

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
*Official Records**



NOV 15 1984

FOURTH COMMITTEE
11th meeting
held on
Friday, 26 October 1984
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 11th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea)

CONTENTS

REQUEST FOR HEARING

AGENDA ITEM 104: 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: 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 (continued)

*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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.4/39/SR.11
31 October 1984

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

REQUEST FOR HEARING (A/C.4/39/8/Add.2)

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a communication regarding a request for a hearing relating to agenda item 26. He suggested that the communication should be distributed as a Committee document (A/C.4/39/8/Add.2) and taken up at a later meeting.

2. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 104: 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: 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 (continued) (A/39/23 (Part III) and (Part III)/Corr.1; A/C.4/39/L.2 and Corr.1)

3. Mr. KESAVAPANY (Singapore), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the Soviet Union had drawn attention to three Singapore-based companies which had been named in the Special Rapporteur's updated report of 10 July 1984. In the case of two of the companies, the same argument would apply as in the case of the company cited in the report of the Centre on Transnational Corporations. The name of the company concerned had been removed from the record after his delegation had pointed out that it was a multinational company with a branch in Singapore which had in no way been involved in the trading activities of its parent company with South Africa. His delegation would take up the reference to all three companies with the Special Rapporteur when it had completed its investigation. His country had a proud record of faithful compliance with United Nations resolutions, particularly those relating to South Africa and Namibia. No exceptions to the provisions of those resolutions had been permitted.

4. His delegation had ascertained from international trade statistics published by the International Monetary Fund that the trade of the Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc countries with South Africa had amounted to \$17 million in 1978, \$48 million in 1979, \$62 million in 1980, \$74 million in 1981 and \$72 million in 1982. Trade between the Eastern bloc countries and South Africa had clearly shown an upward trend over the period. The question was whether the representative of the Soviet Union agreed that all United Nations resolutions were equally valid and must be complied with by all Member States; whether he agreed that selective endorsement of United Nations resolutions would undermine the credibility of the United Nations and the system of international law which it represented; and whether he could show the Committee that the Soviet Union had complied with General Assembly resolutions ES-6/2, 35/37, 36/34, 37/37 and 38/29.

5. He trusted that the Soviet delegation could give the Committee the same assurances as he had himself given regarding his country's compliance with United Nations resolutions on relations with South Africa.

/...

6. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he welcomed the assurances given by the representative of Singapore regarding compliance with United Nations resolutions on trade with South Africa. He looked forward to hearing that no such relations existed between the two countries once the Government of Singapore had completed its investigation.
7. The data on alleged trade between the Soviet Union and South Africa, to which the representative of Singapore had referred, had been based on false information supplied from Pretoria itself. The Soviet Union had no economic, trade, political or diplomatic relations with South Africa, and allegations to the contrary were totally unfounded.
8. Mr. KESAVAPANY (Singapore), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the statistics which he had cited were not based on South African figures, but had been issued by the International Monetary Fund.
9. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of the United States to introduce his delegation's amendments (A/C.4/39/L.2) to the draft decision contained in document A/39/23 (Part III), chapter VI, paragraph 14.
10. Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation's amendments were necessary in order to prevent a serious, though hardly unintentional, miscarriage of justice. The amendments sought to delete the words "in particular the United States and Israel" from paragraph 8, lines 2 and 3, and from paragraph 9, line 11. The text would continue to condemn any countries which violated the arms embargo as well as any countries which assisted the apartheid régime in pursuing military nuclear programmes.
11. The United States had no arms supply relationship with South Africa and had instituted an arms embargo against South Africa long before the United Nations had called for one; the United States embargo was even stricter than was required by United Nations resolutions. The United States neither sold to, nor purchased from, South Africa any munitions of war, any weapons or any weapon technology; it had even ceased to supply spare parts for the transport planes which had been sold to South Africa before the embargo had gone into effect.
12. In the nuclear field, it was true that one United States company had a contract to perform maintenance services for the nuclear reactor at a South African electrical generating plant. That plant, and the services which the United States company provided, were both under IAEA safeguards. The plant was a purely civilian facility and had been sold to South Africa by a country other than the United States. The nuclear reactor, because of its design, could not be used for military purposes.
13. The reason why the United States, notwithstanding those facts, was being condemned was that certain Member States saw the United Nations, and the Fourth Committee in particular, as a convenient place to attack the United States, to hurl insults and cold-war invective and to divert attention from themselves. It was therefore not surprising that the attack was being pushed by one of the world's largest gold- and diamond-producing countries, a country which co-ordinated with

/...

(Mr. Feldman, United States)

South Africa to decide how much gold and how many diamonds should be introduced into world markets each year in order to maintain price levels. That was a procedure which benefited South Africa just as much as it did the State concerned.

14. The question was what that State and certain of its friends had to the work of the United Nations. They did not contribute to UNDP, to UNICEF, or to the projects of the Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women aimed at promoting development and raising living standards in southern Africa. They did not contribute to efforts to deal with the pressing problems of refugees, desertification, or emergency food assistance. Their cold-war tactics were not surprising, but it was regrettable that some worthy States had allowed themselves to be enlisted in that unworthy cause.

15. A vote against the United States amendments would be a condemnation of the United States for a military relationship which did not exist. He asked the Committee to support the amendments in the interests of justice, truth and honest debate. Unfortunately, many people, in his country and others, believed that the United States could no longer receive fair treatment in the United Nations. That was a dangerous view, not only for all Member States but for the Organization itself.

16. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic), Rapporteur of the Special Committee, said that the United States, while claiming to be the leader of the democratic world, had for more than a year been terrorizing third world countries whose economic distress compelled them to seek international aid. United States aid to such countries, was no more than a political weapon designed to intimidate them. Aid to developing countries should be regarded as part of a collective responsibility to compensate them for centuries of colonialism.

17. With respect to the draft decision in document A/39/23 (Part III), chapter VI, paragraph 14, he pointed out that every United States citizen had the right to criticize his Government; the right to criticize should also be accorded to sovereign States. It was wrong to deny them their freedom of expression by using food aid as a weapon.

18. He appealed to the members of the Committee to heed their consciences when voting on the draft decision and the United States amendments (A/C.4/39/L.2).

19. Mr. DEYHIM (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that there must be some conflict between the personal convictions of some representatives and the positions of their Governments where humanitarian questions were concerned. He wished that the United States representative had spoken in accordance with his own conscience rather than in defence of a specific policy.

20. That representative had objected to the fact that his country and the racist Zionist régime had been singled out for their collaboration with South Africa. Yet the United States tried to justify the activities of its foreign economic interests in exactly the same way that the South African régime tried to justify its brutal and inhumane policies. The latter claimed that its education budget for blacks was rising twice as fast as the budget for whites, and the United States claimed that

/...

(Mr. Deyhim, Islamic Republic of Iran)

its activities in South Africa had produced positive change. The United States defended its diplomatic, economic and military collaboration with South Africa, while the representative of South Africa had announced in the Security Council that his Government rejected in advance any decision taken by that body in connection with South Africa. The United States amendments (A/C.4/39/L.2) could be understood only in that light.

21. Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America) said he wished to assure the Iranian representative that he had spoken in accordance with his conscience.

22. In reply to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, he said that his country was proud that all its citizens had the right to criticize their Government; the more than 10,000 Syrians killed at Hama might have liked to have the same right. He had even praised the representative of Ghana, despite the latter's critical comments on the United States.

23. Lastly, his country's policy, as expressed in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, was not very different from that of the Nobel laureate, Bishop Tutu, who, in the Security Council, had called for positive change in southern Africa without revolution or bloodshed.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that votes had been requested on the draft resolution on foreign economic and other interests, contained in document A/39/23 (Part III), chapter V, paragraph 12, and on the draft decision on military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers, contained in chapter VI, paragraph 14.

25. Miss O'FARRELL (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community on the draft decision in chapter VI, paragraph 14, said that those States wished to express their concern at the proposal to vote on a draft decision which dealt with a subject not among the items assigned to the Fourth Committee by the General Assembly.

26. Speaking as the representative of Ireland, she said that her delegation supported the parts of the draft resolution in chapter V, paragraph 12, relating to the exploitation of Namibia by foreign economic interests which it condemned without reservation. Ireland did not, however, agree that foreign economic interests always had detrimental effects in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Carefully promoted economic development was an important factor in preparing such Territories for independence, and the obligation of the administering Powers was to safeguard the long-term interests of the inhabitants. The draft resolution before the Committee did not constitute a fair and balanced approach to that issue, and her delegation would therefore abstain in the vote.

27. Mr. ULRICH (Denmark) said that his country condemned the activities of foreign economic and other interests which impeded the process of decolonization in Namibia and in other Non-Self-Governing Territories, but felt that the draft resolution before the Committee failed to recognize that such activities often were beneficial to the economic and social development of such Territories. Failure to distinguish between kinds of activities detracted from the fundamental aims of the draft resolution. His delegation also had reservations of principle with regard to a

/...

(Mr. Ulrich, Denmark)

number of specific paragraphs in the draft resolution, which failed to take into account the provisions of the United Nations Charter concerning the division of competences between the General Assembly and the Security Council. Denmark therefore would abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

28. Mr. MIKAYA (Malawi) said that while his delegation opposed economic activities that were deliberately undertaken to block Namibian independence and the abolition of apartheid, as well as any military activities designed to intimidate or intended to threaten peace and security in southern Africa, it was convinced that mere condemnation was not enough. Countries must also submit constructive proposals to help the peoples of southern Africa to achieve their full emancipation without further suffering or loss of life.

29. Many countries dealt and traded with South Africa, and to single out two of them, as in the draft decision in document A/39/23 (Part III), chapter VI, paragraph 14, was to create a credibility gap which could not expedite a satisfactory solution. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the amendments in document A/C.4/39/L.2.

30. For reasons already expressed at a previous meeting, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution in chapter V, paragraph 12.

31. Mrs. KUROKOCHI (Japan), said that her delegation supported many elements of the draft resolution in chapter V, paragraph 12, such as paragraph 7, because it fully shared the genuine concern over the harmful effects which foreign economic and other interests sometimes had in Non-Self-Governing Territories when they were not properly regulated and controlled. However, Japan did not agree that all activities of foreign, economic and other interests were necessarily prejudicial to Non-Self-Governing Territories or that they automatically obstructed efforts to achieve self-determination and independence. Whether they were harmful or not depended upon the nature of the activity and upon the situation prevailing in the particular Territory. Namibia was a special case because it had been under illegal occupation for many years; the resulting situation should be terminated as soon as possible through persistent international pressure. However, in such areas as the transfer of technology and managerial skills and the creation of job opportunities, foreign economic and other interests certainly contributed to the social and economic development of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

32. Since the draft resolution was unbalanced in its emphasis on the negative aspects of the activities of foreign economic and other interests, her delegation would abstain in the vote.

33. Mr. TSHAMALA (Zaire) said that his country favoured naming the countries responsible for prolonging the illegal occupation of Namibia and the policy of apartheid and for making South Africa the dominant military Power on the continent. To name names selectively, however, would be discriminatory, and it was in that light that his delegation would cast its vote.

34. Mr. LESETEDI (Botswana) said that although his country fully supported an arms embargo against South Africa and condemned nuclear collaboration and any military

/...

(Mr. Lesetedi, Botswana)

exchanges with Pretoria, it could not, for well-known historical and geographical reasons, support or implement economic sanctions or an oil embargo against South Africa. The destabilization of the front-line States and the obstruction of Namibian independence by South Africa had left Botswana with no trade routes which did not involve South Africa.

35. Mr. WERNDL (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation could not support the draft resolution in document A/39/23 (Part III) chapter V, paragraph 12, because it gave the impression that all foreign economic interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories were by definition detrimental to the peoples in those Territories and because it failed to distinguish properly between harmful activities and those which might contribute to the development of the territories concerned. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

36. With respect to the draft decision in chapter VI, paragraph 14, his delegation associated itself with the statement made by the representative of Ireland on behalf of the European Economic Community.

37. Mr. CARLSON (Canada) said that it was time to re-examine the assumptions underlying the Committee's deliberations and focus more on such basic issues as the impact of transnational corporations on developing countries and colonies. Canada believed that transnational corporations could have a beneficial impact in terms of development and transfer of technology, and it had been successful in using them to implement its development assistance programmes. It therefore questioned any attempt to condemn them categorically and felt that the Committee might become irrelevant or even hinder decolonization if it did not seek common ground on that issue.

38. His delegation therefore regretted that it could not unreservedly endorse the draft resolution concerning foreign economic interests, despite its support for the struggle for freedom and equality in southern Africa, for the following reasons: certain paragraphs could not be implemented by his country without giving Canadian legislation unacceptable extraterritorial application; Canada was not convinced that all foreign economic activity was detrimental or that it automatically impeded self-determination; Canada did not agree that such activity was illegal under international law, as stated in paragraph 14 of the draft.

39. His delegation also did not agree that ending all economic and diplomatic relations with South Africa, as called for in paragraph 9, was an appropriate means of advancing the cause of Namibia's independence. The draft resolution did not even mention the settlement plan for Namibia approved by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978), which Canada would like to see implemented. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on that draft resolution, while supporting its main objectives.

40. As for the draft decision concerning military activities, there was a procedural irregularity in including a decision on military activities under item 104. The draft decision also contained unacceptable, misleading and exaggerated language, as well as unsubstantiated criticism of individual countries. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against it.

/...

41. Mr. WARD (New Zealand) said that New Zealand would abstain in the vote on the draft decision concerning military activities. When a text on the subject had been introduced in 1982, his delegation had objected on procedural grounds; those reservations remained. Moreover, it did not accept the argument, implicit in the text, that military activities necessarily impeded decolonization. The draft decision had no relevance to New Zealand's administration of Tokelau, where there were no military activities.

42. Similarly, New Zealand did not agree with the implication in the draft resolution that overseas-based companies operating in Non-Self-Governing Territories were by their nature inimical to the interests of the people of those Territories. The experience of many Territories provided evidence to the contrary: under reasonable controls and guidelines, foreign investment and trade were a vital spur to development. Nevertheless, despite additional reservations as to whether some provisions of the text were legally practicable, New Zealand would support the draft resolution, since it had always supported - and, as an administering Power, upheld - the principles on which it was based, namely, that foreign economic interests should not impede the political and economic development or the self-determination of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

43. Mr. TAIK (France) said that France would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution on foreign economic interests because it could not accept the condemnation in principle of activities by foreign enterprises in dependent Territories. Although in some situations, when natural resources were exploited without regard for the living and working conditions of the people or for the environment and economic make-up of the Territory, such activities could be harmful, that was not the case in all dependent Territories or even in dependent Territories exclusively. The real problem had less to do with territorial status than with the way world markets were organized and with the unbalanced nature of relations between developing and industrialized countries. His Government was aware of that, and consequently one of the chief objectives of its foreign policy was the establishment of a new international economic order that would be more favourable to the disadvantaged.

44. With regard to the draft decision on military activities, his delegation had the same procedural reservations as in the past and its position on the current draft was fully reflected by the statement made on behalf of the European Economic Community. France would vote in favour of the United States amendments (A/C.4/39/L.2) because it was opposed to singling out specific States for condemnation and it would vote against the draft decision as a whole for the procedural reasons mentioned.

45. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) said that Turkey would vote in favour of the draft resolution because of the principles involved, although it had reservations about naming a particular region in the text itself.

46. Turkey would for the same reason vote in favour of the draft decision, even though it believed that paragraphs 2, 4, 12, 13 and 14 could have been drafted in a more balanced way, and despite its serious reservations about the various references in the text to a particular group of Western States.

47. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) said that the draft resolution and the draft decision before the Committee were essentially the same as those of the previous year. Uruguay would again vote in favour of both, with the same reservations as in the previous year.

48. Mr. KORPERSHOEK (Netherlands) said that, apart from the situation in Namibia, where six years of concerted international efforts had still not secured its independence under the terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), there could be no doubt from the reports of the Secretariat that in all other Non-Self-Governing Territories the administering Powers were complying fully with their obligation to promote the well-being of the inhabitants and were respecting their wishes regarding their future political status. Unfortunately, during the debate, far-fetched accusations had been levelled at the administering Powers by certain countries which did not bother to distinguish between the fundamentally different situations in Namibia and in the other Territories. The Netherlands deeply regretted those attempts to turn the Committee into yet another arena for East-West rivalry and to depict all foreign economic interests as predatory manifestations of colonialism. If the Committee was to function effectively, its first concern ought to be to establish the facts and not to impose ideological misconceptions.

49. Some such misconceptions had regrettably found their way into the draft resolution on the activities of foreign economic and other interests, as in the sweeping statement in paragraph 3. His delegation also rejected the unjustified and selective criticism of Western countries contained in the draft resolution and reserved its position on paragraph 14. With regard to paragraph 17, his delegation reminded the Committee that the Netherlands had recognized the competence of the Council for Namibia to issue Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. Furthermore, the Netherlands favoured a policy of increased pressure on South Africa through the application of selective sanctions and therefore could not agree with the call in paragraphs 11 and 18 for the termination of all ties with South Africa and the total isolation of the country. Notwithstanding those reservations, the Netherlands would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution because of its firm commitment to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

50. Mr. LEFDAL (Norway) said that Norway would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution even though it supported its main thrust, because it did not believe that all foreign economic activities were detrimental; they could, to the contrary, be essential to industrialization and employment, especially in the smaller dependent Territories. Norway also felt that some elements in the draft resolution fell rather within the competence of the Security Council.

51. Mr. BJURNER (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that, taking into account the vulnerability of the colonial Territories and their population compared to the strength of many of the foreign economic interests existing in them, members of the United Nations clearly had a special responsibility to make every effort to contribute to the protection and defence of the rights of those peoples.

52. The main thrust of the draft resolution was the serious situation prevailing in southern Africa, which stemmed from South Africa's apartheid policy and its

/...

(Mr. Bjurner, Sweden)

illegal occupation of Namibia. For that reason, the Nordic countries had adopted a joint programme against South Africa and, in particular, had advocated the prohibition or discouragement of new investments in South Africa. They had also put forward proposals in the Security Council and General Assembly which could result in binding resolutions against investments in and trade with South Africa. Sweden had adopted a law against such investments in South Africa and Namibia by companies under Swedish jurisdiction and had taken other measures to curtail other economic interests in South Africa and Namibia. The Swedish Parliament had adopted a bill which declared purchases of uranium and coal from South Africa or Namibia as unacceptable.

53. The Nordic countries had noted with satisfaction that only those foreign economic activities which impeded the process of decolonization were regarded as negative; foreign economic investments in certain cases and on certain conditions could also be an important element in efforts to promote industrial development and provide employment for the inhabitants of those Territories.

54. Some of the paragraphs which had caused the Nordic countries considerable difficulties in the past were still, however, to be found in the text. The language was still far too sweeping and, in certain paragraphs, evoked the traditional reservations of the Nordic countries with regard to the division of competence between the main organs of the United Nations and the constitutional rights of individual citizens. Furthermore the Nordic countries could not accept the general and legally disputed formulation in the new paragraph 14 that all foreign economic interests in Namibia were illegal under international law. That was a question that remained to be tested in court.

55. Against that background, the Nordic countries would abstain on the draft resolution as in past years. That was all the more regrettable since they fully shared the deep concern expressed in the draft resolution about conditions in southern Africa and supported the general considerations behind it. His Government would shortly propose further measures with the aim of increasing the economic isolation of South Africa.

56. Mr. SARRE (Senegal) said that Senegal would vote in favour of both the draft resolution and the draft decision, and appealed to all States to terminate any economic or military relations with South Africa. Senegal believed, however, that condemnation should always be objective and not selective, and therefore Senegal would vote in favour of the United States amendment to the draft decision. That in no way affected its position on decolonization and on the rights of the Palestinian people.

57. Mr. MOSELEY (Barbados) said that policies in support of South Africa were utterly repugnant to Barbados. At the same time, if the credibility of the United Nations was to be preserved, a minimum of fairness was essential. His delegation would therefore abstain from voting on the draft decision as it stood. Any censure must be even-handed rather than engage in selective name-calling. Barbados was, however, very concerned over the relations maintained by certain countries with South Africa and it would therefore also abstain on the amendments proposed in document A/C.4/39/L.2.

/...

58. Mr. GVIR (Israel) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the amendment submitted by the United States and, if that amendment was not adopted, it would vote against the draft decision (A/39/23 (Part III) chap. VI, para. 14). The structure and wording of the draft decision were unbalanced, nebulous and misleading. Should the amendment submitted by the United States not be approved, Israel's main reason for voting against the draft decision would be that it, together with the United States and certain Western countries, had been singled out for maintaining relations with South Africa. His delegation rejected that kind of selective condemnation. Most if not all of the States represented in the Committee had dealings of one kind or another with South Africa. The difference was that Israel did not try to conceal its relations with South Africa. Singling out Israel for specific condemnation was therefore a gross distortion of reality. In mentioning Israel by name, the initiators of the draft decision had been concerned less with the issue under discussion than with exploiting the opportunity to attack Israel as part of their campaign of political warfare against it.

59. Mr. TRUC (Viet Nam) said that his delegation shared the concern of many others over military bases and installations in colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories. It thought that the word "could" should have been deleted from the statement in paragraph 2 of the draft decision that "the presence of military bases and installations in the Territories concerned could constitute a major obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization". A number of important reports submitted by the Special Committee of 24 as well as the lengthy debate in the Fourth Committee had demonstrated that military activities in those Territories obviously constituted a major obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration and a threat to international peace and security. His delegation also considered that the phrase "to continue" in the same paragraph, in the passage "the Assembly urges the administering Powers concerned to continue to take all necessary measures" was misleading and failed to reflect the real situation in a number of colonial Territories. It would therefore have preferred "the Assembly urges the administering Powers concerned to take all necessary measures not to involve those Territories in any offensive acts etc.". Despite its reservations, however, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft decision as part of the common effort to speed up and encourage the decolonization process in general.

60. Mr. ROWE (Australia) said that his delegation had supported the resolution on foreign economic interests when it was considered in the Committee of 24 despite its serious misgivings about many aspects and it would maintain that position in the Fourth Committee. The resolution focused principally on the situation in southern Africa and Namibia in particular. There would be opportunities under other agenda items for his delegation to elaborate its total opposition to apartheid and its absolute commitment to the cause of Namibian independence. In the context of the resolution, his delegation's vote in favour would reflect its concern about the exploitative practices in Namibia of many companies, both domestic and foreign, in relation both to their work forces and to the extraction of natural resources.

61. There were, however, aspects of the text which it could not endorse. The resolution went beyond the situation in southern Africa to embrace all Non-Self-Governing Territories. There was an inherent contradiction between the wholesale condemnation of foreign economic involvement in Non-Self-Governing Territories

/...

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

implicit in the draft resolution and the calls made in other resolutions for further economic development of those Territories.

62. To the extent that foreign economic interests impeded progress towards self-determination, Australia deplored them. In many Non-Self-Governing Territories, however, constructive foreign investment had proved a potent force for economic development and progress towards self-determination. That had certainly been the case in many countries that were currently Members of the United Nations and there was no reason why careful, balanced and reasonable foreign economic investment should not contribute positively to the economic development of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories. Properly managed, the inflow of foreign investment was usually accompanied by the introduction of new technology, the acquisition of new skills and a general increase in managerial expertise.

63. His delegation did not consider that the draft decision on military activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories had any place on the Committee's agenda. In addition to that procedural objection, there were also problems of substance. As a matter of principle, Australia could not accept the selective and arbitrary naming of Member States. It had therefore voted against the references in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the draft decision in the Committee of 24, and had abstained on the decision as a whole. It would accordingly support the amendments in document A/C.4/39/L.2.

64. He also wished to state that the draft decision had no relevance to the Cocos (Keeling) Islands. There were no military facilities on Cocos and the Australian Government had no intention of making the islands into a strategic military base or using them for that purpose.

65. Mr. YOUSSEM-KONTOU (Chad) said that his delegation's position of solidarity with the people of southern Africa and its denunciations of apartheid and South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia were well known. It was therefore in favour of condemning these countries which maintained relations with South Africa. It was not, however, in favour of the selective naming of some of those countries, and it would therefore vote in favour of the amendments in A/C.4/39/L.2.

66. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Committee on activities of foreign economic and other interests (A/39/23 (Part III), chap. V, para. 12).

67. A recorded vote was requested.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India,

/...

Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

68. The resolution was adopted by 112 votes to 4, with 23 abstentions.

69. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on paragraph 1 of the amendment proposed by the United States of America to the draft decision on military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in territories under their administration which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in document A/39/23 (Part III), chapter VI, paragraph 14 (A/C.4/39/L.2).

70. A recorded vote was requested.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zaire.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's

/...

Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cyprus, Egypt, India, Kenya, Lesotho, Malaysia, Maldives, Mozambique, Oman, Paraguay, Peru, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela.

71. The amendment was adopted by 62 votes to 47, with 24 abstentions.

72. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on paragraph 2 of the United States amendment (A/C.4/39/L.2).

73. A recorded vote was requested.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zaire.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cyprus, Egypt, India, Kenya, Lesotho, Malaysia, Maldives, Mozambique, Oman, Paraguay, Peru, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela.

74. The amendment was adopted by 62 votes to 47, with 25 abstentions.

/...

75. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft decision on military activities, as amended.

76. A recorded vote was requested.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, Dominica, 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, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

77. The draft decision as amended was adopted by 115 votes to 11, with 15 abstentions.

78. Mr. CAMARA (Guinea) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution on foreign economic interests but his vote had not been registered.

79. Mr. DELFOSSE (Belgium) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution on foreign economic interests. Belgium was determined to support the efforts of the international community to ensure the implementation of the many resolutions aimed at ending South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. Nevertheless, his delegation had a number of reservations on some of the provisions of the resolution which applied not only to Namibia but to other Non-Self-Governing Territories. In its view, the economic activities made possible by foreign investment had contributed to the generally satisfactory economic development of these Territories. His delegation therefore deplored the systematic references in

/...

(Mr. Delfosse, Belgium)

the resolution to foreign investment in the Non-Self-Governing Territories as being prejudicial to their peoples.

80. Mr. STEFANINI (Italy) said that, while his delegation had not opposed the resolution on activities of foreign economic interests, it had a number of reservations regarding its substance and language. It did not regard it as any improvement on General Assembly resolution 38/50.

81. Italy was committed to decolonization and opposed to all forces which impeded the attainment of the goals set out in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It also shared the concern expressed by many delegations regarding the situation in southern Africa and wished to see the speedy achievement of Namibia's independence. On the other hand, it did not share the assumption that foreign economic interests as such were detrimental to the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It saw no evidence to support that theory, believing on the contrary that the facts and the statistics emphasized the useful role that foreign investment could play, in the right circumstances, for economic and social development in those Territories, as in any other independent country.

82. Mr. RAM (Fiji) said he had voted in favour of the resolution on the activities of foreign economic interests on the grounds that such activities should not be allowed to impede the implementation of the Declaration. Where they were properly guided and regulated, they could make a useful contribution from the point of view of technology, new skills and job opportunities. Wherever they were detrimental, however, they should be condemned and terminated. His delegation therefore agreed with the main thrust of the resolution, but believed that it was for the inhabitants of the dependent territories to decide whether foreign economic interests were in fact impeding the implementation of the Declaration. It was on that understanding that his delegation had supported the resolution in the Committee of 24.

83. Mr. ALMOSLECHNER (Austria) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution on foreign economic interests, although it was in favour of appropriate measures to eliminate colonialism and apartheid in southern Africa, to ensure the application of the Declaration in Namibia and all other colonial territories. On the other hand, the steps taken by Member States should serve the interests of the Territories in question and should therefore be designed to leave room for activities which could be to their benefit, particularly on the case of the smaller Territories. His delegation did not believe that the resolution took those concerns sufficiently into account.

84. Mr. LOUMA (Papua New Guinea) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision on military activities as a whole, as amended, because it believed that military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration could inhibit the process of decolonization, and also that the military presence of militarily superior States in other States could adversely affect endeavours to eradicate colonialism. It believed that the resolution served the purpose of reminding administering authorities of their obligations under the Charter as well as their obligation to implement, in letter

/...

(Mr. Louma, Papua New Guinea)

and in spirit, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It also served to remind them that the Territories under their custodianship should not be used as pawns in their search for world political influence, and to condemn those Member States which saw fit to undermine United Nations resolutions seeking to further Namibian independence and to end military collaboration with South Africa.

85. Although his delegation joined in condemning those Member States which continued to flout United Nations resolutions, it had voted in favour of the United States amendments. The proposed deletions in no way diminished the authority of the decision or distorted its message. Furthermore, his delegation regarded the singling out of only two Members of the United Nations as hypocritical. If that mode of operation was chosen, all the countries that were engaged in military or nuclear co-operation with South Africa should have been named. He feared that the selective naming of two countries in the draft decision had not been a means to an end but an end in itself.

86. Mr. ATHANASSIOU (Greece) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the United States amendment to the draft decision and had abstained in the vote on the decision as a whole because it felt that it had not been worded in a balanced way. However, that in no way affected its position on the negative impact that military activities could have on the speedy access of dependent Territories to independence.

87. Mr. INFANTE (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because of the principles that had inspired it. The activities of foreign economic interests, however, were not always an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization. In some cases the people of the Territories themselves had asked for an increase in such activities in order to enable them to reach a stage of economic development that would make independence possible. A report by the Special Committee on decolonization on its recent mission to the island of Anguilla, which would shortly be available to the Committee, would confirm the truth of that statement.

88. Mr. ABDULLATIF (Oman) said that his delegation had abstained on the United States amendment to the draft decision because of Oman's friendly relations with the United States. That did not imply any change of position, however, with regard to Israel.

89. Mr. SHARFI (Sudan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and the draft decision as a whole because of its commitment to the principles involved. As for the United States amendment to the draft decision, since it had been established beyond any doubt that there was close collaboration between Israel and South Africa in the military field as well as in other fields, his delegation had no problem with using clear language to that effect and had therefore abstained on the amendment which had sought to remove the specific reference to Israel.

/...

90. Mr. PIMENTEL (Dominican Republic) observed that his delegation had voted in favour of both the draft resolution and the draft decision. It had, however, voted to amend the draft decision because it had not felt that the text of paragraphs 8 and 9 containing selective specific references, was sufficiently balanced.

91. Mr. WOLFE (Jamaica) said that, given Jamaica's full commitment to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and to the achievement by colonial Territories of self-determination and independence, Jamaica had consistently supported the resolutions and decisions proposed by the Special Committee under agenda item 104. It shared the concern, however, that the current draft decision on military activities had introduced a new element of selective condemnation and it had therefore supported the proposed amendment and was pleased that it had been adopted.

92. Mr. BADER (United States of America) noted the historic nature of the vote which had just been taken and hoped that it represented a turning away from name-calling and towards a constructive approach to questions as sensitive as those relating to southern Africa.

93. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 104.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.