

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly

FORTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

FOURTH COMMITTEE

14th meeting

held on

Thursday, 25 October 1990

at 10 a.m.

New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 14th MEETING

Chairman:

Mr. ADOUKI

(Congo)

CONTENTS

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)

AGENDA ITEM 111: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 113: 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 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 114: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 115: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (continued)

General debate (continued)

Consideration of draft resolutions

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 DC2/250,
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.4/45/SR.14
12 November 1990
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

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/45/23 (Parts V and VI); A/45/644 and Corr.1; A/C.4/45/L.2, L.3, L.7 and L.8)

AGENDA ITEM 111: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 a OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/45/23 (Parts V and VI))

AGENDA ITEM 113: 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) (A/45/3 (chaps. I and VI, sect. D), A/45/23 (Part V))

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/45/3 (chaps. I and VI, sect. D))

AGENDA ITEM 114: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued) (A/45/553, A/C.4/45/L.5)

AGENDA ITEM 115: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (continued) (A/45/560, A/C.4/45/L.6)

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. HASBI (Morocco), referring to the question of Western Sahara, said that his country had never declined a concrete and responsible dialogue and that since 1981 it had been arguing at the highest level for a referendum to be held in the Territory with a view to a peaceful, just and lasting resolution of the question and the realization of the ideals of all the peoples of the Maghreb.

2. In the existing circumstances Morocco sincerely hoped for a final and just settlement of the question of Western Sahara and reiterated its determination to make its contribution to the efforts to achieve that end; it maintained constructive contacts with the Secretary-General and recognized the contribution which he was making. In confirmation of its position and its readiness to move forward, his delegation agreed that the draft resolution on the item should be adopted without a vote.

3. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea) said that the decolonization process was far from complete, and the Government and people of Papua New Guinea fully supported the proclamation by the United Nations of the period 1990-2000 as the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism.

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

4. On the question of New Caledonia, his delegation welcomed the active participation of France in the work of the Fourth Committee and its contribution to the consideration of the question of New Caledonia and a number of other Non-Self-Governing Territories; it called upon France to transmit the necessary information under Article 73 g of the Charter.

5. Many Kanaks had lost their lives in the struggle for freedom and independence, but since the signing of the Matignon and Rue Ondinot Agreements New Caledonia had enjoyed relative peace and stability. His delegation urged the administering Power to transfer more political and governmental powers to the Kanaks. They must be given an opportunity to participate fully in the social, economic, political and cultural life of their own land.

6. It was quite clear from the statement by the French delegation at the previous meeting that the administering Power had no clear policy or plan for the self-determination and independence of New Caledonia. France's nuclear tests programme and militarization of its Non-Self-Governing Territories, including New Caledonia, were a serious concern to Papua New Guinea. The French authorities had placed two time-bombs in the South Pacific: firstly, if New Caledonia did not exercise its right to self-determination and independence in the near future, there could be serious political and social unrest in the Territory; secondly, France's programme of nuclear tests and disposal of nuclear wastes in the Territory created a threat of radioactive contamination. Both those issues had serious implications for peace and security in the South Pacific region and throughout the world. The establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific was impossible until the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the region received independence.

7. His delegation believed that any act of self-determination must be consistent with the principles and practices of the United Nations and that all options, including independence, should remain open. An effort must be made in New Caledonia to educate the population about all the available options - an effort which was essential to any genuine act of self-determination. The administering Power, together with the United Nations, must assist in that process.

8. Papua New Guinea appealed to France for its full co-operation in the implementation in New Caledonia of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

9. Mr. MENAT (France), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was regrettable that in his statement the representative of Papua New Guinea had raised an issue - the nuclear tests carried out by France - which was not on the Committee's agenda. As the readily available reports of many scientific missions to the region and the data published by the French Government demonstrated, the nuclear tests in question did not harm the interests of the States of the region, the health of its population, or its environment.

The meeting was suspended at 11.55 a.m. and resumed at 12.20 p.m.

Consideration of draft resolutions

10. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take a decision on the draft resolutions and decisions listed in document A/C.4/45/L.7.

Draft resolution contained in chapter VIII, paragraph 9, of document A/45/23 (Part V)

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, 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, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

12. The draft resolution was adopted by 136 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

13. Mr. HARKIN (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because of the language of paragraph 2, according to which the General Assembly would decide when the administering Power's obligation to transmit information with respect to the Non-Self-Governing Territory would cease. The United Kingdom considered that such a decision should be taken by the Government of the respective Territory and by the administering Power.

14. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of item 111.

Draft resolution contained in chapter VII, paragraph 18, of document A/45/23 (Part V)

Explanations of vote

15. Mr. HAJNOCZI (Austria) said that unfortunately the fourteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 17 of the draft resolution before the Fourth Committee included language that went beyond the thematic scope of the draft. Austria opposed the practice of singling out individual countries. It would therefore abstain, and hoped that the 1991 draft would enable the Committee to express international support for the role of the specialized agencies in the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

16. Mr. MEZZALANA (Italy), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that the accession of Namibia to independence and the dramatic changes in the world over the past year should have favoured a further rapprochement of views in the Fourth Committee and should have led to a realistic draft resolution. However, the text not only contained the previous year's contentious and, therefore, unhelpful terms, but also reintroduced elements that the Twelve had consistently opposed in the past.

17. The Twelve supported the efforts by the specialized agencies to provide humanitarian, technical and educational assistance to Territories covered under the current agenda item. They considered, however, that the autonomy and statutes of the specialized agencies must be respected.

18. The Twelve felt compelled to reiterate their opposition to and concern at the continued reference to apartheid in the context of decolonization. Not only was such reference totally out of place, but the language proposed was removed from reality and far from the consensus language adopted by the General Assembly under the appropriate agenda items. In particular, the Twelve found the fourteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 17 unacceptable, and were convinced that the total isolation of South Africa would undermine the efforts aimed at eliminating apartheid. Furthermore, the Twelve strongly objected to the singling out of an individual country in those paragraphs. Accordingly, they were unable to support the draft resolution.

19. Mr. SIGURDSSON (Iceland), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, said they agreed that the specialized agencies had an important role with regard to the economic and social development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Consequently, the Nordic countries had provided significant humanitarian, technical and other assistance to peoples who had not yet secured their right of self-determination.

(Mr. Sigurdsson, Iceland)

20. Since the adoption of the 1989 resolution, there had been important improvements in the international political climate. Instead of reflecting those positive developments, the 1990 text was more confrontational and represented a major set-back.

21. The Nordic countries regretted that the Special Committee had returned to the practice of singling out individual countries or groups of countries that allegedly maintained extensive links with South Africa and co-operated with it in various fields. The Nordic countries strongly opposed the provisions in the fourteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 17 of the draft resolution. Those paragraphs were also irrelevant to the substance of the matter concerned. For those reasons, the Nordic countries could not support the draft resolution.

22. Ms. BIRD (Australia) said that her delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution. Regretfully, it was obliged to take that step because of the wording of the fourteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 17, which implied that contact with South Africa, including diplomatic contact, was tantamount to support for apartheid. Her Government, which maintained diplomatic links with South Africa, had been in the forefront in pressing for effective measures designed to bring apartheid to an end. Her delegation considered that such links were useful in maintaining pressure towards that end. In addition, Australia opposed the practice of singling out individual countries in the text before the Committee.

23. Mr. GREEN (Canada) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution on item 113, although there were many elements in the text that merited its support. The simple inclusion of references to apartheid would not have been sufficient reason for Canada to vote against the draft resolution. However, the language relating to apartheid was outdated, unrealistic and inconsistent with work being carried out elsewhere in the United Nations. Moreover, Canada could not support a draft resolution that condemned diplomatic contacts with South Africa. His delegation believed that such contacts had been, and continued to be, effective in helping to bring about peaceful and fundamental change in South Africa.

24. Mr. TENNE (Israel) said that the Committee again had to consider a draft resolution that bore little resemblance to reality. The text was partisan and polemical; it was designed not to solve problems, but to create them. It reflected a policy of confrontation, rather than a spirit of consensus. If the Committee wanted results to flow from its draft resolutions, it had to strive for agreement and understanding.

25. It would be wrong to speak of a collective responsibility on the part of the Special Committee as a whole for the situation that had arisen. Politicized amendments had been foisted upon the draft by one person: the Rapporteur, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

26. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of the racist Zionist entity in the territory of occupied Palestine had completely deviated from an explanation of vote, and should pay attention to the need to observe the rules of procedure.

27. Mr. TENNE (Israel), reminded the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic that it was standard practice in United Nations organs to refer to countries by their names. "The Zionist entity" was not his country's name. In referring to Syria, he always used the designation "the Syrian Arab Republic", although he could have called it "the Syrian Arab Dictatorship" or "the Syrian Arab Tyranny".

28. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, appealed to the previous speaker to observe the rules of procedure. A statement in explanation of vote could not be used to criticize other delegations.

29. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to observe the voting procedure.

30. Mr. TENNE (Israel) said that the amendments being forced on the Committee by the Syrian Arab Republic served only the political goals of that country's Government but hardly the goal of decolonization. The singling out of Israel was not only unfair and untrue; it was a blatant misrepresentation of Israel's relations with developing countries. By way of example, he said that in the current year the Government of Israel was offering scholarships for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories under a large number of programmes. Hundreds of black South Africans had been trained in Israel side by side with tens of thousands of other trainees from countries of Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa, Asia and the South Pacific. Hundreds of development projects had been successfully run by Israeli experts in those countries over the years. He wondered whether the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic could report similar achievements, or whether he could be proud of the achievements of the Syrian army in Beirut or of Syrian co-operation with international terrorists.

31. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, said that since the question of Lebanon was not on the agenda for the meeting, it could not be discussed in statements made in explanation of vote. He could not tell whether the representative of the Zionist entity was playing the fool or was really a fool. What Syria wanted for Lebanon was nothing more than what the Lebanese people themselves wanted.

32. Mr. TENNE (Israel) said that his delegation found it necessary to recommend that other delegations should vote against the draft resolution, in the hope that the Special Committee would one day submit a fair and balanced text based on understanding.

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Zaire.

34. The draft resolution was adopted by 105 votes to 12, with 23 abstentions.

Explanations of vote

35. **Mr. SHAHEED** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in keeping with its traditional commitment to the cause of decolonization. The text was the result of open and extensive informal consultations in which almost all delegations had taken part. It was essentially the same in nature as corresponding resolutions adopted in previous years. That was due to the fact that the objectives defined therein had not yet been achieved. While changes were indeed taking place throughout the world, it could not be said that they had a bearing on the right of peoples to self-determination. In its references to countries, the Special Committee had not used unseemly language; there was nothing insulting about such references. His delegation had listened patiently to the statements made during the debate by a number of delegations. It respected their views, even though it considered some of their observations inaccurate and questionable.

36. Mr. EHLERS (Uruguay) said that his delegation, faithful to its traditional stand in favour of all efforts undertaken by the international community with a view to ensuring the success of the decolonization process, had voted for the draft resolution. It considered, however, that the text of the resolution touched upon issues which, in view of recent developments, were no longer timely. Uruguay objected to the wording of the fourteenth preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 17 because it felt that it would be a mistake to lose touch with the respective parties.

37. Mr. GUVEN (Turkey) said that his country, which believed that assistance to the social and economic development of Non-Self-Governing Territories was an absolutely essential pre-condition for their accession to independence and attached great importance to the role of international organizations in that connection, had always supported resolutions designed to contribute towards constructive co-operation between those organizations and colonial territories. His delegation's hopes for a consensus text had not been realized; it regretted that certain elements of the resolution just adopted were unrelated to the topic under consideration and merely diverted attention from the central issue, and had abstained from voting in the hope that a more balanced text would be adopted the following year.

38. Ms. CAÑAS (Argentina) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but wished to enter a strong reservation with regard to the references contained in the fourteenth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 17 to countries with which Argentina maintained normal diplomatic relations. The practice was discriminatory and incompatible with the new international climate.

39. Mr. SLABY (Czechoslovakia) said that his country fully supported the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples but did not approve the resolution just adopted inasmuch as that resolution unfortunately contained obsolete language, referred to certain countries by name and reduced the principle of self-determination exclusively to independence; it also raised the question of apartheid, which was not on the Fourth Committee's agenda.

40. By abstaining from voting on the draft resolution his delegation hoped to alert the Special Committee's members to the fact that times were changing and to the urgent need for the Special Committee to reorient its work.

41. Mr. DORJGOTOV (Mongolia) said that although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, it considered operative paragraph 17 superfluous as the resolution was concerned with specialized agencies.

42. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed the consideration of agenda item 113.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.