

2189th meeting

Thursday, 11 December 1975, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mrs. Famah JOKA-BANGURA (Sierra Leone).

A/C.4/SR.2189

AGENDA ITEM 88

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration (concluded) (A/9998-S/11598, A/10023/Add.1, A/10040, A/10054, A/10055, A/10058, A/10207-S/11811, A/10208, A/10209-S/11813, A/10212, A/10214, A/10227, A/10277, A/10353, A/10402-S/11887, A/10403-S/11890, A/C.4/802, A/C.4/803, A/C.4/808 and Corr.1, A/C.4/L.1131)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded)

1. Mr. MUNGAI (Kenya) said that, had he been present during the vote at the previous meeting, he would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131.

2. Mr. BENUZZI (Italy), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the nine countries of the European Economic Community, said that the situation in Portuguese Timor had been greatly complicated by the events which had taken place in the Territory since April 1974. The nine countries of the European Economic Community especially deplored the unilateral actions taken in the past few months, which were clearly inconsistent with the exercise by the people of Portuguese Timor of their right to self-determination. That situation made it difficult for the Committee to address itself to all the considerations involved, especially since the administering Power had requested a Security Council meeting on the question. Certain passages in draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 fell more appropriately within the competence of the Security Council, which would shortly be considering the matter. The nine countries had therefore decided to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. They would also have abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1132 had it been put to a vote, on the grounds that its language was insufficiently precise.

3. The nine countries of the European Community regarded free self-determination as an essential element in the resolution of the problem and therefore took special note of the Indonesian representative's assurance to the Committee at its 2187th meeting that his Government wanted self-determination for the Territory and a United Nations role in that process, in accordance with the principles of the Charter and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

4. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-ÅHMAN (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131. It still regarded Portugal as the administering Power, with full responsibility for the decolonization of Timor. No matter how closely interested Indonesia might feel, it had no right to intervene and its troops must be withdrawn from the Territory so that the people of Portuguese Timor could exercise their

right to self-determination without any outside interference. The United Nations had an important role to play in that connexion. The various aspects of the problems of Timor fell within the competence of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The concern of the General Assembly was primarily the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). Within the framework of the Security Council, it was for the members independently to decide their positions on specific formulas for the solution of problems on which only the Council could take decisions.

5. Mr. WALTER (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of vote, said it was unfortunate that consideration of the question of Portuguese Timor should have taken place under extremely pressing deadlines and in an atmosphere which had militated against a considered and balanced outcome.

6. His delegation regretted Indonesia's military intervention in the Territory and had consistently argued against the use of force to settle the dispute. It had been deeply concerned at the suffering caused to the people of the Territory following the breakdown in law and order which had occurred under Portugal's administration and it had been taking such steps as it could through the International Committee of the Red Cross to alleviate that suffering. It nevertheless continued to regard Portugal as the administering Power, with continuing responsibilities, and it wished to see the people of Timor determine their own future under peaceful conditions. New Zealand had therefore recognized neither of the unilateral declarations made recently by rival factions in the Territory. The people of Portuguese Timor must be free from threats of the use of force from any source. It was essential that the United Nations be properly represented in the Territory during the act of self-determination and his delegation hoped that it would take a principle role in determining the modalities and procedures of such an act.

7. In the view of his delegation, draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 did not seem to provide an entirely satisfactory response to the situation. It ignored the underlying problems which had resulted in the complete breakdown of the decolonization process long before the events of the previous weekend. The text lacked balance because it placed excessive emphasis on the military aspect of the problem. Furthermore, the penultimate preambular paragraph, which referred to Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, had no place in a resolution on a Non-Self-Governing Territory.

8. His delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. It did, however, wish to associate itself with the principles embodied in the draft resolution. It trusted that the appeal to put the decolonization process back on the rails would be heeded, that Indonesia would

implement its commitment to promote and encourage the free expression of the will of the people regarding their future status, and that the administering Power and the United Nations would do whatever was necessary to assist in the attainment of those objectives.

9. In conclusion, he said that his delegation endorsed the remarks made at the previous meeting concerning the desirability of examining further the possibility of restoring some balance to the text so as to make it more generally acceptable in the General Assembly.

10. Mr. NAGAI (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 because it did not fully reflect the circumstances surrounding recent developments or show an understanding of their origin. It ignored Portugal's failure to fulfil its responsibilities to assist in the peaceful and orderly process of the decolonization of Portuguese Timor in accordance with the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations. Portugal's symbolic presence and its limited authority had led to the escalation of armed strife and tension in the Territory. Portugal's failure to take appropriate measures to restore peace and order, which were essential to the free exercise of the right to self-determination, and its failure to honour its commitment as administering Power had created a vacuum. The resulting escalation of the armed struggle between the rival parties in the Territory had caused bloodshed and suffering and Indonesia's intervention should be viewed against that background.

11. His delegation, however, did not condone or approve of any military intervention and strongly urged that constructive efforts be made by all the parties concerned to restore peace and security in the Territory immediately so that Indonesian forces could be withdrawn. It hoped that, with the prompt restoration of peace and order, the right of the people of Timor to self-determination could be assured.

12. His delegation had taken careful note of the statement of the representative of Indonesia and the announcement by his Government that Indonesia's presence in the Territory had nothing to do with any territorial ambition but was intended mainly to enable the people of Portuguese Timor to exercise their right to determine their own future.

13. In conclusion, his delegation wished to place it on record that its negative vote should not be construed as a departure from its consistent position, namely, that force must not be used to settle international problems, that there must be no interference in the internal affairs of other countries and that the right of the people in Non-Self-Governing Territories to self-determination must be respected in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

14. Mr. KAPETANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had decided to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131.

15. Mr. NANDAN (Fiji), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, prior to the withdrawal of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1132, his delegation had been prepared to vote in favour of both draft resolutions before the Committee

because both reaffirmed the right of the people of Portuguese Timor to self-determination and independence.

16. The critical situation existing in Portuguese Timor was due in the main to the failure of the administering Power, Portugal, to discharge its duties in a responsible manner, and it was unfortunate that Portugal's culpability had not been suitably reflected in any draft resolution. The situation in the Territory had been further aggravated by Indonesia's armed intervention. His delegation could not condone the settlement of any dispute by force of arms and it deplored foreign intervention as a matter of principle, despite its recognition of the compelling reasons for it. It had therefore supported draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131, which reflected its general view.

17. With respect to the amendments proposed by the various delegations to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131, his delegation had voted either in favour of or against them on their respective merits. Some of them would have improved the text by making the draft resolution more balanced and by putting the situation existing in Portuguese Timor in its proper perspective.

18. Mr. WU Miao-fa (China), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation, which had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131, felt it necessary to make certain observations.

19. It was quite obvious that the root cause of the grave situation in Portuguese Timor lay in the Indonesian Government's armed intervention and aggression against that Territory. Such armed intervention and aggression must be stopped immediately and Indonesian forces must be immediately and unconditionally withdrawn from East Timor. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 deplored the military intervention by the armed forces of Indonesia, called upon the Government of Indonesia to withdraw its armed forces from the Territory without delay, and called upon all States to respect the unity and territorial integrity of Timor. His delegation supported those views, which reflected the just demands of the majority of the States Members of the United Nations and the peoples of the world.

20. Secondly, his delegation maintained that, as the Frente Revolucionária Timor Leste Independente (FRETILIN) had already proclaimed independence, the question of talks between the different parties was to be determined by the people of East Timor themselves. Paragraph 8 of the draft resolution requested the United Nations to send a fact-finding mission to Timor as soon as possible. In his delegation's view, in the circumstances in which Indonesia had committed armed aggression against East Timor, the sending of a fact-finding mission would not only be of no avail, but might well be used to rubber-stamp the fait accompli created by Indonesian aggression. His delegation therefore had reservations regarding that paragraph and wished to call upon all countries which upheld justice to be on their guard. The same problem arose with regard to the third preambular paragraph and paragraphs 2 and 3, on which his delegation therefore also had reservations.

21. Mr. YUSSUF (Afghanistan) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131

because it had some reservations with regard to the wording of paragraphs 4 and 5. It had also taken into consideration the statement made in the Committee by the representative of Indonesia to the effect that his country would observe the declaration on the decolonization of the Territory and would respect the right of the people of Timor to self-determination with the participation of the United Nations. If those paragraphs had been rephrased his delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

22. Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 despite its reservations and objections with regard to certain preambular and operative paragraphs.

23. Mr. TSHERING (Bhutan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 because it was in keeping with the principles set forth in the preamble of the United Nations Charter. However, it appreciated and understood the concern of the Government of Indonesia in a difficult situation and appreciated the statements made by the representative of Indonesia with regard to the right of the people of Portuguese Timor to self-determination in an atmosphere of peace and order. In the light of that statement, and judging from the existing situation in Portuguese Timor, his delegation believed that paragraph 4, which strongly deplored the military intervention of the armed forces of Indonesia, and the wording of paragraph 5, went beyond what the existing situation warranted. His delegation therefore felt obliged to state its reservations with regard to those two paragraphs. When the draft resolution was considered in the plenary, his delegation would welcome an amendment to make it more balanced and more compatible with the prevailing situation.

24. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the main reason for the difficult situation in Timor was that the people there were emerging from colonial oppression and that certain external factors had complicated that process. The situation had required that the Committee adopt a single, clear and precise draft resolution before submitting its report to the General Assembly. His delegation had abstained in the vote on the numerous amendments submitted because they only complicated matters and in fact were tantamount to a new draft resolution. Moreover, many delegations had not had sufficient time to consult their Governments on them.

25. As a matter of principle, his delegation had supported and would continue to support the right of every people to self-determination without interference from any outside Power, great or small. The United Nations could assist the people of East Timor, but the people of that Territory must ultimately decide their own future and their own approach to self-determination. No resolution was perfect, but draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 was essentially a good one because it provided for a solution to the problem of East Timor on the basis of the principle of self-determination. His delegation also welcomed assurances that Indonesian forces would leave the Territory and not interfere in the process of self-determination.

26. Ms. WHITE (United States of America) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution

A/C.4/L.1131 because it objected to the wording of paragraphs 4 and 5. It hoped that efforts to produce a more balanced text would be successful before the question was considered in the plenary Assembly.

27. Mr. HOLGER (Chile) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 because it felt that not enough background information was available and because it objected to the provisions of paragraphs 4 and 5. The draft resolution did not adequately cover the causes of recent events in Timor, which revealed an extremely complicated situation and very special problems. His delegation had voted on the understanding that the people of Timor would be permitted freely to exercise their right to self-determination and that the Security Council, as the appropriate body to deal with that problem, would help to create the conditions necessary for self-determination in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

28. Mr. BERGH JOHANSEN (Norway) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131. It felt that the text was not fully satisfactory because it dealt only with some aspects of the problem. A solution to the problem of Timor had to be based on respect for the inalienable right of the people of Timor to decide their political future without outside interference of any kind. Timor was still under Portuguese administration, and internationally accepted rules and principles of decolonization had to be applied to it. His delegation could not accept any military intervention in the Territory and supported the view that foreign armed forces should be withdrawn from it.

29. Mr. KEITA (Niger) said that his country was devoted to the principle of self-determination and that he would have given full support to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 had he been present during the vote.

30. Mr. PETRELLA (Argentina) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 because the draft did not adequately reconcile the positions of the countries of the region, because the question was about to be dealt with in the Security Council, and because there had been no time for a full discussion to determine the facts of the critical situation prevailing in the Territory.

31. Mr. VARGAS-SABORIO (Costa Rica) said he regretted that he had been unable to be present during the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 but that he viewed it with sympathy. It was important to respect the territorial integrity, sovereignty and right to independence of the people of Timor. Negotiations between the administering Power, Indonesia and the political parties in Portuguese Timor should therefore be continued. His delegation supported all efforts to resolve the problem but had certain reservations with regard to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution.

32. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia) said that it had been very painful for his delegation to abstain in the voting on the amendments to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 because some of those amendments contained principles with which Ethiopia agreed and had been submitted by countries with which Ethiopia maintained good relations. That applied

particularly to the draft amendments submitted by Thailand in document A/C.4/L.1133, which, under normal circumstances, no one could oppose.

33. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 not out of solidarity with any one group but in accordance with the objectives of Ethiopia's foreign policy. It had hoped that the countries of the region would take the initiative of submitting a draft resolution which fully reflected the situation and the latest developments in East Timor. His delegation, however, still hoped that the efforts referred to by the representative of Australia at the preceding meeting would be successful and it thanked the representative of India for the statesmanship he had displayed in sparing the Committee a further difficult exercise.

34. Owing to the timing of developments, the problem had not been fully dealt with in negotiations outside the Committee and his delegation hoped that the efforts contemplated in the draft resolution would establish conditions that would enable the people to exercise their right to self-determination without further delay or undue difficulties.

35. Mr. JOEWONO (Indonesia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of China had repeated his allegations against the action taken by Indonesia. His delegation had already explained at the 2185th and 2187th meetings why Indonesia had been forced to act and it regretted that the representative of China had not been able at least to attempt to understand its reasons. Indonesia hoped that China would always maintain its position against all types of aggression, whether covert or overt.

36. The representative of China had stated that the action by Indonesia had been the root cause of the events in Timor. There was no need to reply to that allegation, since other delegations had stated the view that the root cause had been the negligence of the administering Power in discharging its obligations to the people of the Territory. If the administering Power had been able to meet its obligations, the course of events would have been different. The representative of China had stated that the unilateral declaration of independence by FRETILIN had merely been the exercise of the people's right to self-determination. His delegation hoped that the representative of China would be able to give due consideration to the fact that other groups in the Territory, too, had expressed the desire to exercise their right to self-determination. His delegation wished to point out to the representative of China that the leaders of the political parties that had expressed a desire for integration with Indonesia were in New York and wished to be heard by the United Nations. That would provide a good opportunity for the representative of China to learn that FRETILIN was not the only party which had the right to self-determination.

37. Mr. WU Miáo-fa (China), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the statement just made by the representative of Indonesia was an attempt to justify that Government's aggression against Timor and was totally untenable. Everyone knew that aggressors would invariably invent a set of so-called "reasons" to justify their aggression

in an attempt to deceive world public opinion. That was a common occurrence in history. During the time that China had been subjected to aggression, the foreign aggressors without exception had fabricated a variety of pretexts. Aggressors invariably alleged that their action was aimed at repelling the threat coming from the countries subjected to aggression, or that it had been taken at the request of the countries concerned in order to "restore peace and order". The act of aggression could in no way be camouflaged by such pretexts. After the establishment of the Democratic Republic of East Timor, the Indonesian Government had dispatched large numbers of armed forces for the purpose of committing aggression against that country. That type of aggression had been and would continue to be condemned by all progressive international opinion.

38. The representative of Indonesia had asserted that the situation in East Timor had posed a threat to Indonesia. Everyone knew that East Timor had not dispatched a single soldier to Indonesia and did not possess a single warplane, ship or tank. His delegation wished to ask the representative of Indonesia how East Timor, a country with only a few hundred thousand people, could constitute a threat to Indonesia, a large country with over 1 million people. Indonesia should immediately stop its armed intervention and aggression, withdraw forthwith all its armed forces from East Timor and establish good-neighbourly relations with that country on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. His delegation wished to point out that Indonesia was a third-world country; so, too, was the Democratic Republic of East Timor, and those two countries therefore had every reason to coexist in normal and peaceful conditions. There was thus no reason whatsoever for an act of aggression against East Timor. The right of the people of East Timor to independence was inviolable and the annexation of the Democratic Republic of East Timor could not be justified. Justice was on the side of the people of East Timor and his delegation was convinced that the right and wrong of the question of Timor was crystal clear to the peoples of the world.

39. Mr. PAQUI (Benin), speaking on a point of order, requested the Chairman to appeal to the representatives of Indonesia and China to forgo exercising repeated rights of reply. He formerly requested the Chairman to close the debate on the matter in order to expedite the Committee's work.

40. The CHAIRMAN agreed with the representative of Benin and appealed to the representatives of China and Indonesia to discontinue the discussion.

41. Mr. JOEWONO (Indonesia) said that his delegation would accede to the wishes of the Chairman. It merely wished to state that Indonesia's firm intention was to attempt, through the United Nations, to establish conditions in Portuguese Timor that would enable all the people of that Territory to exercise freely their right to self-determination. Indonesia had never intended to impose a political decision regarding the future of the Territory.

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE

42. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its work on the item. If she heard no objection,

she would take it that the Committee agreed to request the Rapporteur to submit its report directly to the General Assembly.

*It was so decided.*¹

Completion of the Committee's work

43. The CHAIRMAN* said that an increasing number of decisions taken by the Committee with respect to specific Territories had come about as a result of thorough examination of the situations prevailing in those Territories, with the active co-operation and collaboration of most of the administering Powers, particularly in the related work 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. It would be recalled in that same context that many members of the Committee had noted the outstanding results of the work accomplished by several visiting missions dispatched in the recent past by the Special Committee, at the invitation of the Governments of Australia, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom, to Territories under their administration.

44. It was quite clear that that encouraging trend had been brought about as a consequence, on the one hand, of intensified commitment on the part of Member States to ensure that the genuine wishes and aspirations of the peoples of the colonial Territories were expressed fully and freely regarding their future status and, on the other hand, of the increasing recognition and realization on the part of the majority of the Member States responsible for the administration of those Territories of the positive role which the United Nations had played and could play in facilitating an orderly and peaceful process of decolonization. It was equally clear that that trend towards full co-operation and collaboration must be actively encouraged and sustained at all cost, if the world community was to continue to serve as an effective guardian for the paramountcy of the interests of the inhabitants of the colonial Territories until they had attained a full measure of self-government and independence. She wished to express the earnest hope that the United Nations would soon receive, especially in the work of the Special Committee, the requisite co-operation of the very administering Power which, as a member of the Trusteeship Council, had itself witnessed the extremely effective and constructive actions taken by that body as a direct result of the continued participation and collaboration in its work of the Administering Authorities of Trust Territories, as well as special and other representatives of the local governments concerned.

45. Speaking of the participation of representatives of the peoples of the Territories, she said that it might perhaps be appropriate to observe that the United Nations stood to gain much in its efforts to assist those people by the direct contribution of their representatives to its work. She was sure that there was no need to dwell on that point extensively, as it had been borne out patently through the

* The statement made by the Chairman is reproduced *in extenso* in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee later at the meeting.

¹ The report was submitted to the General Assembly as document A/10426 and Corr.1.

representations made in the Committee by both the Premier and the Deputy Premier of Belize and also, at the level of the Special Committee, by several representatives of local governments, including the Chief Minister and another Cabinet Minister from the Seychelles in 1975, as well as a number of other representatives from the Gilbert Islands, Tuvalu, Guam and the United States Virgin Islands, in previous years. She was more than ever convinced that the direct association of the peoples of the colonial Territories in the relevant work of the Fourth Committee and the Special Committee was an effective means of promoting the progress of those peoples towards the realization of their aspirations, and that the administering Powers should be encouraged to take the necessary measures to that end.

46. It was particularly satisfying to note therefore that, through the efforts of all concerned, of the 14 sets of recommendations formulated by the Committee relating to specific Territories outside the continent of Africa, only two had received the negative vote of the administering Power concerned. It was to be hoped that those administering Powers would find a way to reconsider their approaches to the matters raised in the two draft resolutions—true to their pledge and their declared commitment to the obligation they had accepted as a sacred trust to promote the well-being of the inhabitants of those Territories.

47. A remarkable accomplishment during the current session had been the unanimous expression of solidarity with the people of Zimbabwe in the draft resolution on the general aspects of the question of Southern Rhodesia, which had been adopted unanimously by the General Assembly in resolution 3396 (XXX). In that instance, all the Member States, including the administering Power, had joined in approving by consensus a specific course of action to be taken to bring an end to the anomaly existing in the Territory. While it was a cause for deep regret that it had not been possible to secure a consensus with regard to the draft resolution relating specifically to economic sanctions against the minority régime in Southern Rhodesia, she was of the firm view that the apparent differences between the position of the majority of the members and that of the few which had abstained in the voting were basically not differences of substance but of procedure, and that there could be no doubt whatsoever as to the unanimity of the views held by all members with regard to the need to intensify, at the international level, all efforts to continue to isolate the minority régime until the attainment of majority rule in Zimbabwe.

48. With respect to the question of Namibia, she was sure that she reflected the general feeling of the members of the Committee when she expressed satisfaction at the progress being made in the extension of humanitarian assistance to the people of Namibia, as indicated in General Assembly resolution 3400 (XXX), adopted unanimously by the Assembly during the current session on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee. It was a source of serious disappointment, on the other hand, that the resolution on the question of Namibia as a whole continued to be denied the support of several Western countries. Admittedly, the administration by an international authority of a Territory in which it had not been possible to secure a physical presence abounded in imperfections and was understandably subject to criticism. Yet it should be

kept uppermost in mind that there existed a clear-cut line of demarcation between constructive criticism and obstructionist tactics designed to perpetuate the *status quo*. Implementation of the Decree for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, for instance, might be fraught with both predictable and unpredictable difficulties; yet it was important to bear in mind the fact that it was the very first instrument of its kind proclaimed by the administrator of the international Territory. If it was to be rejected on the grounds of legislative or juridical imperfections, members should then ask themselves what alternatives were left to safeguard the natural resources of Namibia. It would appear that the onus was on that minority of members which continued to engage in trade with South Africa in disregard of the sovereignty of the Namibians over their natural resources either to terminate such activities or to abide by the aims and purposes of the Decree.

49. The Committee had also heard the oft-repeated criticism that the national liberation movement of Namibia recognized by OAU, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), was not the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia. She believed that members must clearly understand the implications inherent in the concept of representation of the national liberation movements recognized by OAU within the framework of the United Nations. In the context of the Territories in southern Africa, where complete suppression of popular democracy and brutal enforcement of the policies of *apartheid* and racial discrimination prevailed, it was obvious that the true voice of the peoples of these Territories concerning their genuine aspirations could not and would not be heard without the groups of courageous individuals organized as the national liberation movements concerned—the groups of inhabitants of the colonial Territories which the representative of the United States, at the 1859th meeting of the Security Council, had, in a related context, correctly termed the “legitimate national liberation movements”. Therefore, when one spoke of the representation at international conferences and meetings of the national liberation movements recognized by OAU it was not a question of a juridical case of recognition by the international organizations of a nation-State, or a Government for that matter, but rather of ensuring that the freely expressed views and aspirations of the inhabitants of the Territories were duly taken into account in the proceedings relating to those Territories. As was well known, the recognition by the General Assembly of SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibians did not preclude the Assembly organs, the United Nations Council for Namibia or the Special Committee from enabling any other individuals or groups to submit their views on matters relating to their country, since those individuals and groups had, without discrimination, the right and privilege to speak out on their country's future. Indeed, she was confident that those bodies would continue to intensify their efforts to seek the views of the peoples of the Territory on the widest possible basis, in the light of the fact that, regrettably, the dispatch of visiting missions to Namibia, or for that matter to Zimbabwe, appeared to be out of the question for the time being.

50. On the Committee's recommendations relating to the extension of assistance to the colonial peoples by the

organizations within the United Nations system, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 3421 (XXX), she was constrained to observe that the majority of the administering Powers and their friends who had advocated intensified assistance within the framework of the international community to the people of the Territories concerned, were the very members who had persisted in their refusal to support the proposals in favour of the suffering people of Namibia and Zimbabwe and their national liberation movements. She wished to draw the attention of those who had lectured the Committee on the danger of politicizing the work of the specialized agencies to the provisions of the Charter which envisaged a role to be played by the international organizations concerned in relation to the Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories, in co-operation, as appropriate, with the States administering those Territories. In Namibia and Zimbabwe, where no effective administering Powers existed, the corresponding responsibility of the United Nations family of organizations was all the more serious. The people of Namibia and Zimbabwe were not expecting a supply of arms and ammunition from the international organizations; they were seeking humanitarian assistance from the organizations concerned so as to combat hunger, disease and deprivation. Indeed, a number of specialized agencies and other organizations were already in the forefront of the move to extend assistance to the peoples concerned, and the representatives of the national liberation movements had been actively participating as observers in the legislative processes of those agencies and organizations, in keeping with the resolutions adopted on the question by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Special Committee.

51. As for those foreign economic and other interests which operated in the colonial Territories in total disregard of the well-being of their inhabitants, she was comforted to note that most of the administering Powers had in recent years become increasingly conscious of the potential danger of the subjugation of indigenous economic interests to purely commercially-motivated foreign interests, and that measures were being taken, albeit in varying degrees, to ensure effective control of such activities, in co-operation with the local governments. In respect of Namibia and Southern Rhodesia, however, the prospect for the early termination of those damaging activities was far from promising, since those foreign interests had perhaps been left too long to plunder, as they pleased, the natural and human resources of the two Territories. The fact that the Committee's recommendations on the item, contained in General Assembly resolution 3398 (XXX), had once again failed to receive the support of many of the trading partners of the minority régime in Pretoria was to be deeply regretted. It was obvious that the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and the minority racist régime in South Africa continued to derive comfort and support, whether intended or unintended, from the persistent disregard by those Member States of the genuine intents and purposes of the measures called for in the resolution. She wished to appeal most sincerely to those members to reconsider their negative attitude, because they had much to offer in the efforts of the United Nations to bring about the restoration of sovereignty over their human and natural resources to the peoples of the Territories.

52. It was to be regretted that neither the Committee nor the General Assembly had been able to reach a unanimous accord on the measures to be taken to facilitate the process of decolonization in a few of the Territories that had been examined. It was her firm conviction that, irrespective of the nature of disputes regarding sovereignty or territorial claims or counter-claims that might exist, the Committee's basic guiding principle remained unchanged, namely respect for the freely expressed wishes of the people of the Territories concerned. She wished in that regard to stress once again the importance and seriousness of the solemn obligations which the administering Powers had undertaken under the relevant provisions of the Charter and the Declaration. Such responsibilities could not and should not be renounced unilaterally.

53. With respect to the remaining Territories, the Committee had, for the first time, formulated specific recommendations regarding the particular situation obtaining in most of those Territories. In that connexion, she wished only to express her sincere hope that other Territories in addition to Belize, the Seychelles and the Solomon Islands, which had already seen the emergence of self-government, would soon attain self-rule on the basis of the freely expressed wishes of their inhabitants, and that the United Nations could continue to be given the opportunity to play an important role in those exercises. As she had stated earlier, the full and unreserved co-operation of the administering Powers was most essential to the work of the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee and she appealed to those administering Powers to associate or continue to associate themselves with the related work of the United Nations bodies concerned.

54. Finally, she wished to make some brief remarks regarding the conduct of the Committee's business relating to the manner in which draft resolutions or draft decisions of the Committee were worked out by its members. It appeared that, with very few exceptions, those drafts were prepared on the initiative of Member States within one, or at most two, regional groups and that, in most cases, there appeared to have been a conspicuous absence of contributions in the related debates from Member States in a certain group. At the time of voting on those proposals, however, there were invariably many members within the latter regional group explaining why it was not possible for them to support some or all of the proposals. She wondered whether that was perhaps because of their lack of interest or concern on colonial issues in general, or whether it might be that certain States, because of their vested interests, were intentionally indifferent, or even obstructive, to measures envisaged to expedite the process of decolonization. She hoped not. She believed that the formulation of recommendations on colonial questions should not be the monopoly of a limited few: it should be a joint and concerted effort of all the members. To that end, it was all the more important that Member States which had reservations on or difficulties with such proposals should take the initiative or participate actively in the working out of formulas more readily acceptable to them, rather than refrain from putting forward their views either in the debate or during consultations, abstain from supporting the proposals, or, as had regrettably been witnessed very recently at a plenary meeting, even denounce the earnest

intent and aims of the drafters of the recommendations. She commended to those members the wise example set by some of the Nordic countries and, especially, by the representative of Australia.

55. In that context, she would be remiss in her duty if she failed to express her deep gratitude to Mr. Salim, Permanent Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania to the United Nations and Chairman of the Special Committee, for the leading role he had, as usual, played in the Committee's work, and in particular for the efforts he had made to reconcile the divergence of views which sometimes existed among the members concerned. She was certain that all the members would agree that the future of the dependent peoples would be definitely brighter if there were many more Salims. She wished to express her most sincere thanks to all the members of the Committee whose constant co-operation, understanding, patience and assistance had helped to lighten much of her work as Chairman. She also wished to express her deep satisfaction at the atmosphere of friendship in which the deliberations had taken place throughout the session and her hope that it would continue in the Committee's future work. Whatever it had been able to accomplish, its ability to do so had been greatly helped by the fact that, while the approaches of members to certain matters might have differed, members had none the less been honest, sincere, open and friendly towards one another.

56. Her deep appreciation was due to her fellow officers: the two Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Vargas-Saborio and Mr. Aream, and the Rapporteur, Mr. Quartin Santos. She especially wished to pay a tribute to Mr. Aream for his tireless efforts within the context of the work undertaken by the group of African and Asian States, where a number of draft resolutions had been formulated. She owed a personal debt of gratitude to the officers of the Committee for their co-operation and assistance.

57. Her special thanks also went to Mr. Tang Ming-chao, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs and Decolonization, and to Mr. Rifai, the Secretary of the Committee, for all the assistance they personally and their staff had given her. Her personal relationship with the staff had given her the advantage of being able to rely on them, even outside their normal duties. She thanked them for their understanding. She wished to pay a personal tribute to Mr. Tanaka and the group of loyal, industrious and faithful helpers who had worked day and night to meet the Committee's requirements. Without their help, she would not have been able to carry out her duties as effectively as she had. She also wished to express her appreciation for the contribution of the interpreters, the translators, the conference, documents and press officers and all the other Secretariat staff whose services were indispensable for the effective functioning of the Committee.

58. In conclusion, she expressed her appreciation to all those who had helped to make the work of the Fourth Committee less burdensome.

59. Mr. ARAÚJO (Guinea-Bissau) proposed that the statement made by the Chairman should be reproduced *in extenso* in the summary record of the meeting.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that, if she heard no objection, she would take it that the Committee decided to adopt that proposal, bearing in mind that the financial implications would be \$330 per page.

It was so decided.

61. After an exchange of courtesies, the CHAIRMAN declared that the Fourth Committee had completed its work for the thirtieth session.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

