorrence of apartheid and their support for efforts to enable the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories to exercise their right to self-determination. Canada actively participated in efforts to reach an internationally acceptable solution to the situation in Namibia. It was therefore with some regret that his delegation found itself having to vote against the draft resolution.

31. As a major host country of transnational corporations, Canada firmly supported the fundamental principle espoused by the Group of 77 that home Governments of transnational corporations should not exercise their national laws in an extra-territorial manner. Yet the draft resolution contained numerous calls upon Governments to take legislative, administrative or undefined measures in respect of their nationals and bodies corporate under their jurisdiction, measures which specifically violated that principle. While, in recent years, there had been a gradual move away from the proposition in resolutions on the item that foreign economic activity as such impeded the implementation of the Declaration, the implication was still clear in the current text. The draft resolution failed to distinguish between legitimate commercial activities and relations such as those condemned as being "for the enrichment of foreign settlers and the entrenchment of colonial domination and racial discrimination".

32. It was the presence of questionable suppositions and generalizations that Canada found regrettable in the draft resolution - although it noted with some satisfaction the absence of specific condemnations of particular countries by name, a practice which it considered unjust.

33. His delegation had often urged the drafters of reports and resolutions on the item to focus on specific aspects of the question. That approach would be more likely to attract the attention and co-operation of the individuals, enterprises and Governments concerned, and would stand a better chance of promoting the interests of the peoples in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

34. His delegation objected to the irregular manner in which the draft decision (A/37/23 (Part II)/Add.1) related to military activities in colonial Territories had been placed before the Fourth Committee. That aspect of the larger decolonization question had traditionally been debated and included in the draft resolutions on the item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples". The Fourth Committee had not had an opportunity to debate the issue, which was not a separate agenda item. His delegation would have preferred to have the draft decision withdrawn and its subject matter included in the debate and draft resolution under the relevant agenda items. Failing that, it would vote against the draft decision.

35. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that his country could not accept the original, Soviet-inspired premise on which the draft decision on military activities was based, namely, that the presence of military bases in Non-Self-Governing Territories was automatically a hindrance to self-determination. While the draft decision condemned only such military activities and arrangements as impeded decolonization, and only colonial Territories, a list of places where Soviet troops were more powerful than indigenous soldiers would be a welcome addition to the list of "colonial Territories". In fact, the General Assembly had condemned the most flagrant of those impositions of outside political control.

36. His delegation recognized the efforts made by some members to improve the text, but considered that the premise on which the draft decision was based was fundamentally flawed, which explained why the text have not enjoyed consensus in the Special Committee. It was questionable whether it came under agenda item 98 and whether indeed it was on the General Assembly agenda. The Fourth Committee should not allow itself to be led by a few Member States, not all of which were concerned with the welfare of the peoples of dependent Territories. The Fourth Committee was poorly served by being advised to add to its agenda casually and by sloppy procedures inconsistent with the Charter.

37. His Government had no colonies, was not named in the draft decision and, as a matter of principle, would not allow its defence needs to inhibit the kind of self-determination on which its Republic had been founded. It objected because the draft decision was not, and should not be, on the agenda of the thirty-seventh session. His delegation found the draft decision objectionable also because of its non-germane references to trade, nuclear co-operation and the call for a total boycott of South Africa in all fields.

38. His Government was seriously committed to tackling the issue of apartheid and supporting the advocates in South Africa of peaceful evolutionary change. It did not believe that rhetorical excesses such as those embodied in the draft decision gave useful support to those who were struggling to change the system. With regard to Namibia his Government, together with those of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom, were fully engaged in efforts to bring about internationally recognized independence in the Territory. In the light of the reasons he had given, his delegation would oppose the draft decision.

39. Mr. MACLAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution in document A/37/23 (Part III)/Add.1, as it had done in the past on the draft resolutions submitted under the agenda item, because it believed that the premises of the item were false and the philosophy underlying it misplaced.

40. The United Kingdom, the administering Power for 10 of the Territories appearing on the agenda of the Special Committee of 24, had complied scrupulously with its Charter obligations to those Territories, submitting comprehensive information under Article 73 (e) and promoting political, economic and social development in accordance with Article 73 so that the peoples concerned were in a position to make a real choice on the constitutional options open to them. It was therefore illogical that the draft resolution should suggest that attempts by

(Mr. Maclay, United Kingdom)

administering Powers to promote economic development were aimed at the enrichment of those Powers, the exploitation of the people of the Territories concerned, and the repatriation of huge profits to the detriment of the interests of the inhabitants.

41. His delegation recognized that for many delegations the agenda item was aimed primarily at Namibia, and that perhaps explained their willingness to accept wording in the draft resolution which in their view was appropriate to that Territory, if not to the other Territories. It also recognized that, since the previous session, the text of the draft resolution, though still unacceptable, had been had been brought more into line with the facts. His delegation could not accept, however, the dogmatic terms of the draft. The main requirement for dependent Territories was economic development. The territorial Governments concerned had made that clear repeatedly, both to the United Kingdom as the administering Power and to the United Nations, notably in the context of visiting missions to those Territories. The Committee should respect their wishes regarding their own future. The assumption implicit in the draft resolution that they should not have access to the capital, technology and know-how of transnational corporations was in direct contravention of their right to take their own decisions.

42. On the draft decision in document A/37/23 (Part II)/Add.1, his delegation associated itself with the statement made by the representative of Denmark on behalf of EEC. His delegation saw no justification for the inclusion, by the "back door", of a further agenda item which had not been approved in the General Committee. When the Rapporteur of the Special Committee had drawn attention to the draft decision during the debate on item 98, he had not formally introduced the text but had said that certain members of the Special Committee had suggested that he should draw the Fourth Committee's attention to it. That was unsatisfactory: the submission should have been done openly, with reasons given. Neither the Fourth Committee nor the General Assembly had approved the inscription of an item on military activities, nor had any reason been advanced, or decision been taken, to include it within the purview of item 98.

43. His delegation had numerous other objections to the substance of the draft decision but, in the absence of any debate on the question, did not propose to initiate one, particularly since the status of the draft decision was doubtful. The objections of substance which he had outlined were sufficient to induce his delegation to vote against it, but they were reinforced by objections to the procedure adopted, objections to which it would return when the General Assembly considered the Special Committee's report as a whole.

44. Mr. KALINA (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation welcomed the statements made in support of the draft resolution, particularly on the part of delegations from countries which traditionally maintained close ties with the racist régime of South Africa. During the consideration of the draft resolution in the Special Committee of 24, a number of delegations, including his own, had wanted to make reference to specific States in paragraphs 6 and 9 since, as had been revealed in a number of statements made in the Committee, the co-operation of those states with

(Mr. Kalina, Czechoslovakia)

South Africa was constantly increasing. Those paragraphs did not reflect the growing co-operation between certain Western countries and South Africa in the political, diplomatic, economic, trade, military and nuclear fields. Nevertheless, his delegation supported the general thrust of the draft resolution, although it was weaker than the resolution adopted on the subject at the previous session, and would vote in favour of it.

45. The draft decision on military activities had been approved by the Special Committee of 24 in the context of the same agenda item the Committee was now discussing, and was a well-balanced document. A number of representatives of non-aligned and socialist countries had referred to military activities of colonial and occupying States in Territories under colonial and racist domination which were impeding the full implementation of the Declaration, and had called for the immediate and unconditional removal of military bases and installations of colonial Powers. His delegation felt that the consideration of the draft decision under item 98 was fully within the Committee's competence; the resolution adopted on foreign economic and other interests at the previous session had included two paragraphs on military activities.

46. Mr. DENKHIN (Bulgaria) acknowledged that his delegation was not entirely satisfied with the text of the draft resolution in document A/37/23 (Part III)/Add.1. It firmly believed however, that foreign economic and other activities in colonial Territories, including military activity, constituted a major obstacle to complete and speedy implementation of the Declaration; that those activities were the root cause of the continuation of the illegal colonial situation in Namibia and other Territories; and that the unrestrained drive for profits led to continuous squandering of the natural resources of those Territories. His delegation therefore rejected the idea that foreign economic interests did not always impede the colonial peoples' right to self-determination.

47. For all those reasons, his delegation would like to see the draft resolution made stronger particularly through inclusion of the names of the countries which collaborated with the Pretoria régime. While, therefore, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution he wished to register its reservations in respect of paragraphs 6 and 9.

48. Mr. JANI (Zimbabwe) said that his delegation fully supported the draft resolution and draft decision before the Committee. It believed that the struggle to eliminate apartheid had been frustrated mainly by foreign economic and military activities, and that the Fourth Committee had the responsibility to speak out against the continuation of that situation. Furthermore, the continued military and economic collaboration between South Africa and a number of countries enabled South Africa to maintain its hold on Namibia and its strategic resources, and the United Nations must seek to end that situation. Support for the two drafts before the Committee was a reaffirmation of the United Nations position that apartheid must be eliminated and not modified and that the only way to eliminate it was to put an end to all foreign economic aid and collaboration. That was why his delegation rejected the contention that not all foreign economic collaboration with South Africa was bad in itself. Lastly, it was important to keep in mind the dangerous element of instability introduced by South Africa's arms build-up, which was a threat to international peace and security.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that, as members were aware, that chapter of the report of the Special Committee of 24 which related to military activities had, since 1968, been the subject of annual consideration by the General Assembly, both in plenary meeting and in the Fourth Committee, in relation to specific aspects of the agenda items on the question of decolonization.

50. As indicated by the Rapporteur of the Special Committee in his statement to the Fourth Committee on 19 October, the Special Committee had requested its Rapporteur during the current year to submit the draft decision for consideration by the Fourth Committee in connection with item 98, in view of the close correlation between item 98 and the subject-matter dealt with in the draft decision. Bearing in mind the nature of the recommendations contained in the draft decision, which encompassed broad aspects of decolonization, the Fourth Committee could very well take up the draft decision under any of the items allocated to it by the General Assembly. However, in keeping with a long-standing practice of the Committee, it might very well be most appropriate for the Fourth Committee to be guided by the indication given by the Special Committee in that regard and to take action thereon under item 98.

51. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution contained in document A/37/23 (part III)/Add.1, chapter V, paragraph 19.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

52. The draft resolution was adopted by 99 votes to 6, with 17 abstentions.

53. A recorded vote was taken on the draft decision in document A/37/23 (Part II)/Add.1, chapter IV, paragraph 13.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

54. The draft decision was adopted by 94 votes to 10, with 16 abstentions.

55. Mr. RAM (Fiji), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, as in previous years, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in Namibia and all other Territories under colonial domination. The activities of foreign economic and other interests should certainly not be permitted to impede the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). His delegation did not, however, subscribe to the view that economic and military activities necessarily constituted an obstacle to self-determination.

56. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and, in so doing, had based itself on the following principles: the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence and to dispose of their own natural resources; and the responsibility of administering Powers to promote the economic and social welfare of the inhabitants of colonial Territories and to protect their human and material resources. While it was a matter of

(Mr. Lasarte, Uruguay)

satisfaction that references to individual countries had been eliminated, the draft resolution still concentrated on alleged harmful activities where no conclusive proof was available. It was to be hoped that a balanced text could be achieved for future draft resolutions on the item, so that they could be adopted by consensus.

57. His delegation had also voted in favour of the draft decision on the military activities of colonial Powers as it agreed with its general thrust. His delegation nevertheless doubted whether the draft decision was relevant to item 98.

58. Mr. PEREZ (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, as it endorsed the fundamental principles embodied in the draft. His delegation nevertheless welcomed the elimination of any reference to individual States; such references contributed nothing to the development of the spirit of collaboration and understanding which was indispensable for the solution of the problems confronting the Committee. His delegation did not accept that all the activities of foreign economic and other interests necessarily constituted an impediment to the full implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The elimination of all such activities would not only be counterproductive to the interests of the Territories concerned but would also contradict other resolutions both of the Special Committee and of the Fourth Committee which exhorted administering Powers to do everything possible to promote the economic and other interests of the Territories concerned.

59. Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of both the draft resolution and the draft decision.

60. Statements made by representatives of the Western Powers in an attempt to cast doubts on the relevance of the draft decision to item 98 had been refuted by the results of the voting which had just taken place.

61. It was regrettable that the draft resolution had been watered down to the extent that it failed to name the States and the transnational corporations which were responsible for the fact that General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) had not yet been fully implemented. The draft resolution should have identified those countries which continued to co-operate with Pretoria in all fields of activity.

62. According to information published by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, there had been a substantial increase in the number of transnational corporations which had their headquarters in Western countries and which co-operated with Pretoria. The number of such corporations with their headquarters in the United Kingdom had increased from 699 to 874 between 1978 and 1981 and, over the same period, the number of United States-based transnational corporations had increased from 539 to 894. Similar increases had taken place in the numbers of such corporations domiciled in Australia, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Netherlands. All such corporations had co-operated fully with the apartheid régime. Previous resolutions of the General Assembly referring to the activities of transnational corporations had demanded that steps should be taken to prevent such corporations from continuing their plundering activities; nothing had, however, been done. Once again, the draft resolution just adopted seemed to favour

/...

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

the activities of transnational corporations in colonial Territories; moreover, an attempt had been made to cast doubts on the paragraphs relating to South Africa and Namibia.

63. A few days previously the General Assembly had adopted, by an overwhelming majority, resolution 37/2 on the granting of an enormous loan to South Africa by IMF. The granting of such a loan, which would be the largest international credit granted by the agency during its existence, would represent utter defiance of that resolution; the alliance of colonialists would be striking directly at the interests of the peoples of Africa.

64. He had no intention of replying to the representative of the United States, whose comments on the Soviet Union had been clearly intended to divert attention from the issue of decolonization.

65. Mr. LESETEDI (Botswana) said that his delegation had reservations on paragraphs 14 and 20 of the draft resolution, as well as on the references in paragraph 8 to the sale of oil to South Africa and in paragraphs 9 and 11 to trade links with South Africa. His delegation also reserved its position on parts of paragraph 11 of the draft decision.

66. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) said that his delegation had voted for both the draft resolution and the draft decision but had not been satisfied by the fact that those countries which continued to co-operate with Pretoria had not been named specifically. The omission of their names would hardly contribute to the reduction of their activities in Namibia and would impede independence. It would also encourage the collaboration of the Zionists with Pretoria, particularly in the nuclear sphere.

67. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of item 98 and that, if there were no objections, the Rapporteur would submit the Committee's report directly to the General Assembly.

68. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/37/23 (Part V) and (Part V) Add.1-2, A/37/333, A/AC.109/682-686, 687 and Add.1-3, 688-689, 691-695, 697, 698, 700, 708, 711, 713-715, 720)

(a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 96: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (A/37/23 (Part III) and (Part III)/Add.1, A/37/113 and A/37/501)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (b) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

AGENDA ITEM 97: QUESTION OF EAST TIMOR (A/37/23 (Part V), A/37/113, A/37/538, A/C.4/37/2, 3 and Add.1-3, A/C.4/37/6, A/C.4/37/8 and Add.1, A/AC.109/715)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 99: 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 (A/37/23 (Part III) and (Part III)/Add.2, A/37/177 and Add.1-3, A/AC.109/L.1421 and L.1446 and Add.1)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (A/37/3 (Part II), A/37/333)

AGENDA ITEM 100: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/37/436)

AGENDA ITEM 101: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/37/539)

69. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic) Rapporteur of the Special Committee of 24, proceeded to introduce the chapters of the report of the Special Committee of 24 relating to the agenda items under consideration in document A/37/23 (Part V) and Add.1 and 2 (on item 18); in document A/37/23 (Part III) and Add.1 (on item 96); in document A/37/23 (Part V) (on item 97); and in document A/37/23 (Part III) and Add.2 (on item 99).

(Mr. Adhami, Syrian Arab Republic)

70. Members would recall that, at its thirty-sixth session, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 36/68, by paragraph 12 of which it had requested the Special Committee to continue to seek suitable means for the immediate and full implementation of General Assembly resolution 15/14 (XV) in all territories which had not yet attained independence and, in particular, to formulate specific proposals for the elimination of the remaining manifestations of colonialism. In paragraph 12 (d), the General Assembly had also requested the Special Committee to continue to pay particular attention to the small Territories and to recommend to the General Assembly the most suitable steps to be taken to enable the populations of those Territories to exercise their right to self-determination, freedom and independence.

71. In carrying out the tasks thus entrusted to it, the Special Committee had also been guided by the relevant provisions of the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration, contained in General Assembly resolution 35/118.

72. The Special Committee had given extensive consideration to the situation in the Territories concerned as well as to other related questions. In particular, with regard to the smaller Territories, the Committee had once again approved a series of recommendations and proposals with a view to the full and speedy implementation of the Declaration in respect of those Territories. In its consideration of most of the Territories, the Special Committee had continued to receive the co-operation of the administering Powers, whose representatives had participated actively in the relevant work of the Committee.

73. In a related context, the Special Committee, in accepting the invitation extended to it in that regard by the administering Power concerned, had during 1982 dispatched a visiting mission to Montserrat, which was under United Kingdom administration. The Special Committee would shortly consider the report of that mission and would submit its recommendations on the item to the Fourth Committee at a later date.

74. The Special Committee, conscious of the constructive results achieved as a consequence of previous United Nations visiting missions in securing first-hand information about the Territories concerned, wished once again to stress the need to continue to dispatch such missions to colonial Territories in order to facilitate the full and speedy implementation of the Declaration with respect to those Territories.

75. The question of the extension of assistance by the organizations of the United Nations system to the peoples of the colonial Territories, particularly in southern Africa, had also continued to engage the close attention of the Special Committee during the year. In particular, on the basis of its review of related developments, the Special Committee expressed its concern that the assistance extended to the colonial peoples, particularly the people of Namibia and their national liberation movement, SWAPO, was far from adequate to meet their critical and pressing needs. The Committee accordingly recommended that the organizations concerned should broaden contacts with those peoples, review their procedures with

(Mr. Adhami, Syrian Arab Republic)

respect to the formulation and preparation of assistance programmes and projects and introduce greater flexibility in those procedures so as to be able to extend the necessary assistance without delay. In a related context, it had also been agreed that, during 1983, a high-level mission composed of the three presiding officers of the Special Committee of 24, the Special Committee against Apartheid and the United Nations Council for Namibia be dispatched to the International Monetary Fund.

76. In pursuance of General Assembly decision 34/401, paragraph 31, by which the General Assembly had recommended that subsidiary organs reporting to the General Assembly should make every effort to submit draft resolutions in order to facilitate the consideration of the items, the Special Committee had decided that, where possible, it would submit to the General Assembly draft resolutions and/or decisions to assist the work of the Fourth Committee. Those draft resolutions and decisions were contained in documents A/37/23 (Part III) and Add.1 and 2, and A/37/23 (Part V) and Add:1 and 2.

77. In its report the Special Committee had recommended a number of measures to assist in the implementation of the Declaration. On behalf of the Special Committee, he expressed the hope that the Fourth Committee would give its full support to those recommendations.

78. Mr. MONFORT (Philippines), speaking on agenda item 97, asked why the question of East Timor remained on the agenda when the process of decolonization there had long been completed. Indeed, six years had elapsed since the people of East Timor had formally declared their desire to become part of Indonesia, and the Indonesian Parliament, in acknowledgement of that desire, had passed a bill incorporating East Timor as Indonesia's 27th province. To keep the item on the agenda was a violation of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter proscribing intervention by the United Nations in matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a State.

79. His country, with its own colonial experience and excellent credentials in the struggle for decolonization, could understand why a people long under colonial rule should have decided to unite with a neighbouring people with whom it shared bonds of blood, culture and common ethnic origin. The reunification of the two parts of Timor, long divided by an accident of colonial history, had restored security and stability to the island, thereby contributing to the peace and security of South-East Asia. Since integration with Indonesia, the economic and social conditions of the province of East Timor had improved considerably thanks to the modernization programmes of the Indonesian Government. Many prestigious international organizations operating there, including the International Committee of the Red Cross, Catholic Relief Services, the United Nations Children's Fund, and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, had dismissed charges from certain quarters that famine, military operations and violations of human rights were rampant.

(Mr. Monfort, Philippines)

80. The Committee could contribute nothing to the maintenance of security and stability in that part of the world by submitting to those elements who were bent on turning back the clock of history at all costs. The Committee should remove the item from its agenda once and for all.

81. Ms. DUKULY-TOLBERT (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), said that the basic philosophy underlying her organization's activities was the need to provide sufficient skilled scientific, intellectual and educational personnel to liberation movements and to create conditions in the post-independence period conducive to the establishment of vital infrastructure in education, science, culture and communication. In that connection, one of the specific goals of the establishment of a new world information and communication order was to enable all colonial and former colonial peoples to express their own vision of the world. In addition, a powerful propaganda machine was required to combat the historical falsification of textbooks and manipulation of the mass media by the racist and colonialist ideologues in southern Africa.

82. For a number of years, therefore, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) had undertaken a critical analysis of the ideology and thinking of apartheid and had systematically distributed the results of its research and studies to the general public in publications such as Apartheid: Its effects on education, science, culture and information, which was already in its third edition, Women and Racial Discrimination in Rhodesia, which examined the effects of the economic and social structure on the status of women and future prospects for women in an independent Zimbabwe, and Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism, which emphasized the critical analysis of both the traditional and more recent sociological theories on which the apartheid ideology rested. Another important work entitled Apartheid Power and Historical Falsification analyzed the fallacious historical assumptions behind apartheid, while Anti-Development: South Africa and its Bantustans had formed part of the UNESCO contribution to International Anti-Apartheid Year.

83. More recently, Reporting Southern Africa had studied the complex role played by the media in either combating or perpetuating apartheid in South Africa and Namibia. That analysis provided useful food for thought for all those who wondered how such a reprehensible political, economic and cultural system could survive in a world where justice, human rights and the right of peoples to self-determination were recognized and proclaimed by so many prestigious national and international institutions.

84. The UNESCO General Conference at its twentieth session, in November 1978, had adopted two important instruments to help eliminate racism, namely the Declaration on Race and Racial Prejudice and Declaration on Fundamental Principles concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthening Peace and International Understanding, to the Promotion of Human Rights and to Countering Racism, Apartheid and Incitement to War.

(Ms. Dukuly-Tolbert, UNESCO)

85. In connection with the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, UNESCO had put forward programmes relating to training, the teaching of English as the national language, communication, and the participation of women in development. The General Conference, at its eighteenth session, had decided to admit Namibia as an associate member and, at its nineteenth session, had decided to suspend the payment of an assessment by Namibia until such time as that Territory acceded to independence. At the twentieth session, the General Conference had decided to admit Namibia as a member with the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal administering Authority until the illegal occupation of the Territory was terminated.

86. Assistance had also been provided to the national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity. An intersectoral sub-committee had been set up to co-ordinate activities in that regard and UNESCO would allocate considerable resources to assist those movements, particularly in the field of education and science.

87. It also continued to co-operate closely with the Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Refugees and with the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, through which scholarships had been allocated to South African refugees. Lastly, as the executing agency for several projects financed by the United Nations Development Programme, UNESCO was providing school equipment, supplies, grants and scholarships, and was paying teachers' salaries.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.