

UNITED NATIONS  
**General Assembly**  
FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION  
*Official Records*

FOURTH COMMITTEE  
8th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 3 November 1992  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 8th MEETING

Chairman:

Mr. MELENDEZ-BARAHONA

(El Salvador)

UN LIBRARY

JAN 12 1993

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 98: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 99: ACTIVITIES OF THOSE FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH IMPEDE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued)

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

AGENDA ITEM 100: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 101: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (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 corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.4/47/SR.8  
12 November 1992

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH  
/...

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 98: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

Draft resolution contained in document A/47/23 (Part IV), chapter VIII, paragraph 10

1. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

2. The draft resolution was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

3. Mr. EVANS (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution, as it had in previous years. It would of course continue to comply with its obligations in respect of the United Kingdom dependent territories under Article 73 e of the United Nations Charter. It did not, however, agree with

(Mr. Evans, United Kingdom)

the statement contained in paragraph 1 of the resolution that it was for the General Assembly to decide when a Non-Self-Governing Territory had reached a level of self-government sufficient to relieve the administering Power of the obligation to submit information under Article 73 g of the Charter. Such decisions must be left to the Government of the Territory concerned and the administering Power .

AGENDA ITEM 99: ACTIVITIES OF THOSE FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH IMPEDE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued)

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

AGENDA ITEM 100: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

Draft resolution contained in document A/47/23 (Part III), chapter V, paragraph 15

Draft decision contained in document A/47/23 (Part III), chapter VI, paragraph 12

Draft resolution contained in document A/47/23 (Part IV), chapter VII, paragraph 15

4. Mr. EVANS (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States in explanation of vote before the voting on the draft resolutions and draft decision before the Committee, said, in connection with agenda item 99, that the European Community and its member States did not hesitate to oppose any activities, such as the depletion of indigenous natural resources, of foreign economic and other interests which might be impeding the process of self-determination of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. However, as in previous years, the draft resolution on the item failed to take into account that foreign investments often contributed greatly to the economic and social development of those Territories. The lack of a clear distinction between beneficial and harmful activities, and the underlying assumption that any foreign investment as such was detrimental, constituted a major flaw in the draft resolution. In that connection, the European Community recalled the appeals contained in other resolutions and decisions, previously adopted, for acceleration of the economic development of Non-Self-Governing Territories. The European Community also had reservations of principle with regard to a number of specific paragraphs in the draft

(Mr. Evans, United Kingdom)

resolution that did not conform to the Charter provisions concerning the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council.

5. The European Community and its member States wished to express their concern that the Committee once again had to deal with a draft decision relating to military activities in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. That subject was not on the list of the agenda items allocated by the General Assembly to the Fourth Committee. The European Community and its member States had made the same comments repeatedly in the past and regretted to see that, once more, they had not been taken into account.

6. The European Community recalled yet again that the situation in Namibia was the basis for the reference to apartheid under agenda item 99. Since Namibia had been independent for over two years, they felt that matters relating to apartheid should not be considered in the Fourth Committee, which dealt with decolonization. The European Community would have the opportunity of reiterating its condemnation of apartheid and racial discrimination under the appropriate General Assembly agenda items.

7. It was for those reasons that the European Community and its member States would vote against the draft resolution and the draft decision.

8. In connection with agenda item 100, the Community and its member States considered that the draft resolution on the subject unnecessarily retained 1991's contentious and therefore unhelpful language, and elements that the Community and its member States had consistently opposed in the past. The Community supported the efforts by the specialized agencies to provide humanitarian, technical and educational assistance, within their particular competence, to Territories concerned. They considered, however, that the autonomy and statutes of the specialized agencies must be respected. They also felt compelled to reiterate their opposition to the continued references to apartheid in the draft resolution on the item as well. Not only were such references totally out of place but the language proposed was far removed from reality and from the consensus language adopted by the General Assembly under the appropriate agenda items. The European Community and its member States strongly regretted that the draft resolution in question did not contribute to the attainment of the goals it shared in the field of decolonization and, in view of the considerations he had just stated, were unable to support it.

9. Mr. DZAKHAEV (Russian Federation), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that it had worked with other delegations in the Committee on decolonization to seek agreement on the texts in question and was glad that it had been possible to supersede to some extent the language used in the past. Nevertheless the texts continued to use some of the old language, and for that reason his delegation would find it necessary to vote against them. It hoped that it would be able to go on working in the Committee on decolonization for a speedy end to colonialism.

10. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution contained in document A/47/23 (part III), chapter V, paragraph 15.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Panama, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Ukraine, Uruguay.

11. The draft resolution contained in document A/47/23 (Part III), chapter V, paragraph 15, was adopted by 89 votes to 32, with 8 abstentions.

12. A recorded vote was taken on the draft decision contained in document A/47/23 (Part III), chapter VI, paragraph 12.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania,

Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Panama, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Uruguay.

13. The draft decision contained in document A/47/23 (part III), chapter VI, paragraph 12, was adopted by 90 votes to 33, with 7 abstentions.

14. Mr. MOTSWAGAE (Botswana) said that it had voted in favour of the draft decision, but, for reasons well known to members of the Committee, wished to reserve its position with respect to all the provisions in it calling for the imposition of sanctions.

15. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution contained in document A/47/23 (Part IV), chapter VII, paragraph 15.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Greece, Ireland, Japan, New Zealand, Panama, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Spain, Turkey, Uruguay.

16. The draft resolution contained in document A/47/23 (Part IV), chapter VII, paragraph 15, was adopted by 93 votes to 27, with 13 abstentions.

17. Mr. MANSO (United States of America) said that the new sense of hope and optimism with which the world now looked to the United Nations conferred on Member States a responsibility to work together in a spirit of cooperation and honesty in striving to fulfil the world's new expectations. The Committee had just adopted three resolutions that failed to live up to that responsibility or the hopes of the world's peoples. Most tragically, they mocked the true needs of the people in the few remaining Territories still working towards a greater measure of self-government.

18. The resolutions on foreign economic interests, specialized agencies and military activities could have been vehicles for discussing important and constructive ideas. Instead, they again focused on outmoded agendas and rhetoric inappropriate to the United Nations and long since bypassed by history. The legacy of those resolutions was their complete irrelevance.

19. As the United Nations struggled to come to grips with serious new issues, it could not afford the cult of irrelevance which some would perpetuate. The Organization was taking great strides to meet the needs and opportunities of the future. The commitment to relevance of the Fourth Committee's forward-looking members guaranteed that change would come to it too, despite the efforts of the few. But time was precious, and it was necessary to hurry.

20. Ms. NIELSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, confirmed their long-standing support for the decolonization process and the right of all peoples in Non-Self-Governing Territories to self-determination in accordance with their own freely expressed political aspirations. In recent years the Nordic countries had called on the Committee to direct its efforts to issues relevant to the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories. Important work remained to be done by the United Nations. The Nordic countries welcomed the work that was being done by the specialized agencies in those territories and the presentations made by the United Nations Development Programme and other agencies during the current session's general debate.

21. Despite the debate over the last two years about the need for reform of the working procedures of the Fourth Committee and the need for fundamental

(Ms. Nielsen, Denmark)

changes in some of the resolutions and decisions, the Committee was again taking action on texts almost identical to those of the last session under agenda items 99 and 100.

22. The arguments of the Nordic countries against key parts of the three drafts had been clearly stated at both of the Fourth Committee's last two sessions. They regretted that they had had to vote against the two draft resolutions and the draft decision and hoped that the voting pattern at the present session would compel a majority of the Committee to work more realistically and in a way which would be of direct relevance to the peoples of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories.

23. Mr. HAJNOCZI (Austria) said it was his delegation's view that, although the objectives set forth in the Declaration on decolonization still remained as applicable as they had been when that document was adopted, that did not mean it was unaware of the manifold changes and substantial progress achieved with regard to decolonization over the past years. The three texts on which the Committee had just voted failed to reflect those important improvements and contained language that was clearly outdated.

24. Austria did not object to a reflection in the relevant draft resolution of the view that some activities of foreign economic and other interests could impede the process of decolonization but regarded it as a major shortcoming that the text did not state that such interests undoubtedly promoted economic and social development of non-self-governing territories in many cases. Now that the independence of Namibia had been achieved, it saw no further need to address the question of apartheid in the context of decolonization, although it must remain an item of utmost priority in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly. Moreover, the language used concerning apartheid in the three texts was outdated, as it no longer reflected developments in South Africa; moreover, it continued to be important that the General Assembly should respect the prerogatives of the Security Council.

25. For the reasons given, his delegation had found it necessary to vote against all three texts. However, it hoped that the changes necessary to make the resolutions more relevant would be made in 1993. Although some steps had been taken since 1991 to make the Committee's working methods more efficient, his delegation wished to see the Committee concentrate its efforts on the real challenges with regard to decolonization. In that spirit, it welcomed the important contributions made by the United Nations and its specialized agencies as well as the international institutions associated with the United Nations to the economic and social development of Non-Self-Governing Territories and would continue to support those activities through the funding of the specialized agencies and other institutions and its positive attitude in the relevant intergovernmental bodies.



26. Mrs. CAÑAS (Argentina) said that Argentina continued to support unswervingly the decolonization process of the United Nations but had abstained in the votes just taken because the references to South Africa were not in keeping with political developments in that country, and it considered that better balanced language would promote speedier settlement of the situation there.

AGENDA ITEM 101: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (continued)

27. The CHAIRMAN announced that Burkina Faso, Malaysia and Senegal had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/47/L.4.

28. Draft resolution A/C.4/47/L.4 was adopted without objection.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued) (A/47/23 (Part V), chap. IX, para. 31 and (Part VI), chap. X, paras. 25 and 26; A/C.4/47/L.2 and L.3)

29. Mr. DE SOUZA (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.4/47/L.2 on the question of Western Sahara, informed the Committee, with respect to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, that the Secretary-General intended within the next four weeks to submit a full report to the Security Council on his Special Representative's current efforts to reactivate the implementation of the settlement plan but was in the meantime proposing to maintain the existing deployment and staffing of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO). That would have no financial implications for the regular budget because MINURSO was made being financed under a separate assessment. As to the activities referred to in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, they had been originally programmed under section 6C.2 of the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993 but had, after the restructuring of the Secretariat, been transferred to section 37 (Department of Political Affairs) of the budget and would fall under subprogramme 3 of programme 4 of the medium-term plan for the period 1992-1997, if the proposed revisions to programme 4 recommended by the Committee for Programme and Coordination in its report (A/47/16 (Part II), paras. 43-54) were adopted by the General Assembly at its current session.

30. With regard to the programme budget implications of the draft proposals on the Territories covered under agenda item 18 that were contained in document A/47/23 (Part V), chapter IX, paragraph 31, and (Part VI), chapter X, paragraphs 25 and 26, it was estimated that those draft proposals would not give rise to additional costs or programmatic changes since adequate provision had been made under section 6A of the programme budget, subsequently transferred to section 37.

Draft resolution A/C.4/47/L.2 on the question of Western Sahara

31. The CHAIRMAN said that, after consultations with the parties concerned and with all the interested parties, agreement had been reached on the draft resolution on Western Sahara, which he was submitting as a text from the Chairman. He thanked the parties concerned for the efforts they had made to achieve a consensus, and all the interested parties for their cooperation.

32. Mr. GAMBARI (Nigeria), speaking in explanation of position on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Jamaica, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, St. Kitts and Nevis, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe, observed that those Member States had been among those which had initiated the joint good-offices mission of the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity and the Secretary-General of the United Nations established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 40/50, and which had introduced several successive resolutions supporting the peace process in Western Sahara. At a time when the peace process was at a critical stage, those same delegations supported draft resolution A/47/C.4/L.2, in particular paragraph 3, and were pleased that the Committee had again reached consensus on the question of Western Sahara.

33. Mr. SNOUSSI (Morocco), speaking in explanation of position, observed that, in view of the Chairman's determined efforts to obtain the consensus, in advance, of all members of the Committee on the draft resolution in question, he found that the statement just made by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of a group of traditional sponsors of resolutions on the question was not only superfluous but counterproductive, and discourteous to both the Chairman and Morocco.

34. It was true, however, that the Sahara issue had reached a decisive stage. Thanks to the untiring good offices of the Secretary-General since 1985 in search of a peaceful solution to the question, a settlement process had been developed and implemented in stages under the authority of the Security Council, and the Council was currently continuing to exercise in respect of Western Sahara the functions assigned to it in the Charter, as the Secretary-General had noted in his latest report on the matter (A/47/506, para. 25).

35. Morocco commended the Chairman for his considerable and much appreciated efforts, which had allowed him to submit a draft resolution on the Sahara that could be adopted without a vote.

36. Draft resolution A/C.4/47/L.2 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.4/47/L.3 on the question of Gibraltar

30. Draft resolution A/C.4/47/L.3 was adopted without objection.

Draft resolution on the question of New Caledonia (document A/47/23 (Part V), chapter IX, paragraph 31)

31. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea), endorsing the position of the South Pacific Forum countries as set out in document A/47/391 and reiterated recently in the plenary Assembly, expressed the hope that New Caledonia would achieve self-determination and independence as soon as possible, with the active involvement of the United Nations and in accordance with the wishes of the Kanaks and their representatives and all the people of New Caledonia, working in cooperation with the Administering Power within the framework of the Matignon Agreement. Encouraged by the positive steps being taken by the parties concerned, his Government hoped that the economic, social and political imbalances in the Territory due to its colonial history would be redressed. The South Pacific Forum had just established a fund for the education and training of the Kanaks, in order to ensure effective participation by the indigenous population. The Administering Power and the other parties to the Matignon Agreement should begin preparations on the establishment of an accurate electoral roll for the forthcoming 1998 referendum.

32. The draft resolution on New Caledonia was the product of consultations with all parties concerned and reflected the actual situation in the Territory. It had the support of the administering Power, and he hoped that the Committee would adopt it by consensus.

40. The draft resolution on the question of New Caledonia, contained in document A/47/23 (Part V), chapter IX, paragraph 31, was adopted without objection.

Draft decision I on the question of Pitcairn (A/47/23 (Part VI), chapter X, paragraph 26)

41. Draft decision I on the question of Pitcairn, contained in document A/47/23 (Part VI), chapter X, paragraph 26, was adopted by consensus.

Draft decision II on the question of St. Helena (A/47/23 (Part VI), chapter X, paragraph 26)

42. A recorded vote was taken on draft decision II on the question of St. Helena.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi,

Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine.

43. Draft decision II was adopted by 96 votes to 2, with 34 abstentions.

44. Mr. EVANS (United Kingdom) said that the draft decision on St. Helena was, as in previous years, unacceptable to his Government since it referred to military facilities on Ascension Island which, though linked to St. Helena for administrative reasons, was not on the Committee's agenda. Furthermore, the suggestion that the very limited military facilities in question could be a source of concern regarding aggression or interference in neighbouring States was incomprehensible. His Government's policy towards the British Dependent Territories was conducted fully in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. Accordingly, his delegation had voted against the draft decision.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.