



## CONTENTS

Agenda item 12:	Page
Question of convening an international conference on problems of the human environment ( <i>resumed from the 1553rd meeting and concluded</i> ) . . . . .	153
Agenda item 25:	
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 ( <i>resumed from the 1553rd meeting</i> ) . . . . .	153

President: Mr. PÉREZ GUERRERO (Venezuela).

## AGENDA ITEM 12

**Question of convening an international conference on problems of the human environment (E/4466/Add.1, E/4553; E/L.1226/Rev.1, E/L.1227) (*resumed from the 1553rd meeting and concluded*)**

1. Mr. ÅSTRÖM (Sweden), introducing the revised draft resolution (E/L.1226/Rev.1), said that most of the suggestions made during the Council's discussions had been incorporated in the revised text. In the first preambular paragraph the words "and other forms of soil deterioration" had been inserted between the words "erosion" and "secondary". In the second preambular paragraph the word "thereof" had been inserted between the words "effects" and "on". In the third preambular paragraph the words "and in order to protect and improve the natural surroundings in the interest of man" had been added after the word "environment". The final preambular paragraph, which was considered superfluous, had been deleted. In the second line of operative paragraph 1 the word "including" had been substituted for the word "and" between the words "above" and "in". Operative paragraph 2 had been redrafted to take into account various suggestions made with regard to the preparatory work to be undertaken if a conference was convened. Some minor drafting changes had been made in operative paragraph 3.

2. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) stressed that his delegation had not proposed amendments to the original draft resolution in any spirit of obstruction. It was fully aware of the problems of environment. It merely felt that the case for a conference had not been proved and that it might be better not to prejudge the outcome of the General Assembly's discussion of the subject. The United Kingdom supported the revised draft resolution.

3. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) and Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium) supported the revised draft resolution subject to drafting changes in the French text.

4. Mr. YOKOTA (Japan) said that he was in favour of the revised draft resolution on the understanding that his support would not prejudice his delegation's position in the General Assembly.

5. Mr. GREGH (France) supported the revised draft resolution subject to drafting changes in the French text and on the understanding that the General Assembly might decide to deal with the problem by some means other than an international conference. In that connexion, he considered operative paragraph 2(e) very pertinent.

6. Mr. ÅSTRÖM (Sweden) agreed, at the suggestion of the Turkish representative, to insert the words "of Member States" after the word "Governments" in operative paragraph 2.

*The revised draft resolution (E/L.1226/Rev.1), as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

## AGENDA ITEM 25

**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 (E/4546, E/4547, E/4557 and Corr.1) (*resumed from the 1553rd meeting*)**

7. Mr. MILI (International Telecommunication Union) said that ITU was giving no technical or financial assistance to South Africa, Southern Rhodesia or Portugal. It had taken a number of steps to implement the Declaration in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). In 1965 the Conference of Plenipotentiaries had decided to exclude South Africa and had also decided that it should not be invited to regional conferences for Africa held by ITU. In 1967 the Administrative Council of ITU had decided that the South African Government no longer had any right to represent the Territory of South West Africa. In 1966 the Administrative Council had decided that Southern Rhodesia should not be invited to take part in any ITU conference or meeting. In 1965 the Conference of Plenipotentiaries had strongly condemned the colonialist policy of the Portuguese Government. In addition, the Administrative Council would be giving further consideration to General Assembly resolutions 2270 (XXII), 2307 (XXII), 2311 (XXII), 2324 (XXII) and 2326 (XXII) at its next session.

8. Mr. COX (Sierra Leone) referred to the answer by the representative of IBRD to his question regarding the possibility of the Bank granting assistance in any form, including financial aid, to South Africa, Southern Rhodesia or Portugal (1553rd meeting). He was not satisfied with that answer and felt that the Council should not accept a situation in which matters of importance might be kept from its knowledge on the grounds that the

Bank's relations with its members were confidential. He still wished to know whether the Bank envisaged any situation in which it might give aid to the three countries he had mentioned. If no reply was forthcoming from the IBRD representative before the end of the current session, he would request the Secretariat to follow up the matter until a reply was received.

9. Miss JEFFREYS (International Atomic Energy Agency) said that General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII) had little direct bearing on the Agency's activities because of their being of such a highly specialized scientific and technical nature. Operative paragraph 3 of the resolution called for the extension of aid to the oppressed peoples of Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese domination. IAEA was willing to extend assistance, but no requests for help had yet been received from any refugee or refugee organization. Apart from advanced training it was difficult to imagine what kind of help in the sphere of nuclear science might be given to the peoples of those—or other—parts of the African continent, of whose misery the world was reminded daily. Operative paragraph 4 of the same resolution recommended that no assistance should be granted to South Africa or Portugal while they continued their racial and colonial policies. Those countries were both members of IAEA, but for some time they had not received any assistance from the Agency under its regular technical assistance programme or any other programme or trust fund, including the United Nations Development Programme.

10. The Agency, being completely centralized with no regional committees or offices, had not encountered the problems mentioned by the representatives of WHO and FAO. It had no relations with Southern Rhodesia.

11. Mr. EL-BOURI (Libya) said that the General Assembly had made many appeals to the specialized agencies, especially IBRD and IMF, to refrain from granting any financial, economic or technical assistance to minority régimes in Africa. They were, in particular, required to comply with operative paragraph 3 of resolution 2311 (XXII). According to the statements made in the Council and the information given in the President's report (E/4547), the specialized agencies were prepared to apply such resolutions. The Council had been informed of their efforts to assist peoples seeking to free themselves from colonialism and to aid African refugees. It was difficult to discuss the question properly, since most of the international institutions had not yet adopted definite plans in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII) and since the Chairman of the Special Committee had been unable to take part in the Council's debate. It seemed, however, that in their efforts to implement resolution 2311 (XXII) the specialized agencies should concentrate on three matters: first, they should increase their assistance to refugees, particularly in education and vocational and administrative training; secondly, they should strengthen their assistance and training programmes in colonial Territories, with a view to raising the living standards of dependent peoples and enabling them to achieve independence quickly; thirdly, they should cease granting any assistance, particularly economic and

financial assistance, to the minority and racist régimes which refused to implement General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). In that connexion, attention should be paid to the need for co-operation and co-ordination between the specialized agencies themselves and between them and the Organization of African Unity, in accordance with operative paragraph 3 of resolution 2311 (XXII).

12. Mr. RIDGE (Universal Postal Union) said that UPU was concerned with one activity only, namely, international postal exchanges and related services. It naturally hoped that a suitable solution could be found to the question under discussion, but the action it could take in response to any General Assembly resolution was limited by the scope of its activity and the legal provisions governing it. Under its constitution UPU was prevented from taking collective action to exclude a member country from the Union. It had, however, taken some measures. For instance, South Africa had not been authorized to participate in the Universal Postal Congress held in Vienna in 1964. At the same time the Congress had adopted a resolution condemning Portugal's colonial policy and had decided that neither Portugal nor South Africa should be a member of the two bodies set up to deal with administrative, financial, legal and technical matters in the interval between two Congresses. The Union had no direct relations with Southern Rhodesia. Neither South Africa, Portugal, nor Southern Rhodesia received any assistance, technical or other, from the Union or played any part in the system of technical co-operation which was developing within the Union. At its first meeting in May 1968 the Executive Council of the Union had taken note of General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII) and decided that, since collective action was not possible, the resolution should be circulated to the postal administrations of all member countries, each of which would be able to take any measures it thought fit.

13. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII) contained clear and precise provisions on the role of the specialized agencies in achieving the objectives laid down in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It was therefore natural that Council members should ask what the specialized agencies had done since the adoption of the resolution. Unfortunately, that question was not answered in the documents submitted to the Council. Nevertheless, certain pertinent facts were known. It was known, for instance, that although some specialized agencies, particularly WHO, had decided to discontinue assistance to Portugal and South Africa, others, including the ILO, had taken no decision concerning the discontinuance of assistance to Portugal. Furthermore, it was common knowledge that the channels through which financial assistance was afforded to colonial régimes were still open, since IBRD continued to grant loans to Portugal and South Africa. Had it not been for the support afforded them by certain circles in the West, some of the countries which still denied peoples their independence would have passed into history. Certain Western Powers, including the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Portugal and the Federal Republic of Germany,

were preventing implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. To cover up their activities, they used hypocritical arguments about the technical character of the assistance granted by the specialized agencies. His delegation shared the concern of others regarding the lack of action by most specialized agencies in implementing General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII). It appeared from most of their statements that the specialized agencies did not intend to take any immediate measures against colonialists and racialists.

14. As to the question addressed to the representative of IBRD by the representative of Sierra Leone, it was extremely rare to hear an international civil servant give such a cynical answer to a member of the Economic and Social Council. It was perhaps in order to suggest that the question should be addressed to the master, rather than a servant, of the Bank.

15. As a first step in its efforts to secure implementation of resolution 2311 (XXII) the Council should require IBRD and the other specialized agencies to implement fully the Assembly's decision that no further assistance should be granted to the Portuguese and South African Governments or the Southern Rhodesian régime. The Council should also recommend the Bank to require the return of loans granted to Portugal and South Africa, which used them to suppress national liberation movements. The specialized agencies should increase their contacts with those United Nations bodies concerned with questions of decolonization and make efforts to co-ordinate their activities in the matter. The Secretariat, for its part, should prepare a concise report on the implementation by the specialized agencies of General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII). When it received such a report, the Council would be in a better position to fulfil the mandate entrusted to it in operative paragraph 6 of that resolution.

16. Mr. CLAMOUNGOU (Chad) drew attention to operative paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII) and paragraph 2 of the Secretary-General's note (E/4546). It was essential that the specialized agencies and international institutions concerned should work out appropriate measures to put into effect the resolutions of the General Assembly relating to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The statements by the representatives of the ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, WMO and IMCO and the High Commissioner for Refugees, which had described steps being taken to implement resolution 2311 (XXII), were encouraging, but those by the representatives of ITU, UPU and IBRD, which had contained debatable and outmoded arguments for failing to comply with United Nations directives, bordered on hypocrisy.

17. The reply given by the representative of IBRD at the 1553rd meeting to the question put by the representative of Sierra Leone could only be described as impertinent. The Council was the main body responsible for co-ordinating and controlling the activities of the various members of the United Nations family, including the Bank, and the representative of Sierra Leone, a member

country, in asking his question, was merely fulfilling the investigatory functions normal to any control body. The world was aware of the Bank's aloof attitude to the problems concerning the United Nations, its propensity to shirk important issues and its tendency to grant only small credits to the developing countries. The European reconstruction work for which the Bank had been established had been completed and it must now adapt itself to the new conditions prevailing in the world. Rather than sheltering behind the argument that it was prevented by its constitution from revealing certain matters to the Council, it should take the steps necessary to enable itself to implement resolution 2311 (XXII). The delegation of Chad hoped that the Bank, and the other agencies which had advanced similar arguments, would realize that the time had come to face reality.

18. Mr. EKONDY-AKALA (Congo, Brazzaville) said that the United Nations attitude to the independence of colonial peoples had been based in part on the moral debt contracted by European colonialist countries to the peoples which had agreed to help them fight nazism. But despite that debt the peoples under colonial domination had had to fight for their own liberty. The Charter of the United Nations had been treated as a mere piece of paper in so far as the question of colonialism was concerned. Recently, South Africa had defied all nations striving for justice and peace by refusing to heed the decisions of the United Nations on South West Africa. That illustrated the arrogance and insincerity of the imperialist Powers, which still endeavoured to keep certain countries in a state of subjugation.

19. The specialized agencies, for their part, had done little to implement General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII) and other resolutions on the subject. His delegation reserved the right to speak at a later stage on the measures the United Nations should take to enable peoples still under foreign domination to achieve their legitimate aspirations. The African States were still confident that the United Nations and the specialized agencies would do all in their power to implement General Assembly decisions on the matter.

20. Before concluding he wished to suggest that in future the representatives of IBRD should give less cynical answers to questions asked by Council members than the one given to the representative of Sierra Leone at the current session.

21. Mr. KOROSSO (Tanzania) said that his delegation appreciated the information given in the documents before the Council and noted that some specialized agencies had made minor attempts to implement General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII). With the exception of UNHCR, however, the agencies had not taken the action expected of them. Some of the activities on which they had provided information had been undertaken before the adoption of resolution 2311 (XXII). It should be noted that those measures, and the measures taken by FAO as described in paragraph 26 of document E/4557, had not been taken on the initiative of the specialized agencies, but on that of the independent African States. Despite the recommendation in resolution 2311 (XXII) that the specialized agencies should take urgent action,

it appeared from paragraphs 25 and 26 of document E/4557 that neither the ILO nor FAO had yet taken a final decision on the question. Similarly, it seemed that UNESCO, content with the steps it had taken in 1966, had given no serious consideration to resolution 2311 (XXII). It should be noted in that connexion that if the steps taken in 1966 had been sufficiently effective there would have been no need for the General Assembly to adopt resolution 2311 (XXII). WHO's action to amend its constitution with a view to permitting measures to be taken against South Africa was welcome. It was disappointing to learn, however, that as Southern Rhodesia was only an associated member of the Organization, WHO's relations with it went through the United Kingdom. For how long would the United Kingdom continue to shelter the rebel Rhodesian régime in WHO? The representative of UPU had said that the Union was prevented by its constitution from taking effective measures to implement resolution 2311 (XXII). Why could not steps be taken to amend the constitution? IBRD, IMF and IMCO were among the institutions which had done nothing to implement resolution 2311 (XXII) on the ground that they were prevented by their constitutions from taking effective action. Those organizations too, should realize that it was within their power to change their constitutions.

22. Nor was there any indication that the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations were co-ordinating their activities with the Organization of African Unity. Each agency appeared to be acting independently and, with the exception of UNHCR, their individual efforts amounted to little. His delegation therefore hoped that they would examine the situation more carefully and co-ordinate their efforts along the lines suggested by the General Assembly.

23. His country, owing to its geographical situation near Southern Rhodesia, Portuguese Territories in Africa and South Africa itself and its opposition to racial discrimination, had often been the victim of violations of its air-space. It had had to sever diplomatic relations with the United Kingdom on the Rhodesian question, with the result that it had forfeited aid from that country. It was also in a position to appreciate the suffering being inflicted on the majority of the inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and areas under Portuguese occupation.

24. For all those reasons, he hoped that the representative of IBRD would give the Council a fair and frank reply to the questions put to him. His delegation, together with others, was preparing specific recommendations on the matter under consideration for submission to the Council.

25. Mr. KRISHNAN (India) noted that, despite the many resolutions and decisions adopted on the subject, very little progress had been made towards the ultimate goal of complete decolonization. However, it was gratifying to see from the President's report that the process of consultation between the President of the Council and the Chairman of the Special Committee, on the one hand, and the heads of the specialized agencies, on the other, had been initiated and would apparently continue;

it was vital that the activities of organizations in the United Nations system should be co-ordinated with a view to the implementation of the Declaration.

26. Although the relevant paragraphs of document E/4557 and the supplementary statements made by the representatives of the specialized agencies in the Council indicated that steps were being taken to implement General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII), much still remained to be done. Various difficulties and obstacles admittedly had to be overcome, owing to the fact that the approach of each specialized agency varied, depending on the nature of its activities and its constitutional position. But the very purpose of the Council's discussion was to determine how each specialized agency could best contribute to the common goal.

27. Unfortunately, the information supplied by the specialized agencies indicated that some of them had adopted a rather passive attitude. Although their position might be correct from a legal and technical standpoint, it was desirable that they should adopt a more dynamic approach. They shared the responsibility for decolonization with the General Assembly, and should go further and suggest ways and means by which they themselves could speed up the process, as indicated in the last sentence of paragraph 8 of document E/4547. They were naturally reluctant to become involved in political issues. But decolonization was a cause to which the international community was committed and no longer a political issue, so that any action they took in that field would be in accordance with the wishes of the international community and not irrelevant to their work.

28. His delegation would be happy to co-operate with the Tanzanian delegation in the preparation of recommendations for action by the Council.

29. Mr. BRUNI CELLI (Venezuela) said that the information supplied by the specialized agencies would help the Council to implement paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII). Venezuela attached great importance to the implementation of operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of that resolution, and its representatives in the specialized agencies had firmly supported any action proposed along those lines. In particular his delegation supported the activities of the ILO referred to in the last sentence of paragraph 24 of document E/4557 and, at the meeting of the Governing Body in November 1968, would urge further action. His delegation also hoped that the FAO Council, at its October session, would decide to take more direct action along the lines suggested by the General Assembly.

30. Venezuela was also keenly interested in the action being taken by the other specialized agencies, and noted that some of them had explained why they could not do more than they were doing at present. His delegation hoped that those specialized agencies which had not yet taken action, such as IBRD, would take steps to apply operative paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII), subject to their constitutional limitations. In any event, as a result of the Council's discussion and the Secretary-General's report to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, the Special Committee would

be placed in a better position to co-ordinate activities and to overcome any remaining difficulties.

31. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom), referring to the Tanzanian representative's observations, assured him that the United Kingdom was in no way sheltering the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. That territory's position as an associated member of WHO was in accordance not only with its own constitutional position but also with the constitutional position of WHO, and the United Kingdom had no knowledge whatever of any direct contacts between Southern Rhodesia and WHO.

32. Nor was the United Kingdom channelling any aid to Southern Rhodesia. On the contrary, its policy was to intensify the sanctions imposed on the Territory since it wished to deny its illegal régime aid from any source whatever.

33. The United Kingdom had welcomed the resumption of diplomatic relations with Tanzania, and was confident that any minor disputes that might have arisen were a thing of the past.

34. The USSR representative had referred to the United Kingdom in disparaging terms, and had included it in a list of allegedly colonialist Powers. It was unclear what the purport of his remarks had been but the United Kingdom thought its record of decolonization was fairly creditable.

35. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said his delegation had hoped to hear constructive suggestions from the colonialist Powers on the item under consideration, and specifically from the United Kingdom representative concerning Southern Rhodesia, where the present situation had been brought about by lack of action on the part of the United Kingdom. Referring to paragraph 32 of document E/4557, he said it would be interesting, for example, to learn the exact nature of the relations between WHO and the illegal Smith régime, and what steps would be taken to prevent the further development of such relations. It would also be interesting to hear from Portugal's NATO allies what steps they were taking through the specialized agencies or other organizations to put an end to colonialism in its African Territories.

36. He regretted that the statements by the specialized agencies had been of a rather nebulous character, and his delegation was considering the advisability of recommending that the Council should elicit further information from them.

37. Mr. COX (Sierra Leone) asked the United Kingdom representative whether he considered that Southern

Rhodesia, whose régime had been declared illegal by the United Kingdom Government, should continue to be an associate member of WHO.

38. He also asked whether the WHO representative considered that a Territory whose régime had been declared illegal by the Power through which it derived its status should remain an associate member of that Organization.

39. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the United Kingdom representative's remarks, reiterated that the policy pursued by the Western Powers, including the United Kingdom, of assisting the colonialists should be condemned, as any such assistance was at variance with the Declaration. Those Powers frequently used the specialized agencies to strengthen colonialist and racist régimes, and their reactionary policy was often concealed by hypocritical talk about the technical character of the specialized agencies.

40. Mr. EKONDY-AKALA (Congo, Brazzaville) said that the tentative resumption of relations by African countries with the United Kingdom should not be interpreted as a weakening of their position on the Rhodesian problem. Those countries considered that the United Kingdom was primarily responsible for the present situation in Southern Rhodesia and were not taken in by talk of sanctions. In that connexion he wondered what would have happened had the Africans of Rhodesia taken up arms against the white minority; surely the United Kingdom would not have been content to brand the black régime illegal but would have suppressed it by force, as indeed had happened quite recently in Gabon.

41. Mr. ESTABLIE (France) regretted that the Congolese representative had seen fit to mention Gabon, which was not a member of the Council and where the situation was quite different from the one under discussion.

42. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that no purpose would be served if the Council were to go into the constitutional details of the Rhodesian problem, which had, in any event, been exhaustively discussed in other United Nations bodies.

43. He assured the representatives of the African countries that the United Kingdom was seeking to restore legality in Rhodesia, but could not accept the Congolese representative's suggestion that force might have been used there, in other circumstances.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.