

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

FORTIETH SESSION

Official Records*



FOURTH COMMITTEE
21st meeting
held on
Tuesday, 12 November 1985
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 21ST MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua)

CONTENTS

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

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)

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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

85-57529 4747S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/40/SR.21
15 November 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/C.4/40/8/Add.4 and 5)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to grant the requests for hearings contained in documents A/C.4/40/8/Add.4 and Add.5.

2. It was so decided.

3. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a communication containing a request for a hearing on agenda item 34. He suggested that, in accordance with the usual practice, the communication should be circulated as a Committee document (A/C.4/40/8/Add.6) for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

4. It was so decided.

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)

Draft resolutions

Question of Gibraltar (continued) (A/C.4/40/L.7)

5. The draft consensus on Gibraltar was adopted without objection.

Question of Western Sahara (continued) (A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1, L.4, L.8 to 11)

6. Mr. GBEZERA-BRIA (Central African Republic), introducing the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/40/L.4 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the problem of decolonization in Western Sahara had been complicated by the intrusion of extraneous factors. Legal stratagems had been used to turn the Territory of Western Sahara into a so-called State, wrongly admitted to the Organization of African Unity, on the misguided assumption that that could replace a just and definitive solution based on the principles of the United Nations Charter.

7. The aim of the draft resolution under consideration was to promote a peaceful and equitable solution to the problem of Western Sahara. The preambular paragraphs set forth principles and commitments, while the operative paragraphs dealt with ways and means of solving the problem. He urged members of the Committee to support the draft resolution, which would make it possible for the populations of Western Sahara to exercise their right to self-determination, thereby contributing to peace and security throughout the region.

8. Mr. BASSOLE (Burkina Faso), introducing the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the purpose of the draft resolution was to have the Committee endorse a peace plan that had been

(Mr. Bassolé, Burkina Faso)

adopted by the Organization of African Unity in its resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX) and endorsed by the General Assembly, in its resolutions 38/40 and 39/40 and by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The many sponsors of the draft resolution, which reflected the consensus of the international community, urged its adoption with a view to expediting a peaceful, just and definitive solution of the conflict.

9. In conclusion, he wished to draw attention to a number of errors in the English version of the draft resolution which should be corrected. In operative paragraphs 3 and 5, "dans les meilleurs délais" had been incorrectly translated as "as soon as possible". In operative paragraph 5, the words "President of the Organization of African Unity" should be replaced by "current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity".

10. Mr. LUKANGA (Mozambique) introduced the amendment to draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 contained in document A/C.4/40/L.8.

11. Mr. BASSOLE (Burkina Faso), introducing the amendment to draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 contained in document A/C.4/40/L.9, said that the purpose of the amendment was to establish that a referendum in Western Sahara must be organized on the basis of the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and independence and conducted on the basis of the peace plan agreed upon by the Organization of African Unity in its resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX) and endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolutions 38/40 and 39/40.

12. Mr. RASON (Madagascar), introducing the amendment to draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 contained in document A/C.4/40/L.10, said that paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 referred only to the Secretary-General but that, since the Organization of African Unity had always co-ordinated its efforts with those of the United Nations, OAU should not be excluded at any level from the search for a solution to the problem of Western Sahara. That paragraph also referred to the Implementation Committee of OAU but should, at the same time, mention the efforts of OAU reflected in its resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX).

13. Mr. OUYAHIA (Algeria), introducing the amendment to draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 contained in document A/C.4/40/L.11, said that the purpose of the amendment was to clarify paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 by recalling that the parties concerned were in fact the Kingdom of Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO and by emphasizing the need for parties to negotiate, as urged by the United Nations and the international community at large.

14. Mr. TANAKA (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretary-General wished to inform the Committee that he was not in a position at that time to prepare estimates for the programme budget implications of paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 and paragraphs 1 to 3 of draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4. Accordingly, he intended to incur whatever expenditures might be necessary and appropriate for those purposes, under the terms of the resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses to be adopted by the General Assembly at its current session.

/...

15. Mr. ARTACHO (Spain), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation agreed with the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations that the problem of Western Sahara was one of decolonization and that it could be resolved only by a referendum which enabled the Saharan people to express itself freely. That position was reflected in draft resolutions A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 and A/C.4/40/L.4; those draft resolutions were not incompatible and his delegation would vote for both of them. A just and lasting solution to the problem of Western Sahara required that all the parties concerned participate in negotiations conducted in a spirit of compromise and the Secretary-General and OAU should lend their services to facilitate that process.

16. Mr. ALAOUI (Morocco) said that his country had done everything possible to achieve a genuine consensus solution to a problem which threatened the peace of an entire region. It had welcomed the Secretary-General's efforts to give the United Nations a more active role in the matter and had reaffirmed its commitment to respect the results of a referendum. Algeria, however, wished to neutralize the efforts of the Secretary-General and draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 simply reiterated negotiating conditions which Morocco had already rejected, without making any reference to the decisions of the Implementation Committee of OAU which had envisaged detailed arrangements for a cease-fire and a referendum. His delegation would vote against that draft resolution because it would frustrate the wishes of the Saharan people, which must be consulted through a referendum.

17. Mr. TAIK (France) said that he shared the concern expressed by the Secretary-General over the delay in the exercise of the right of the Saharan people to self-determination, and the resultant tension in the region. His delegation favoured a political solution based on referendum organized without any constraints and under international control, as agreed upon by the United Nations and OAU, and regretted that the parties to the dispute were unable to agree on the implementation of such a referendum. It would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

18. Mr. OUYAHIA (Algeria), referring to the statement by the representative of Morocco, said that it was difficult to see how the people of Western Sahara might express their wishes freely when Morocco continued to refuse to negotiate with their representatives and held to its decision, declared on 6 November, never to withdraw its troops or administrative authorities from Western Sahara. In taking such action, Morocco was effectively denying the Saharan people's right to self-determination and independence. That right could be exercised only within the framework of OAU resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX) and General Assembly resolutions 38/40 and 39/40. Draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4, on the other hand, asked the United Nations to endorse very strange positions: to repudiate the consensus resolutions adopted on the question by the General Assembly, to view the question of Western Sahara as a non-colonial issue, and to legitimize procedures that simply accepted a fait accompli. Algeria would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

19. Mr. OYOUE (Gabon) said that he would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1. By settling into a pattern of adopting year after year repetitive resolutions that offered no generally acceptable solution, the Committee had not done its part to resolve the question of Western Sahara. The only real solution to the situation in that Territory was the holding of a free and fair referendum. In that connection, Morocco's very constructive attitude of consistently supporting such a referendum must be noted. Earlier that month, Morocco had invited the Secretary-General and the OAU leadership to consult on procedures for organizing a referendum in January 1986 and had unilaterally proclaimed a cease-fire in Western Sahara. Morocco's prudent and concrete proposals would lead to a settlement, thereby meeting the international community's concern to end a dispute between two neighbouring countries.
20. Mr. BROWNE (New Zealand) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1. It supported the involvement of the Secretary-General in seeking a settlement to the dispute over Western Sahara. His Government wished to make clear, however, that it interpreted paragraph 5 of the draft resolution as inviting the Secretary-General to co-operate in the search for a peaceful solution to the dispute and, while taking into account the OAU proposals, to explore any paths to a settlement which were consistent with the Charter and the principle of self-determination.
21. Mr. FAN Guoxiang (China) said that China would abstain in the vote on the draft resolutions.
22. The dispute over Western Sahara should be settled in accordance with the wishes of the people of the Territory. As to how that people might exercise its right of self-determination, it was China's sincere hope that all the parties concerned would conduct patient negotiations aimed at a peaceful settlement, conducive to stability in the Maghreb and to unity and co-operation between two neighbouring States. China believed that the Secretary-General and OAU should be involved in that process.
23. Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) observed that one of the two draft resolutions before the Committee had many sponsors while the other had very few. Zaire believed in defending the just cause in the dispute, however, and had therefore sponsored draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 and would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1. The latter resolution simply reproduced the resolution adopted the previous year on the question, whereas draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 contained genuinely new elements, reflecting Morocco's new political will in the calling for the organization of a referendum on self-determination in January 1986 and unilaterally declaring a cease-fire. He urged all members of the Committee to note the significance of those new elements.
24. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that he perceived similarities and differences between the two draft resolutions under consideration. Both resolutions recognized that the question of Western Sahara involved the right of self-determination and both acknowledged that self-determination could best be exercised through a free and fair referendum under international auspices. Although draft resolution

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 set forth the procedures for such a referendum in greater detail, the two texts were compatible on those two central issues. They both left something to be desired, however. Draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 seemed to predetermine some issues that were better handled through diplomacy and draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 was not sufficiently specific on certain points. Since it believed that the adoption of both draft resolutions might help to reconcile the positions of the respective sponsors, Pakistan would vote in favour of both texts, and since the amendments to draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 were intended to make it conform to draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 - a procedure which would not be conducive to reconciling positions - Pakistan would vote against those amendments.

25. Mr. MASABO (Burundi) said that the peace plan set forth in OAU resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX) and General Assembly resolution 39/40 offered the only feasible solution to the question of Western Sahara. Clearly, only draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 conformed to that peace plan and Burundi would accordingly vote in favour of it. It would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 because it was completely at odds with the peace plan.

26. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Central African Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Guatemala, Morocco, Zaire.

Abstaining: Bangladesh, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Canada, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway,

Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

27. The draft resolution was adopted by 91 votes to 6, with 43 abstentions.
28. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote first on the amendments to draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4, contained in documents A/C.4/40/L.8-11, and then on the draft resolution itself.
29. Mr. ALAOUI (Morocco), speaking on a point of order and on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4, said that he was forced to call to the Committee's attention the real aim of the amendments under consideration, which were in reality not amendments but a new draft identical in content and source of inspiration to the draft resolution just adopted. The sponsors of those amendments had three objectives: to destroy the operational character of draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 and its overall balance; to cancel out the efforts already undertaken by the Secretary-General by giving him an impossible mission; and to prevent the Committee from proposing to the General Assembly a just solution to the question of Western Sahara. Morocco, it should be added, would have been ready to consider and accept any constructive amendments.
30. Consequently, under rule 116 of the rules of procedure, he requested the Committee not to take a decision on the amendments and moved the adjournment of all debate on them. The Committee would then be able to proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4, without the amendments.
31. The CHAIRMAN read out rule 116 of the rules of procedure.
32. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria), speaking against the motion, said that it invoked rule 116 not for its proper function of adjourning discussion of the agenda item as a whole but as an expedient to prevent decision-making on a particular point. I thus denied sovereign States the right to express their opinions freely on the subject of decolonization or to propose amendments to a draft resolution. He questioned the legitimacy of such a procedure and considered that, if accepted, it would have grave implications for the future of the United Nations.
33. Mr. BANERJI (India), speaking against the motion, said that the purpose of the amendments proposed to draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 had been to give the text greater clarity and bring it into line with the international consensus that had been expressed in such forums as OAU, the General Assembly and the recent ministerial meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held at Luanda. Acceptance of the motion would therefore thwart the will of the international community, alter the General Assembly's established position on the question of the terms and conditions for the decolonization of Western Sahara and deny the people of Western Sahara its legitimate rights and aspirations.

34. Mr. BAGBENI ADEHO NZENGEYA (Zaire), speaking in favour of the motion, said that the proposed amendments added nothing of substance that was not already included or implied in draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4, which represented a new and constructive initiative on the part of Morocco that deserved United Nations support. The aim of the proposed amendments was simply to destroy the draft resolution and reduce it to the same dimensions as the newly adopted resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1.

35. Mr. MAYE ELA (Equatorial Guinea), speaking in favour of the motion, said that draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 contained new elements that might help to solve the question of Western Sahara. Its operative part was sufficiently comprehensive in its present form and illustrated clearly Morocco's spirit of co-operation on the subject. In his opinion, the proposed amendments had been introduced simply to thwart that spirit of co-operation.

36. A recorded vote was taken on the motion by Morocco under rule 116 to adjourn the debate on amendments.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Central African Republic, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Iraq, Jordan, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay, Zaire.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chad, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela.

37. The motion was rejected by 54 votes to 27, with 45 abstentions.

38. Mr. ALAOUI (Morocco), speaking on a point of order, said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 had hoped that the Committee would examine the proposal it contained in its totality, in order to take all interests into account and work towards a just, democratic and lasting settlement in Western Sahara. Since the Committee had been prevented from proceeding in that manner, the sponsors withdrew their draft resolution.

39. Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that he deeply regretted that the two principal parties to the dispute had not found it possible to work for a resolution that could have been adopted by consensus in the Committee. Although it had been discussing the problem for 10 years, the General Assembly was still no nearer to a solution. While not objecting to draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 in principle, his delegation had abstained in the vote on that resolution in the belief that it was unlikely to advance a settlement of the problem. It would have voted for draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 had it been put to a vote, since that resolution represented an advance in Morocco's position. The positions set forth in the two draft resolutions were in fact very close and he hoped that the gap would be closed at the next session of the General Assembly, by means of a resolution supported jointly by Algeria and Morocco. Since the General Assembly had no power to impose its decisions by force, the only workable solution would be one which was acceptable to all parties.

40. Mr. BJURNER (Sweden) said that the paramount principle for any solution of the issue was that the people of Western Sahara should be allowed to express its wishes freely with regard to the future status of the Territory. Sweden supported the efforts of OAU and welcomed the resolutions it had adopted on the subject in 1981 and 1983. It also shared the concern expressed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his report on the issue. An unequivocal expression of opinion on the matter was required from the United Nations. Hence, a single text that could have been adopted by consensus, rather than two separate texts, would have been the best solution. Sweden had opted for resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 because it referred more explicitly to the principle mentioned above and to the relevant resolutions of OAU and the United Nations.

41. Mr. EGGERT (Finland) said that Finland supported the right of the people of Western Sahara to self-determination. It regretted that it had not been possible to implement the OAU resolutions adopted in 1981 and 1983, and hoped that the parties concerned would spare no effort to come closer to a peaceful settlement in the Territory. Finland would have preferred a consensus text but, in its absence, had voted for resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1. However, it would also have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 had it been put to a vote.

42. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that Costa Rica had always supported the two pillars of the decolonization process, namely self-determination and territorial integrity, and consequently had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1, just as it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 had it not been withdrawn. The two draft resolutions had put forward alternative proposals for achieving the same goal: a peaceful solution to the situation in Western Sahara, based on the exercise by the people of that Territory

(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

of the inalienable right to self-determination and independence. She agreed with what the representative of Spain had said in that regard. Her delegation did not wish to comment on the divergences between the two texts, but neither could it ignore the promise made by Morocco to respect absolutely the results of the January 1986 referendum.

43. Her delegation had voted in favour of the Moroccan motion because the amendments proposed to draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 would indeed have altered that text substantially. Costa Rica's main concern was that a peaceful solution should be found to the problem that satisfied all the parties concerned and, above all, the authentic population of the Territory.

44. Mr. ROWE (Australia) expressed regret that it had not been possible to arrive at a single resolution, especially when there had been sufficient common ground in 1983 for the General Assembly in that year to adopt a single consensus resolution. Australia had felt that resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 deserved support in its efforts to resolve the problem, since it insisted on the principle of self-determination, although Australia would not support any kind of wording that could be construed as prejudging the outcome of any referendum. Nevertheless, it supported the right of other delegations to put forward proposals and regretted that draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4, which it would also have supported, had been withdrawn.

45. Mrs. CARRASCO (Bolivia) said that negotiations between the parties concerned, namely Morocco and the representatives of the Saharan people, were the only proper framework for peace initiatives in the region. The international community must do everything possible to create a climate conducive to reconciliation rather than confrontation. The Secretary-General had a major role to play in that connection. Bolivia had therefore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 and against the Moroccan motion.

46. Mr. TAIX (France) said that France had abstained in the vote on the motion by Morocco for the reasons given in his previous statement.

47. Mr. KABAS (Austria) said that he too had hoped for a resolution that would receive unanimous support. Austria had voted in favour of resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 because it called for a peaceful settlement to the conflict, to be achieved through negotiations between all the parties concerned. Austria also supported the role of OAU and the Secretary-General of the United Nations in efforts to find a fair and peaceful solution.

48. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) said that Turkey hoped for an eventual settlement of the question of Western Sahara based on the principle of self-determination for the people of Western Sahara. Turkey had therefore voted for resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1 and would also have voted for resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 had it been put to the vote. It had not been in favour of voting first on the proposed amendments.

49. Mr. MOHAMED (Sudan) said that Sudan was deeply concerned with the problem of Western Sahara because it was a member of the Executive Committee of OAU, which had considered the details of the proposed referendum. Sudan was in favour of holding such a referendum, under the necessary conditions for a peaceful and fair process of self-determination and had therefore voted for resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1. It would also have voted for draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 in its original form, because it presented a number of positive aspects.

50. Mr. LIEROP (Vanuatu), noting that Vanuatu had been a sponsor of resolution A/C.4/40/L.2/Rev.1, said that had he been present during the voting on that resolution, he would have voted for it.

51. Mr. FILALI (Morocco) noted that, by adopting virtually the same resolution as it had adopted the previous year on the so-called question of Western Sahara, the Committee had opted for action that was ineffective and inapplicable. Morocco, on the other hand, had hoped by its draft resolution to gain wide support for peace and dialogue. Morocco had made repeated efforts over the past 10 years to reach a compromise that would provide for a peaceful solution, and had responded positively to calls for self-determination in the Territory. The King of Morocco, in his recent address to the General Assembly, had emphasized Morocco's desire to seek peace. Draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4 had been the expression of that desire and the Committee's unfavourable reception of that initiative would only lead to continued and perhaps increased tension in the region.

52. Morocco and all its people would meet such attempts at destabilization and hegemony in the region with their customary calm and determination. Although Morocco was prepared at all times to seek compromise and dialogue, it would not surrender its principles and had now exhausted all the recourses available to it. The Committee, like OAU, had reached an impasse. Morocco therefore wished to declare formally that it was no longer prepared to take part in or attend any discussion or negotiation on the Territory in the Fourth Committee, the Special Committee of 24 or other meetings of the General Assembly, nor would it consider itself bound by any resolution adopted by the General Assembly in its absence. That did not mean that Morocco was looking for a way out of working for a peaceful and just solution, only that the way forward lay elsewhere. Morocco continued to place its confidence in the Secretary-General and was prepared to listen to him whenever the General Assembly allowed him to act in accordance with the Charter and to seek a peaceful and fair solution through a referendum.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had conducted its consideration of agenda item 18.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.