



MAY 19 1987

15 COLLECTION

FOURTH COMMITTEE
20th meeting
held on
Friday, 8 November 1985
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 20th 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)

Hearing of petitioners

AGENDA ITEM 109: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

Draft resolution

AGENDA ITEM 111: 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

AGENDA ITEM 112: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 113: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

Draft resolution

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 proposals

*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.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/40/SR.20
14 November 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/C.4/40/8/Add.2 and Add.3)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to grant the requests for hearings relating to the question of Namibia, contained in document A/C.4/40/8/Add.2 and Add.3.
2. It was so decided.
3. The CHAIRMAN announced that he had received two communications containing requests for hearings under agenda item 34. He suggested that, in accordance with the normal practice, the communications should be circulated as Committee documents and taken up at a future 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)

Hearing of petitioners

5. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Biadillah (Deputies of Saguia El Hamra) took a place at the petitioners' table.
6. Mr. BIADILLAH, speaking on behalf of deputies of Saguia El Hamra and in continuation of the hearing granted to him at the Committee's 11th meeting, recalled that at the Committee's 19th meeting reference had been made to the report of the United Nations visiting mission to Western Sahara contained in document A/AC.109/L.1063. After reading out paragraph 112 of that report, which stated the Algerian position concerning the Territory, he said that the paragraph belied completely the statement made by the Algerian representative at the Committee's 19th meeting and proved irrefutably Algeria's hegemonistic policy towards Western Sahara.
7. The fact was that Algeria paid little heed to the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination. He wished to cite a 1978 report in a Spanish newspaper describing the Algerian Government's collusion with the Franco régime with a view to establishing an independent Saharan State in order to prevent the Territory from becoming part of Morocco and, ultimately, its annexation by Algeria. Algeria had mounted a massive diplomatic and media offensive to impede the process of self-determination in the Territory, thereby diverting the Committee's energies from issues which were of vital importance to the international community.
8. From the outset, Algeria had maintained a military presence in Western Sahara. The Committee had heard references to the statement by the King of Morocco regarding the tenth anniversary of the "green march", but absolutely no reference

(Mr. Biadillah)

had been made to the King's call for dialogue and a peaceful settlement of the dispute. Algeria had yet to state its views concerning direct negotiations with Morocco, without the presence of the Frente POLISARIO. Algeria was ill-advised to pose as an intermediary or disinterested defender of the right of peoples to self-determination, since it had from the outset pursued its own selfish interests and geopolitical objectives with regard to Western Sahara.

9. An atmosphere of peace prevailed in Western Sahara, which had enjoyed substantial economic and social development. He invited members of the Committee to visit the Territory to see the situation for themselves.

10. Mr. Biadillah withdrew.

AGENDA ITEM 109: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/40/23 (Part V))

Draft resolution

11. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft resolution on agenda item 109 contained in chapter VIII, paragraph 9, of the report of the Special Committee in document A/40/23 (Part V).

12. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution in chapter VIII, paragraph 9, of document A/40/23 (Part V).

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

/...

Against: None.

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

13. The draft resolution was adopted by 131 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

14. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because it considered that paragraph 2 of the draft resolution left it to the General Assembly to decide at what point a Non-Self-Governing Territory had attained a full measure of independence and the administering Power concerned no longer needed to continue transmitting information under Article 73 e of the Charter with respect to that Territory. Such decisions should be left to the administering Power and the local Government concerned.

15. Mr. MASABO (Burundi) said that, had his delegation been present during the vote, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 109.

AGENDA ITEM 111: 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/40/23 (Part V); A/C.4/40/L.13)

Draft resolution

17. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft resolution contained in chapter VII, paragraph 16, of the report of the Special Committee contained in document A/40/23 (Part V) and also to an amendment to the draft resolution submitted by Israel, contained in document A/C.4/40/L.13.

18. Mr. JOFFE (Israel), introducing his delegation's amendment (A/C.4/40/L.13) to the draft resolution under consideration, said that his delegation categorically condemned racism in all its forms, including apartheid. His country had repeatedly expressed its revulsion for, and opposition to, apartheid in world forums and directly to the Government of South Africa. Israel's diplomatic ties with South Africa and its commercial relations in no way implied support for South Africa's policies. Some 30 countries had diplomatic representation in South Africa, including some African States. His Government had recently decided to defer sending a new Israeli ambassador to Pretoria, and its Embassy was currently headed by a Chargé d'affaires. Many other countries maintained clandestine ties with South Africa. International Monetary Fund statistics showed that Israel ranked seventeenth among countries receiving exports from South Africa and twenty-third among those supplying imports to that country.

19. African States conducted extensive trade with South Africa, yet they were not charged with propping up apartheid. A study by the Shipping Research Bureau, an

(Mr. Joffe, Israel)

anti-apartheid organization in Amsterdam, had found that three fourths of South Africa's oil imports originated in the Arabian Gulf. In the Third Committee, the representative of the United Arab Emirates had indicated recently that his country had sold oil to a consortium which might in turn have sold it to South Africa, but that his Government did not have the capacity to monitor the shipment.

20. Mr. AL-MOSFIR (United Arab Emirates), speaking on a point of order, said that the Committee was in the process of hearing explanations of vote before the vote and asked the Chairman to request the representative of the Zionist entity not to raise extraneous matters.

21. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that explanations of vote before the vote had not yet begun, that the Committee was discussing a draft resolution and that the representative of Israel was introducing an amendment thereto.

22. Mr. JOFFE (Israel), continuing his statement, said that his delegation proposed the deletion of the words "and Israel" from the third line of the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution under consideration.

23. On 4 September 1979, his delegation had informed the Security Council that it would comply with Security Council resolution 418 (1977) and, accordingly, would not provide South Africa with weapons, ammunition, military vehicles or equipment. As for alleged nuclear co-operation, the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/36/431 indicated that, in the absence of specific examples of actual nuclear exchanges or transactions, there was no clear evidence of such co-operation. Repeated allegations of an Israeli-South African military alliance were equally baseless. Most of South Africa's weapons came from three Western suppliers. Some Arab States sold weapons to, and bought them from, South Africa. In 1975, the Swedish International Peace Research Institute had reported that Jordan had sold almost \$15 million in military equipment to South Africa. More recently, according to Africa Confidential and to the representative of Iran to the United Nations, Iraq had purchased artillery guns from South Africa.

24. The CHAIRMAN urged the representative of Israel not to reopen the debate on the item to which the draft resolution under consideration related.

25. Mr. JOFFE (Israel), continuing his statement, said that Israel clearly was being judged by a double standard and that the singling out of Israel was a form of political warfare. The reality of the situation was much more sober and muted. Delegations must recognize the harsh realities of an imperfect and sometimes very cruel world that imposed its constraints on what nations wished to achieve. In that respect, Israel was no better - but also no worse - than any other country in the world.

26. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the draft resolution under consideration was the result of a consensus among various regional groups and that, consequently it was inappropriate for any delegation to propose an amendment to it. The facts of the situation emerged clearly from document A/40/22/Add.2 concerning co-operation between South Africa and Israel.

/...

27. Mr. ALSUDANI (Iraq) said that there was ample evidence of the co-operation between the Zionist entity and the racist entity in South Africa. The charges against Iraq by the Zionist entity's representative were groundless and deserved no credence. His Government signed agreements to purchase weapons only with countries with which it had formal diplomatic relations.

28. Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America) said that all delegations in the Committee were aware of the types of relationship maintained - or not maintained - by different countries with South Africa. The arguments behind the naming of Israel in resolutions concerning the specialized agencies had nothing to do with the level of Israel's contacts or trade with South Africa. The statement by the representative of Iraq was another example of the way in which a certain group of States was attempting to subvert the mechanisms of the United Nations for its own national or group purposes. The case for adopting Israel's proposed amendment had in fact been made by the Iraqi representative.

29. The CHAIRMAN invited any members of the Committee who wished to do so to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

30. Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America) speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that Israel was being singled out in the draft resolution for reasons that had nothing to do with its infinitesimal trade with South Africa. The idea for that particular provision of the draft resolution had come initially from a country closely allied with the Soviet Union. In that connection, it was useful to refer to document A/39/417 on the operational activities of the United Nations system, where it was pointed out that, of the total contributions by Member States to the regular budgets of the agencies and organizations of the United Nations system, 91 per cent were paid by the Western countries, 8 per cent by the developing countries and 1 per cent by the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries. It was easy to deduce from those figures which States supported the activities of the specialized agencies and which States wished to politicize them.

31. The United States would vote against the draft resolution and in favour of the Israeli amendment to it.

32. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) said that, while his delegation shared many of the ideas reflected in the draft resolution, it would abstain in the vote because it had serious reservations on certain preambular and operative paragraphs concerning the International Monetary Fund. Italy believed that international financial institutions must enjoy full autonomy and that to impose outside restrictions on the action of the Fund would be detrimental to the economies of all the countries which enjoyed its assistance.

33. Mr. INFANTE (Chile) said it was his country's position that, in general, it was not a correct procedure in draft resolutions to refer selectively to certain countries and omit mention of others that were clearly involved in a particular situation. It would therefore vote in favour of the Israeli amendment to the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution but, because it was a member of the Special Committee, would also vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

34. Miss MILLAN (Colombia) said that, because of her country's solidarity with the Namibian people and with all other colonial peoples, her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution. At the same time, following a general principle of Colombia's foreign policy, it would vote in favour of the Israeli amendment because it did not believe that United Nations documents should make selective references to specific countries.

35. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom) said that the draft resolution exemplified just how far the Committee had lost its way and had become increasingly detached from reality. It had produced a free-floating contentious text, that was almost totally irrelevant to the role of the specialized agencies. What little relevance it had was hardly enhanced by name-calling. The main task of the specialized agencies in relation to the Non-Self-Governing Territories - and in relation to independent countries as well - was to advance their economic and social development yet there was barely one paragraph in the draft resolution that acknowledged that self-evident fact. Instead, the draft focused in highly political terms on South Africa and Namibia, and said not one word about other Territories. Moreover, it sought to issue instructions to agencies such as the International Monetary Fund, an autonomous body the independence of which must be respected if its decisions were to continue to be taken on the basis of economic need rather than political expediency. The politicizing of the specialized agencies implied by the general thrust of the draft resolution would invariably spell an end to their effectiveness as impartial and independent operators.

36. The Committee needed a resolution that testified to the crucial role of the specialized agencies in economic development and, in particular, set forth how they could help the Non-Self-Governing Territories which were the Committee's special concern. To concentrate on their alleged inadequacies rather than their achievements was hardly constructive. Paragraph 2 of the draft resolution did make some attempt to highlight the fact that the specialized agencies could act only within their sphere of competence, but the overall tenor of the draft resolution was adverse and critical and its overall objective was to distract the agencies from their appointed task.

37. The United Kingdom would therefore vote against the draft resolution and in favour of the Israeli amendment.

38. Mr. KURPERSHOEK (Netherlands) said that his delegation could associate itself with the appreciation expressed in the draft resolution for the contributions for decolonization made by the specialized agencies. It could not, however, accept the criticism levelled at the agencies in the twentieth and twenty-first preambular paragraphs and in paragraphs 8 and 9, which disregarded the autonomous status of the Bretton Woods institutions. Such an attempt to politicize them struck at their very foundations and could not but divert them from their true purpose, which was to assist Member countries in their economic development and to facilitate the expansion of balanced world trade.

39. It was true that, as indicated in paragraph 21, the Agreement between the United Nations and the International Monetary Fund entitled the United Nations to propose agenda items for inclusion at meetings of the Fund's Board of Governors and

(Mr. Kurpershoek, Netherlands)

allowed for consultations between the United Nations and the Fund. Unfortunately, however, the draft resolution did not acknowledge that the same Agreement also made it clear that the Fund was an independent international organization.

40. The form of the draft resolution also left much to be desired. It was an incoherent, sprawling mass of words. Surely it was not beyond the powers of the Special Committee to trim away such excess verbiage in its draft resolutions?

41. While supporting immediate independence for Namibia, the Netherlands also rejected the selective criticism levelled at Western countries and Israel in the eighth preambular paragraph, which held those countries responsible for South Africa's stubborn refusal to relinquish Namibia.

42. The Netherlands would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

43. Mr. BJURNER (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, observed that those countries had actively supported the work of the specialized agencies with regard to decolonization and had themselves provided technical assistance to peoples in need. They had, in particular, been among the largest contributors to the United Nations Fund for Namibia. The newly adopted Nordic joint programme of action against South Africa, outlined in document A/40/784, prohibited the granting of any loans by Nordic countries to South Africa and committed them to increasing their broad humanitarian assistance to southern Africa. As for International Monetary Fund loans to South Africa, such loans should be discouraged, with due regard for the articles of Agreement between the United Nations and the Fund.

44. Although the Nordic countries supported the main thrust of the draft resolution, they deplored the fact that it contained some sweeping or inaccurate statements, and some important elements that raised problems of principle, for instance the disregarding of the independent and universal character which the specialized agencies must retain, the singling out of individual countries or groups of countries as being allegedly responsible for the policies pursued by the South African Government, and the inclusion of paragraphs irrelevant to the substance of the draft.

45. The Nordic countries would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

46. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran) expressed deep regret that some members of the Committee were trying to condone not only the crimes of South Africa but also the actions of those countries and agencies which were actually responsible for those crimes. He hoped that all his African and Muslim and non-aligned colleagues would pay attention to the facts, which had been established in documents prepared by impartial United Nations committees and which spoke for themselves, and that they would meet with honour and dignity the test to which they were being put.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

47. The support of the United States and certain Western European countries for the Zionist position should deceive no one. Those who were annoyed at seeing Zionism singled out in the draft resolution were the same countries which supported Zionism in the Security Council and other forums. Iran counted on the Muslim, African and non-aligned delegations to defeat all such attempts to condone the Zionist entity and ignore the objectively established links between that entity and South Africa. Israel's well-documented collaboration with South Africa, extending even to the nuclear sphere, constituted a virtual alliance which threatened international peace and security. The Committee must therefore be objective, heed the impartial evidence and vote against the amendment submitted by the Zionist terrorist entity.

48. Mr. ROWE (Australia) said that his delegation welcomed the important past and present contributions made by the specialized agencies to decolonization, and objected in principle to those preambular and operative paragraphs of the draft resolution which impugned their independence and impartiality; it would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. It also objected to the selective singling out of particular States in that or any General Assembly resolution and would therefore vote for the amendment in document A/C.4/40/L.13.

49. Mr. AL-MOSFIR (United Arab Emirates) said that from the ample documentation available, everyone knew the source of the financial support being given to the South African racists and under what conditions it was being given. His delegation appealed to all those who supported human rights, peace, justice and freedom to oppose the Zionist amendment in document A/C.4/40/L.13. His delegation would vote against that amendment and for the draft resolution.

50. Mr. JASUDASEN (Singapore) said that his delegation objected to the arbitrary and selective condemnation of individual States and would therefore vote for the amendment in document A/C.4/40/L.13.

51. Mr. AL SAUD (Saudi Arabia) said that the Israeli representative had tried to divert the Committee's attention from the subject under consideration with misinformation regarding oil exports. The fact was that Saudi Arabia did not co-operate with South Africa. His delegation would vote against the amendment in document A/C.4/40/L.13.

52. Mr. SVOBODA (Canada) said that his delegation objected to the gratuitous and arbitrary mention of individual countries in the draft resolution and would therefore vote for the amendment to that resolution. It would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole because it found the references in that resolution to the financial institutions and the specialized agencies objectionable.

53. Mr. PASTOR (Honduras) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution because it contained many positive elements, but regretted its controversial wording. It would vote for the Israeli amendment because it objected to any selective reference to particular States.

54. Mr. HAYASHI (Japan) said that the specialized agencies should be encouraged to promote self-determination, but only within the limits of their own competence. His delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution because the twentieth and twenty-first preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 6, 8 and 9 asked those agencies to follow special directives and ignored the principle of universality which governed them. His delegation also objected to the resolution's references to specific countries.

55. Mr. CONTEH (Sierra Leone) said that, while he understood the objections which had been raised to certain paragraphs of the draft resolution, the latter was the result of extensive negotiations and based upon specific reports. It was unfortunate therefore that certain delegations had preferred to make allegations against the Committee rather than to support its draft resolution. His delegation supported the draft resolution in its entirety.

56. Mr. ABDULLATIF (Oman) said that the paragraph that Israel was seeking to amend was very clear and required no explanation. It showed the close links that existed between South Africa and Israel and how the former persecuted the black majority in South Africa while the latter persecuted the inhabitants of the occupied territories. Israel had been stigmatized in the United Nations as a racist régime and its organic links to South Africa were not surprising. His delegation would vote against the amendment and for the draft resolution.

57. A recorded vote was taken on the amendment in document A/C.4/40/L.13.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chad, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Grenada, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Suriname, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

58. The amendment was rejected by 77 votes to 40, with 26 abstentions.

59. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution in chapter VII, paragraph 16, of document A/40/23 (Part V).

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

60. The draft resolution was adopted by 119 votes to 3, with 25 abstentions.

61. Ms. O'FARRELL (Ireland), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that her delegation has always recognized the important role which the specialized agencies played in promoting decolonization and therefore agreed with the general thrust of the resolution just adopted but had abstained in the vote because of the criticisms levelled by the resolution at the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and the fact that it did not take into account the statutes of those institutions.

62. Mr. TAIK (France) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution and had voted for the Israeli amendment because it objected to the unjust criticisms of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and to the attempt to undermine the universality and independence of the specialized agencies.

63. Mr. LUPINACCI (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because it recognized the important role which the specialized agencies played in promoting decolonization. It had reservations of principle, however, with respect to some of the paragraphs of the resolution.

64. Mr. ASSIMACOPOULOS (Greece) said that he had voted for the draft resolution because the assistance of the specialized agencies and other international institutions to peoples under colonial occupation could be of great importance in helping the latter achieve national independence. He felt it was unfair to single out certain countries in the draft resolution and had voted therefore for the Israeli amendment. That vote should not be construed as implying any lessening of his country's support for the Namibian people, however.

65. Mr. LOUKASHAH (Jordan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that Israel's charges against his country were simply an attempt by Israel to overcome the isolation in which it found itself because of its co-operation with South Africa. Jordan had no relations whatsoever with South Africa and did not co-operate with that country.

66. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 111.

AGENDA ITEM 112: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.4/40/L.5)

Draft resolution

67. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.5 on agenda item 112 and announced that Guinea-Bissau had become a sponsor.

68. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea) said that his delegation was also sponsoring the draft resolution.

69. Draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.5 was adopted by consensus.

70. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 112.

AGENDA ITEM 113: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.4/40/L.6)

Draft resolution

71. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.6 on agenda item 113 and announced that Bangladesh and Guinea-Bissau had become sponsors.
72. Draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.6 was adopted by consensus.
73. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 113.

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/40/23 (Part VII); A/C.4/40/L.3)

Draft proposals

74. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the statement of the Secretary-General (A/C.4/40/L.3) containing information on the related programme budget implications of proposals submitted under agenda item 18.

Question of Tokelau (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XIII, para. 13)

75. The draft consensus on Tokelau was adopted without objection.

Question of Pitcairn (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XIV, para. 10)

76. The draft consensus on Pitcairn was adopted without objection.

Question of St. Helena (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XV, para. 11)

77. The CHAIRMAN announced that the United Kingdom had requested a separate vote on the fifth sentence of the text, which read: "The Assembly notes with concern the presence of military facilities on the dependency of Ascension Island and, in that regard, recalls all the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions concerning military bases and installations in colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories."

78. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would vote against the sentence in question and, if it was not deleted, against the text as a whole. Consensus could have been achieved on the text if inappropriate and prejudiced references had not been made in it to facilities on an uninhabited island 700 miles from St. Helena. Ascension Island was a separate entity and the links between it and St. Helena were only administrative. The administrative link made sense, but its use to inject concern into the text where none should exist did not. The facilities on Ascension Island were no threat to anyone, least of all to St. Helena, and if they were felt to be a threat to peace and security, that

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

concern should be taken to the Security Council. Ascension Island only had stationing facilities for transport aircraft, which had been there since 1942. It was difficult to see why concern should be expressed more than 40 years later, especially since the rest of the text was complimentary to the administering Power. There was no good reason to include such language and he hoped that all delegations would join in voting against it. In doing so, they would not be voting in support of the United Kingdom on St. Helena but recognizing that references to Ascension Island were out of place. They would also be contributing to the process of a return to more constructive resolutions in 1986.

79. A recorded vote was taken on the fifth sentence of the draft decision on St. Helena (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XV, para. 11).

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Singapore, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago.

80. The fifth sentence of the draft decision on St. Helena was retained by 77 votes to 27, with 27 abstentions.

81. Mr. SOLANO (Spain) said that his delegation's abstention had not been recorded.

82. A recorded vote was taken on the draft decision on St. Helena as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

83. The draft decision on St. Helena was adopted as a whole by 112 votes to 3, with 25 abstentions.

84. Mr. EINARSSON (Iceland) said that his delegation's vote had been misrecorded and should have been an abstention.

Question of American Samoa (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XVI, para. 10)

85. The draft resolution on American Samoa was adopted without objection.

Question of Guam (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XVII, para. 10)

86. The draft resolution on Guam was adopted without objection.

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

concern should be taken to the Security Council. Ascension Island only had stationing facilities for transport aircraft, which had been there since 1942. It was difficult to see why concern should be expressed more than 40 years later, especially since the rest of the text was complimentary to the administering Power. There was no good reason to include such language and he hoped that all delegations would join in voting against it. In doing so, they would not be voting in support of the United Kingdom on St. Helena but recognizing that references to Ascension Island were out of place. They would also be contributing to the process of a return to more constructive resolutions in 1986.

79. A recorded vote was taken on the fifth sentence of the draft decision on St. Helena (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XV, para. 11).

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Singapore, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago.

80. The fifth sentence of the draft decision on St. Helena was retained by 77 votes to 27, with 27 abstentions.

81. Mr. SOLANO (Spain) said that his delegation's abstention had not been recorded.

82. A recorded vote was taken on the draft decision on St. Helena as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

83. The draft decision on St. Helena was adopted as a whole by 112 votes to 3, with 25 abstentions.

84. Mr. EINARSSON (Iceland) said that his delegation's vote had been misrecorded and should have been an abstention.

Question of American Samoa (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XVI, para. 10)

85. The draft resolution on American Samoa was adopted without objection.

Question of Guam (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XVII, para. 10)

86. The draft resolution on Guam was adopted without objection.

Question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XVIII, para. 12)

87. The CHAIRMAN said that, on the basis of the consultations which he had held with the Chairman of the Special Committee of 24, as well as with a number of other delegations concerned, he wished to suggest that the Committee should not take any action at that stage on the draft resolution submitted on the question by the Special Committee of 24.

88. It was so decided.

Question of Bermuda (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XIX, para. 11)

89. The draft resolution on Bermuda was adopted without objection.

Question of the British Virgin Islands (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XX, para. 10)

90. The draft resolution on the British Virgin Islands was adopted without objection.

Question of the Cayman Islands (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XXI, para. 10)

91. The draft resolution on the Cayman Islands was adopted without objection.

Question of Montserrat (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XXII, para. 11)

92. The draft resolution on Montserrat was adopted without objection.

Question of the Turks and Caicos Islands (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XXIII, para. 10)

93. The draft resolution on the Turks and Caicos Islands was adopted without objection.

Question of Anguilla (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XXIV, para. 10)

94. The draft resolution on Anguilla was adopted without objection.

Question of the United States Virgin Islands (A/40/23 (Part VII), chap. XXV, para. 11)

95. The draft resolution on the United States Virgin Islands was adopted without objection.

96. The CHAIRMAN said that the text of a draft consensus resolution on the question of Gibraltar would be circulated at the Committee's 21st meeting, at which he suggested that the Committee should also take action on the draft proposals and related amendments on the question of Western Sahara.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.