



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 8th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

later: Mrs. KING-ROUSSEAU (Trinidad and Tobago)

CONTENTS

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 105: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

*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 DC 2 750, 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.4/41/SR.8
16 October 1986
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/C.4/41/3/Add.1-Add.3)

Western Sahara

1. The CHAIRMAN said that three requests for hearings concerning Western Sahara (A/C.4/41/3/Add.1-Add.3) had been submitted to the Committee. In the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to accede to the requests.

2. It was so decided.

Question of Namibia

3. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to a communication containing a request for hearing on the question of Namibia (A/C.4/41/4/Add.5). In the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to accede to the request.

4. It was so decided.

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and international institutions associated with the United Nations

5. The CHAIRMAN said that a request for hearing concerning the implementation of the Declaration by the Specialized Agencies and International Organizations Associated with the United Nations (A/C.4/41/6) had been submitted to the Committee. In the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to accede to the request.

6. It was so decided.

7. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received two communications containing requests for hearings concerning the question of Namibia. In accordance with established practice, he proposed to have them distributed as documents of the Committee which would consider them at a later meeting.

8. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 105: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/41/23 (Parts III and IX), A/41/341 and Corr.1; A/AC.109/850, 852, 854, 855, 858 and Corr.1, 860, 862, 863, 865; A/CONF.138/4-A/AC.131/179/Add.1, A/CONF.138/7-A/AC.131/203; E/C.10/1986/9) (continued)

9. Mr. TAEB (Afghanistan) condemned the colonial Powers which, in spite of the requests repeatedly addressed to them, most recently by the General Assembly in its resolution 40/57, had taken no steps to withdraw immediately and unconditionally their military bases and installations from colonial territories.

10. Thus, the racist Pretoria régime, with the firm support of certain Western States, was continuing its illegal military occupation of Namibia and refused to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Once again he emphasized that the question of Namibia was a decolonization problem which could not be included in the context of the East-West confrontation, nor linked to extraneous issues, without diminishing the importance of the right of all nations to self-determination and independence. His delegation therefore categorically rejected all attempts to "link" the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist troops stationed in Angola. South Africa, by transforming the Territory of Namibia into a military bastion and a springboard for its acts of aggression against the front-line States, was brandishing against southern Africa the threat of a wider and even more destructive conflict. His delegation supported the Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, and held that the United Nations Plan for Namibia should be implemented immediately so as to put an end to the question of Namibia once and for all.

11. The United States and Israel, in contempt of United Nations resolutions, were continuing to collaborate in the development of the military and nuclear capacity of the racist South African régime which seriously threatened the peace and security not only of southern Africa but also of the African continent as a whole.

12. The existence of naval and air bases of colonial Powers and their allies in some Non-Self-Governing Territories, in addition to being a potential source of tension, was a major obstacle to implementation of the Declaration. In Central America and the Caribbean, the policy of the current United States Administration was a continuation of the commitment of United States imperialism to hegemony and to the suppression of national liberation movements in the region. Puerto Rico, as a strategic military base, was used as an instrument of that aggressive policy.

13. The United States was attempting to annex Micronesia, the last strategic Trust Territory, through the so-called Compact of Free Association. The Pentagon used the Territory for testing atomic weapons and developing its ballistic missile defence system. Actually the United States intended to turn Micronesia into a

(Mr. Taeb, Afghanistan)

strategic military base in the Pacific which would serve its purpose of ensuring control over vast regions in that part of the world and of intimidating the independent States. Those activities were in clear violation of Article 73 c of the Charter and of the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

14. In reply to accusations levelled by the representatives of two administering Powers, who had described a statement which he had made the previous day on foreign economic interests as a set of lies, he explained that he had only quoted data from official United Nations documents. In fact, therefore, what had been challenged was United Nations documents, including resolutions. If there were any facts or figures which those Powers could cite in support of their arguments challenging the data published by the United Nations, he would be more than happy to hear them.

15. Mr. MAHONEY (Gambia), outlining the history of Namibia, said that, while exploitation of the Territory by foreign interests had been greatly intensified, the methods used remained essentially the same. South Africa, the illegal occupying Power, had actually arrogated to itself the role of suzerain and had sold to the highest bidder concessions for exploiting Namibia's abundant natural resources. In that situation, which had no foundation in law, transnational corporations became conscious accomplices of the apartheid régime.

16. The concessions sold to foreign interests were an important source of revenue for the racist régime, as described in detail by Standing Committee II in its report. There was clear collusion with the apartheid system, because those interests conferred a semblance of legitimacy on South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia and subsidized its military effort. The most dangerous consequences of that collaboration were the huge profits reaped by foreign Powers which were thus indulgent towards the racist régime, even to the point of championing it. History was replete with episodes in which Governments had been led to disaster by business sharks.

17. It was therefore clear that foreign economic, military and other interests were bleeding the Territory white and jeopardizing its future as an independent nation. Concrete and immediate action was essential for implementing the United Nations plan set forth in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). If the plundering of Namibia's resources was to be stopped and the Territory enabled to accede swiftly to independence under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole authentic representative, the mandatory sanctions specified in Chapter VII of the Charter must be imposed as a matter of the utmost urgency.

18. Mrs. King-Rousseau (Trinidad and Tobago) assumed the Chair.

19. Mrs. BYRNE (United States of America) said that the United States continued to support fully the right of self-determination for all peoples, which had inspired the resolution on foreign economic interests. However, it was not those interests which were obstructing the achievement of that right but military occupation, not only of Namibia but also of Afghanistan, Cambodia and other countries.

(Mrs. Byrne, United States)

20. The debate on the activities of multinational corporations in non-self-governing territories was frequently tainted by outmoded and erroneous assumptions. Some Member States continued to claim - although the facts proved otherwise - that those corporations impeded political and economic progress. In fact, the independent countries of Africa and Asia which had been most successful in developing their economies - Côte d'Ivoire, Kenya, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Thailand or even members of the Gulf Co-operation Council - were precisely the countries that had welcomed foreign investment. The benefits of such investment were many: new technologies, more jobs, higher export earnings, upgraded labour skills and advanced training. Other countries, including some whose ideology would seemingly argue against the participation of multinationals were beginning to realize that they had everything to gain from foreign investment.

21. Non-self-governing territories also benefited from the presence of foreign interests. Multinational corporations could pave the way to self-determination by providing those territories with the financial and human resources they needed to create viable economies. The positive role played by the private sector in providing education and developing entrepreneurial skills was increasingly being recognized by key development institutions such as the World Bank.

22. Nations all over the world were turning increasingly towards the free market. During the special session of the General Assembly on the critical economic situation in Africa, the African nations had called for reform leading to greater reliance on their private sectors for economic growth. Only a few years earlier, many African Governments had been either hostile or indifferent to foreign private enterprise. Now, even countries with a Marxist orientation were increasingly eager for trade and investment relations with the West.

23. The real obstacle to the independence of Namibia was the presence on Angolan territory of more than 35,000 Cuban troops and military advisers. Although the removal of those troops was not a requirement of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) for the independence of Namibia, South Africa had made clear its readiness to proceed to implementation only in the context of a parallel commitment to resolve the issue of Cuban troop withdrawal. The United States believed that that issue must be dealt with as a practical necessity to obtain a durable settlement acceptable to all parties. It was actively engaged in trying to remove that final obstacle.

24. Regarding South Africa, there was no doubt that apartheid was a despicable system which must be eliminated as soon as possible. However, it must be eliminated in a manner which did not leave in ashes the hopes of a prosperous and multiracial society in southern Africa. Everyone knew that the United States Government had never looked favourably on economic sanctions against South Africa. However, since the Congress of the United States had voted for sanctions the Committee could rest assured that the sanctions would be applied. Disinvestment, which would certainly increase the misery of thousands of black South Africans, was not part of the measures adopted.

(Mrs. Byrne, United States)

25. In that connection she pointed out that a majority of black South Africans employed by United States multinational corporations worked for subsidiaries of United States firms which were signatories to the Sullivan Code. Those subsidiaries, which therefore applied equitable conditions of employment, had improved the situation for blacks, Coloureds and Asians in South Africa. They provided training, education, health and housing programmes representing annual expenditures of \$200 million, which benefited not only the 200,000 people which those corporations employed but the larger population as well.
26. There were, undoubtedly, certain cases of exploitative foreign economic practices. To cite only one example, a number of countries, including those who most vituperatively denounced the alleged exploitation of Namibia's mineral wealth, had been plundering its fishery stocks, violating with impunity the 200-mile exclusive economic zone. United Nations institutions, including FAO, had documented that pillage.
27. The United States intended to co-operate with all who were trying to find non-violent solutions to southern Africa's enormous problems.
28. Mr. POLO (Peru) said that recent political developments made it possible to assert, with SWAPO, that 1986 had been a year of general mobilization and of decisive action to bring about the final victory over apartheid. The Paris Conference on sanctions against South Africa and the Vienna Conference on Namibia, the La Valleja Conference and the recent special session of the General Assembly had underscored the need to isolate South Africa so as to compel it to implement General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and Security Council resolution 435 (1978).
29. The exploitation of Namibia's mines and natural resources in the absence of any regulatory machinery inevitably resulted in the violation of the rights of the workers, unrestrained pillage of natural resources, repression of any attempt at national liberation and serious social conflict. While foreign interests in Namibia were putting greed above the implementation of the fundamental rights of peoples set forth in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, thereby helping South Africa to remain in power and undermining the authority and effectiveness of the United Nations. Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia remained a dead letter and Namibia's natural resources were being depleted. Accordingly, Peru endorsed and encouraged the proceedings being instituted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in the courts of the countries in which the transnational corporations operating in Namibia originated.
30. The mandate entrusted under the United Nations Charter to the Administering Powers of Non-Self-Governing Territories, who were duty bound to promote the political, economic, social and cultural development of the people of those Territories and to protect the human and natural resources of those Territories, had not been carried out; indeed, his delegation was concerned at the increasing militarization of colonial territories in the Caribbean and South Pacific and also in Namibia where the installation of military bases was aggravating tensions and threatening the front-line States. The Namibian people were being compelled to defend their strategic interests in the context of East-West confrontation.

(Mr. Polo, Peru)

31. In that connection, his delegation wished to once again voice its concern at the movements of armed forces and the creation of military structures in the South Atlantic, where the conflict over the Malvinas (Falkland Islands) was still latent and posed a permanent threat to Latin America. It called on the Power controlling that Territory to renounce its intention, which threatened regional peace and security. At the same time, Peru was deeply concerned at the problem of Namibia. As a non-aligned country, it rejected the pretexts advanced by certain countries which were seeking to perpetrate an obsolete order and thus camouflage the rivalries that were dividing the world into two blocs.

32. It was contrary to the resolutions of the various United Nations organs, and to the efforts of the Secretary-General, to minimize the importance of the question of Namibia and to inject extraneous issues into it. The Secretary-General had made that point quite clear in his annual report on the work of the Organization. Peru was doubly committed to the cause of Namibia because that was a question which concerned the United Nations directly and because Peru had recently established diplomatic relations with SWAPO, which it recognized and whose just struggle against the oppressor it supported.

33. The Eighth Summit Conference of Non-aligned Countries held at Harare had reaffirmed that the activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia were impeding the decolonization process and were incompatible with the relevant United Nations resolutions and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. His delegation was firmly in favour of strict sanctions against South Africa. It was utterly convinced that Namibia's independence was inevitable and once more gave notice to those who were co-operating with the oppressor that they would be held responsible for the consequences of the choice they had made, in defiance of justice. Finally, it supported the recommendations of the Special Committee of 24, to which it was grateful for its precious contribution to the cause of decolonization.

34. Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria) expressed his delegation's deep concern at the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

35. Despite the numerous resolutions, in particular resolutions 261 (XXV), 40/56 and 40/52, and other relevant decisions of the United Nations, the colonial Powers and certain Western countries continued to deprive colonial peoples of their legitimate rights over the natural resources of their Territories and to oppose their legitimate aspirations to self-determination, genuine independence and economic self-reliance. The basic impediment to the full and speedy implementation of the Declaration was rooted in the very nature of imperialism and its political, economic and military-strategic interests. The preservation of the colonial status quo favoured the ruthless exploitation of natural and human resources, which explained the presence of a very large number of transnational corporations in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

36. The wanton exploitation of the natural and human resources of Namibia was of particular concern. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/CONF.138/7-A/AC.131/203) and the Secretary-General's note (E/C.10/1986/9) gave a

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

clear picture of the practices of Western transnational corporations in Namibia. According to document A/AC.131/22, over 60 per cent of Namibia's gross domestic product was repatriated by capitalist monopolies as company profits, the rest being used mainly in the form of current expenditures by foreign economic interests. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia also denounced the continuing co-operation between foreign banks operating in Namibia and the Pretoria racist régime, which enabled that régime to finance its military operations and to perpetuate its repressive policies in and illegal occupation of the Territory.

37. His country supported fully the position of the African and other non-aligned countries, was in favour of achieving a political settlement of the question of Namibia and putting an end to the policy of "constructive engagement" pursued by the United States and some of its allies with regard to the racist Pretoria régime, and supported the recommendations of the Special Committee of 24 (A/AC.109/881).

38. The international community was particularly concerned at the military activities of the colonial Powers in the colonial and Trust Territories and the use of those Territories for purposes contrary to the maintenance of international peace and security. Those activities were designed to repress national liberation movements, perpetuate the colonial status quo and interfere in the internal affairs of other independent States.

39. Nuclear colonialism in the dependent Territories posed a particular threat to the peoples of the entire world. The main objective of United States policy in Micronesia was to turn that strategically located Trust Territory into a military springboard in the western Pacific in order to control that region. In contravention of its obligations under Article 75 (a) and Article 84 of the Charter, the United States had imposed on the Micronesian island of Palau agreements that would permit the transit of nuclear weapons through the Territory. According to reports in the American press, the Pentagon would also be permitted to stockpile weapons of mass destruction on the island and to transform Kwajalein atoll into a huge testing range for its inter-continental ballistic missiles. That was why the peoples of dependent Territories, particularly in the southern Pacific, were in favour of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that part of the world. That was also why the legitimate struggle of the peoples of the region for a demilitarized and denuclearized Pacific should receive the Committee's wholehearted support.

40. International peace and security were also seriously threatened by the build-up of the military might and nuclear potential of South Africa with the assistance of certain Western countries, and by the military presence of the colonial Powers in dependent Territories such as Guam, Diego Garcia, Puerto Rico, Bermuda, the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and the Virgin Islands. In keeping with its own decisions, the United Nations must demand imperatively that the colonial Powers put an end to all military activities that contravened the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on decolonization.

41. His delegation continued to support unreservedly the total elimination of the military presence of colonial Powers and their allies, and of the activities of foreign economic interests in the colonial Territories, and hoped that the Committee would take a strong stand on that issue.

42. Mr. WANUME KIBEDI (Uganda) said that his Government, which had its origins in the national resistance movement which had fought and finally triumphed over years of anarchy, violence and systematic denial of human rights by previous Governments, pledged its total and militant support for the peoples of Namibia and South Africa in their struggle against the racist régime and its collaborators. Although decolonization efforts had progressed significantly in the past 40 years, they were still hampered by foreign economic and other interests which persistently violated the rights of peoples in dependent Territories.

43. Nowhere was that situation better exemplified than in Namibia, where foreign interests had worked hand in glove with South Africa to consolidate the illegal occupation of the Territory and plunder its resources. The two mainstays of the Namibian economy, the mining and fishing industries, were largely dominated by South Africa and by transnational corporations which exploited them to the hilt to their own advantage, without concerning themselves with the Territory's internal development. Transnational corporations had thus helped directly and indirectly to sustain the apartheid system and the occupation of Namibia.

44. His delegation was particularly concerned at the assistance which transnational corporations and other foreign interests were providing to South Africa in the nuclear and military spheres. In spite of the mandatory arms embargo, military equipment had been sold to South Africa, which had then been able to manufacture weapons and develop its nuclear capabilities. That had strengthened its repressive arsenal at home and its means of waging aggression against the front-line States.

45. South Africa's self-portrayal as the last line of defence that so-called Western interests in the region had against communism was indefensible. Equally indefensible was the insulting argument that transnational corporations had improved the standard of living in Non-Self-Governing Territories, as though people were better off in slavery so long as they were fed by their master. Uganda totally rejected the strategy of linking Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. The actions of the South African régime had exposed the bankruptcy of the policy of "constructive engagement", which had merely served to encourage Pretoria's repressive and aggressive policies, in growing contempt of the international community.

46. For all those reasons, Uganda had consistently called for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. The argument that such sanctions would hurt neighbouring countries or the people they were intended to help enjoyed no support in Africa. Rather, the question at hand was how to help those countries cope with the impact of sanctions. In that regard, his delegation welcomed the recent decision by the United States Congress to impose sanctions. It called upon those countries that engaged in extensive trade with South Africa to follow that example, limited though it might be.

47. His delegation therefore denounced the concept and policy of apartheid, which was an insult to the entire black race, and reaffirmed that the struggle of the Namibian and South African peoples to exercise their fundamental human rights was a just cause whose triumph was inevitable.

48. Mr. MASHHADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, since the adoption by the General Assembly in 1960 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, many countries had gained independence, yet the problem of colonialism was still not settled. The notorious system of apartheid had not been dismantled, nor had Namibia attained independence, despite all the efforts made over the past 40 years, particularly within the United Nations. Nevertheless, if there was one subject on which the international community unanimously agreed, it was apartheid. Responsibility for that failure clearly lay with those Western States that supported the policy of apartheid and misused their veto.

49. Foreign investments, which by their sheer volume played a vital role in the key sectors of the economy and in South African military policy, together with the régime's collaboration with transnational corporations explained South Africa's intransigence and the support it received, especially from the United States of America, with its so-called policy of "constructive engagement". Like all colonial Powers, the Pretoria régime had made the Namibian economy totally dependent on South Africa.

50. Few régimes showed so many similarities as did the racist régime of South Africa and the Zionist régime: both discriminated against indigenous peoples and constantly attacked neighbouring States; they were also the régimes most frequently condemned by the international community, and both were supported by the United States Administration.

51. South Africa continued to occupy Namibia illegally, in violation of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, which had terminated its Mandate over the Territory, and no concrete progress had been made towards securing Namibia's independence since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). For its part, the Islamic Republic of Iran continued to maintain a complete trade embargo against South Africa; it believed that greater pressure should be exerted on the Pretoria régime through the application of the sanctions specified in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter and in Security Council resolution 283 (1970), and that support for the struggle led by SWAPO should be strengthened.

52. The presence of military bases and installations in dependent Territories constituted a major obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It could hardly be said that local populations did not object to nuclear tests or that the installation of weapons of mass destruction was in their interest.

53. Mr. Gbeho (Ghana) resumed the Chair.

Draft resolution on foreign economic interests and draft decision on military activities

54. The CHAIRMAN said that he floor was open to delegations wishing to speak on the draft resolution and draft decision contained in chapters IV and V of document A/41/23 (Part III) respectively.

55. Mr. SKOPENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the military activities of colonial Powers in the territories under their administration, which threatened international peace and security, were in fact intended to crush national liberation movements. Namibia was a case in point.

56. South Africa maintained a 100,000-man army of occupation on Namibian territory, spread out over 90 bases. To overcome the resistance of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, South Africa was unleashing special units in Namibia made up in part of foreign mercenaries, which were terrorizing the civilian population. In addition, South Africa was now using Namibia as a base from which to launch attacks against neighbouring countries, particularly Angola.

57. Those activities were possible only because Pretoria enjoyed the support of major Western Powers and financial circles, and because foreign corporations did not hesitate to violate the arms embargo. Pretoria's military co-operation with Tel Aviv was also significant since nearly all the weapons currently produced in South Africa were based on Israeli models. Finally, the international community could not but share the African countries' concern at Pretoria's efforts to obtain nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons and at the support South Africa was receiving for those efforts from Western corporations.

58. The Ukrainian SSR fully supported the Special Committee's appeal, contained in the draft decision on military activities in document A/41/23 (Part III), to all States to render sustained and increased moral and political support, as well as assistance in all fields, to SWAPO to enable it to intensify its struggle for the liberation of Namibia.

59. As for the other Non-Self-Governing Territories, whether Micronesia, Diego Garcia, Puerto Rico or the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), it was obvious that Western military circles sought to step up their military activities there, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on decolonization. His delegation believed that the draft decision could have been more forceful and specific in that regard. Nevertheless, in so far as it condemned all military activities by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration that were detrimental to the rights and interests of the peoples concerned, his delegation would support it, and would also vote in favour of the draft resolution on foreign interests.

60. Mr. AL-SUDANI (Iraq) said that all colonial Territories, regardless of their size or population, must be able to exercise their right to self-determination and independence freely. Dispatching visiting missions to those Territories, like the one to Tokelau in previous year, was the best way to ascertain the aspirations of the local population. Neither foreign economic interests nor military interests, which often went hand in hand, should impede the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). It was occasionally maintained that foreign presence in Non-Self-Governing Territories was beneficial because it generated employment. That argument was unacceptable, for freedom had no price.

61. His delegation called on all administering Powers to prevent the transnational corporations under their jurisdiction from plundering the resources of the Territories they administered and from holding those Territories back as they moved towards independence.

(Mr. Al-Sudani, Iraq)

62. Namibia was a blatant example of that form of neo-colonialist exploitation which had been condemned by numerous international seminars and conferences organized during 1986. That question was dealt with in documents A/CONF.138/4 and 7, E/C.10/1986/9 and A/41/23 (Parts III and IX). The continued occupation of Namibia was a severe test of the credibility of the United Nations. Certain States Members of the United Nations were hardly concerned about the independence of Namibia and considered it of less importance to them than political considerations. The repugnant régime of apartheid which, contrary to certain types of enlightened "colonization", in no way sought to bring about the emancipation of the indigenous population, was in fact the only party to benefit from the status quo.

63. Iraq, as an independent non-aligned country, firmly supported the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, using all means at their disposal, including armed struggle.

64. Iraq condemned the support provided by certain States to the Pretoria régime, which thus enabled it to strengthen its military power and to defy the United Nations Organization, the front-line States and, in fact, Africa as whole. His delegation denounced in particular the growing economic and military co-operation between the Zionist régime and the apartheid régime, which had permitted those two partners to acquire nuclear weapons. It called upon the international community to intensify its pressure on the South African régime by reinforcing the boycott decreed against it and to rapidly bring about Namibia's accession to independence. The apartheid régime could not indefinitely resist the march of history, and all peoples would inevitably achieve their independence.

65. The CHAIRMAN gave the floor to Delegations wishing to explain their vote before the vote.

66. Mr. DELFOSE (Belgium) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution on the activities of foreign interests because several paragraphs of the draft carelessly lumped together the current situation in Namibia and the very different situation that existed in other Non-Self-Governing Territories. He regretted that the text ignored the relatively positive developments, having regard to the international economic situation, in most of the Territories concerned, and that consequences harmful to indigenous populations continued to be systematically attributed to foreign investments.

67. In principle, countries should not be mentioned by name. Moreover, certain delegations persisted in injecting an anti-Western tone into the debate, thus transforming it into an exercise which became more academic and sterile with each passing year. The question might also be asked whether such an attitude did not reflect resentment at the poor results obtained elsewhere by other methods. The sincerity of the denunciations of military activities, real or imagined, attributed to the West, could also be questioned since they were constantly reshaped by members of a military alliance which was constantly expanding throughout the world.

(Mr. Delfosse, Belgium)

68. He wished to recall his delegation's consistent support for the many resolutions of the United Nations aimed at putting an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia and to South Africa's policy of apartheid. While acknowledging that the Organization was called upon to take an active interest in the political, economic and social development of small Territories that were not yet independent, it hoped that such situations would be examined with objectivity and realism and with the sole intention of serving the populations concerned.

69. Mr. PEKURI (Finland), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, reaffirmed that they were very committed to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in all Territories under colonial domination, including Namibia and that they held the South African Government responsible for the prevailing oppression and instability in southern Africa. Furthermore, the Nordic countries condemned the activities of all foreign economic interests which impeded the process of decolonization in Namibia and in other Non-Self-Governing Territories.

70. The draft resolution under consideration by the Committee, however, failed to acknowledge that some of those activities could be favourable to the economic and social development of the Territories in question; not to distinguish between different types of activities would be to lose sight of the fundamental objectives of the draft resolution. The Nordic countries also had reservations of principle in respect of certain paragraphs which did not distinguish between the area of competence of the General Assembly and that of the Security Council.

71. With respect to the draft decision on military activities, the Nordic countries had reservations with regard to the implicit endorsement of recourse to armed struggle and recalled that the search for peaceful solutions was one of the fundamental principles of the Charter. They also regretted that countries or groups of countries which supported the policy of the South African Government continued to be mentioned by name. They would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution and on the draft decision.

72. Mr. MAJLOOR (Netherlands) said that his country would continue to support all efforts by the international community to put an end to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and to allow the Namibian people to exercise their right to self-determination. While recognizing the major role played by SWAPO, the Netherlands considered that, before free elections were held, no political group should be designated as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

73. Concerning the other Non-Self-Governing Territories, the Netherlands was confident that the administering Powers would continue to promote the interests of the inhabitants, in close co-operation with them. It therefore regretted that certain speakers had tried to depict those Territories as "victims" of unmitigated colonialism and had made accusations which found no basis in the reports prepared by the Secretariat. As a result, the debate on that agenda item was becoming each year more sterile and artificial and was being transformed into a rhetorical

(Mr. Ma'joor, Netherlands)

warfare against the values of nations which, like the Netherlands, supported all initiatives to advance the interests of the Territories in question. In order to promote a more rational and realistic appreciation of issues, his delegation would welcome the biannualization of that item. Such a step would also help to shorten the agenda of the Fourth Committee.

74. The draft resolution in document A/41/23 (Part III) contained unhelpful and contentious propositions that were unlikely to advance the interests of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was wrong, for example, to assume that all foreign economic interests were, by definition, an impediment to the self-determination of peoples. Foreign investments could and should play a role in accelerating the economic and social development of those Territories. It was unacceptable that the role of Western countries should be singled out in a number of paragraphs and that three States members of the European Community should be mentioned by name. Since the Netherlands was committed to a policy of increasing the pressure on the South African Government through the establishment, with the other States members of the European Community, of selective mandatory sanctions, it was unable to join in efforts to totally isolate South Africa, as had been called for in paragraph 18. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

75. Mr. JOFFE (Israel) strongly objected to the singling out of his country by name in paragraph 8 of the draft decision. Israel could shed some light on the "other countries" to which the draft decision referred without specifying them. From 1980 to 1984, 167 oil tankers had brought 251.2 million barrels of Arab oil to South Africa, coming mainly from Bahrain, Iran, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. He also wished to recall his statement of the previous day on the diamond, gold and platinum connection and wished to assure the Committee that the singling out of Israel without any proof would not camouflage the real collaborators. Israel would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution and would vote against the draft decision.

76. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) regretted that, despite its deep commitment to the right of all peoples to self-determination, his delegation was compelled to vote against the draft resolution before the Committee.

77. The Federal Republic of Germany could not accept the assumption underlying the draft resolution that all activities of foreign economic and other interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories were harmful. Foreign investment was undoubtedly an asset to newly independent States which were seeking to put into place their own economic systems. Moreover, his delegation could not accept the singling out in the draft resolution of three Member States, one of which was his own, a procedure that was incompatible with the spirit of co-operation which should inspire the work of the Committee.

78. With regard to the draft decision on military activities, he wished to refer the Committee to the statement which would be made later by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Community.

79. Mr. AOKI (Japan) said that he had difficulties in subscribing to the basic thrust of the draft resolution on the activities of foreign economic and other interests, inasmuch as all such activities were represented as necessarily prejudicial. In fact, whether or not such activities were harmful depended on the nature of the activity in question and on the situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territory concerned. It was known from experience that foreign economic and other interests could have a beneficial influence on Non-Self-Governing Territories, particularly with regard to the transfer of technology, management training and the creation of job opportunities. His delegation deplored the fact that, year after year, a group of Member States were singled out for criticism. That undesirable practice was counter-productive for the enhancement of concerted international action. For those reasons, his delegation could not support the draft resolution and would abstain in the voting.

80. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Economic Community, said that he wished to reiterate the concern of the Community at the proposal to vote on the draft decision relating to military activity in Non-Self-Governing Territories, a subject that did not appear on the list of agenda items allocated by the General Assembly to the Fourth Committee.

81. Speaking as the representative of the United Kingdom, he said that he would vote against the draft resolution on foreign interests, which was unhelpful and controversial. Instead, it served as a vehicle from which certain delegations could score political points at the expense of colonial Powers. His delegation's main objection related to the assumption that foreign economic interests were prejudicial to the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories and constituted an impediment to self-determination. Any reasonable resolution should make a distinction between activities that might be harmful and those that might be beneficial to the economic and social development of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Furthermore, it was absurd to condemn economic activity by foreign companies in Non-Self-Governing Territories and at the same time to call upon administering Powers in other resolutions or decisions to accelerate and extend economic development in the Territories for which they were responsible. The resolution under consideration had lost all meaning and purpose because it had become divorced from the real world.

82. His delegation looked forward to the day when the Fourth Committee could draft a resolution couched in balanced, analytical and realistic terms and, above all, terms that would be understood by the main parties concerned - the inhabitants of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories.

83. Mr. McLEAN (Canada) said that he had already expressed reservations concerning the excessively polemical and repetitive nature of the reports and resolutions on which the Committee was called upon to take a decision. He had also reviewed the actions taken by Canada to exert pressure on the South African régime to abolish apartheid and liberate Namibia, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. McLean, Canada)

84. Canada did not wish to support resolutions and decisions which were so unbalanced and some provisions of which had extra-territorial implications inapplicable under Canadian law, called into question the independence of specialized bodies such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and took as a given a status for certain organizations that several delegations had not accepted. His delegation had serious reservations concerning texts which, because of their polemical and complicated phraseology, tended to turn support for the legitimate purpose for decolonization into a diatribe against the Western States. Such texts, instead of making the Organization "a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations", as provided for in the Charter, fostered divisiveness, disharmony and disagreement. For the above-mentioned reasons, his delegation would abstain in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/41/23 (Part III).

85. As in preceding years, his delegation would vote against the draft decision on military activities. The inclusion of a decision on military activities under the agenda item under consideration appeared to be a procedural irregularity. The draft decision was, moreover, couched in tendentious language, with which his delegation did not wish to be associated.

86. Mr. BASTELICA (France) said that his delegation had serious reservations concerning the draft resolution on foreign interests. France could not accept the condemnation in principle, as contained in the text of the draft, of the activities of foreign enterprises in the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories. Even if those Territories were in very different situations, he considered that, generally speaking, foreign enterprises could contribute to their development. While it was true that the activities of foreign enterprises could sometimes be of little use or even harmful, when natural resources were exploited without regard for the living and working conditions of the labour force, the environment and the economic fabric of the territory, such a state of affairs did not exist in all Non-Self-Governing Territories or only in such Territories. The real problem lay, in fact, in the way markets were organized and the unbalanced character of relations between developing countries and industrialized countries.

87. In other words, the solution was closely linked to the efforts of the international community to establish a just and effective international economic order and to the progress in such areas that the United Nations was called upon to promote. The French Government was aware of that, and that constituted one of the axes of its foreign policy, whether it was a question of public aid for development, the organization of raw materials markets, the reform of the international monetary and financial system or respect for the rules of international trade.

88. The reservations which it had expressed, would, in themselves, have led his delegation to abstain. However, it noted with regret that the draft resolution before the Committee also mentioned certain Member States by name. It was opposed in principle to such citations and would therefore vote against that text.

(Mr. Bastelica, France)

89. With regard to the second text, which related to military activities, his delegation maintained, on the subject of procedure, the reservations that it had expressed on many occasions. Its position was that set forth by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the 12 countries members of the European Communities and, for that reason, it would, as in the preceding year, vote against that draft.

90. Mr. BARILLARO (Italy) reaffirmed his country's firm commitment to the cause of decolonization and assured the Committee that Italy supported to the best of its ability the efforts made by the United Nations to bring that process to an end speedily and peacefully.

91. His delegation was also convinced that it was necessary to continue to follow closely the activities of foreign interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories but deplored the tendency that had emerged in the Committee since 1982 to proceed to a vote on resolutions and decisions drafted in a controversial manner. His delegation could not accept the general thrust or a number of the features of those texts, particularly when it was implied that all foreign economic investments were prejudicial to the economic and political development of Non-Self-Governing Territories. That statement was, to say the least, surprising in view of the fact that, at that very moment, the General Assembly in plenary session was calling for increased capital inputs for developing countries. It also disregarded the economic theory that capital and technological inputs were beneficial to the development of all countries, even industrialized countries, and it penalized Non-Self-Governing Territories by reason of their status by ignoring their development needs.

92. Similarly, his delegation could not accept that certain countries, including some of Italy's partners in the European Economic Community, should be singled out and accused of having special responsibility for practices that were in no way proven to be prejudicial to Non-Self-Governing Territories. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

93. Mr. ORTIGAO (Portugal) said that, although his delegation fully shared the concern over the effects of the unchecked activities of foreign interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories and concurred with many positive factors of the draft resolution contained in document A/41/23 (Part III) (chap. IV, para. 11), it would vote against that draft resolution. Portugal could not agree that all foreign economic interests were necessarily prejudicial or that they automatically obstructed efforts to ensure the accession of Non-Self-Governing Territories to self-determination and independence. There was a contradiction between the wholesale condemnation of all foreign economic involvement in Non-Self-Governing Territories, which was implicit in the draft resolution, and the calls made in other recommendations of the Committee, as well as in the Charter, for the further economic development of those same Territories. Portugal could also not accept the fact that three States members of the European Community had been mentioned by name in the text.

(Mr. Ortigao, Portugal)

94. With regard to the draft decision on military activities contained in chapter V, paragraph 11, of the same document, his delegation fully endorsed the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community.

95. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Special Committee of 24 because of Uruguay's steadfast support for the principles contained in the Declaration on decolonization, in particular the right of peoples to dispose of their natural resources, and the administering Powers' obligation to promote the progress of the populations of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and to protect those natural resources. Nevertheless, since the texts of the current session were a restatement of texts of previous years, Uruguay deemed it necessary to enter the same reservations as it had in the past, since it preferred more balanced texts. It would also vote in favour of the draft decision on military activities because it approved the substance of that draft, but it reiterated its doubts regarding the advisability of including a text on that subject in the consideration of agenda item 105.

96. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea) said that peoples living in colonial situations were not able to influence either the economic activities conducted by others or the equitable distribution of the wealth resulting from foreign investment. While Papua New Guinea respected the views on the importance of economic and social development in the dependent Territories and on other countries' assistance in that development, it found it difficult to vote for resolutions in which certain countries were mentioned by name. If there had been a separate vote on the paragraphs in question, Papua New Guinea would have voted against them. However, since his delegation considered the substance of the issue to be highly important, it would vote for both the draft resolution and the draft decision.

97. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Committee on activities of foreign economic and other interests [A/41/23 (Part III) (chap. IV, para. 11)].

98. A recorded vote was requested.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and

Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Cameroon, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, Norway, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

99. The draft resolution was adopted by 91 votes to 9, with 18 abstentions.

100. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft decision on military activities and arrangements [A/41/23 (Part III) (chap. V, para. 11)].

101. A recorded vote was requested.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Cameroon, Chile, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Lesotho, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

102. The draft resolution was adopted by 89 votes to 13, with 17 abstentions.

103. The CHAIRMAN gave the floor to delegations wishing to explain their vote after the vote.

104. Mr. POTTS (Australia) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution which had just been adopted even though it had had significant reservations about the paragraphs dealing with southern Africa and, in particular, with Namibia. Those reservations in no way diminished Australia's total opposition to apartheid nor its absolute commitment to Namibia's independence, and, therefore, in favour of a mandatory system of concerted and coherent sanctions against South Africa. However, there was an inherent contradiction between the wholesale condemnation of foreign economic interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories, which underlay the draft resolution, and the appeals to expedite economic development contained in draft resolutions on particular Territories. In many Non-Self-Governing Territories, constructive foreign investment had proved to be a potent force for economic development and the exercise of the right to self-determination. If handled correctly, foreign investment could assist economic development through the introduction of new technology and skills and greater employment. Australia's support for the draft resolution did not imply its acceptance of the designation of SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, since it was for the people themselves to freely elect their representatives.

105. His delegation noted with concern that, once again, the resolution had failed to take account of the fishing activities of a group of countries from both East and West which fished off Namibia's coastal zone; such activities, which brought no revenue to Namibia, constituted an obstacle to Namibia's early accession to independence. It was disappointing that some members of the United Nations Council for Namibia and other Members of the United Nations had not responded to the call of the Council, in consultation with SWAPO, for the early proclamation of an exclusive economic zone off Namibia's coast; such a measure would prevent the rapid depletion of Namibia's rich fishing stocks, which had been capably documented by FAO. Australia hoped that, in future, delegations would submit a more balanced report on the question of foreign economic interests.

106. His delegation hoped that the reservations which it had just expressed and which were shared by many other delegations would be taken into account when any further resolutions on that subject were prepared in future.

107. The issue of foreign military installations and activities was not on the agenda of the Fourth Committee, and a discussion of that question was therefore a procedural irregularity. Moreover, because Australia had had difficulties with the content of the draft decision on that aspect of the issue, it had abstained in the vote.

108. Miss MILLAN (Colombia) reiterated Colombia's unwavering support for the cause of decolonization and its conviction that the remaining impediments to the decolonization of Namibia and other dependent Territories must be eliminated as quickly as possible. The international community must not slacken its efforts towards that goal. The essential aim of the Committee's present efforts was to

(Miss Millan, Colombia)

protect the natural resources, particularly the marine resources of Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was that position of principle which had led her delegation to vote for the draft resolution and the draft decision submitted to the Committee, although it would have preferred more balanced texts. In keeping with its foreign policy, Colombia also had reservations with regard to the discriminatory naming of certain countries or groups of countries in texts submitted to the Committee.

109. Miss O'FARRELL (Ireland) said that, under the umbrella of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, foreign economic interests continued to exploit that Territory's human resources and plunder its natural resources. Her delegation condemned those activities without reservation and therefore supported the general thrust of the sections of the draft resolution which related to foreign economic interests in Namibia. It could not, however, accept the argument that foreign economic interests had, in all cases, detrimental effects in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Carefully promoted economic development was an important factor in bringing those Territories to independence. Administering Powers therefore had the obligation to ensure that foreign economic interests were geared to the long-term interests of the inhabitants of those Territories and did not constitute an impediment to the implementation of the Declaration. The draft resolution just adopted by the Committee did not constitute a balanced approach because it did not adequately address the complex range of issues confronting the remaining small Non-Self-Governing Territories, for which carefully promoted economic development remained an important factor in the achievement of independence. That was why her delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution and hoped that a more balanced draft would be submitted to the Committee in the future.

110. Mr. ERKMENOGLU (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution condemning foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the decolonization process in Namibia and in all other dependent Territories. While Turkey strongly supported efforts to eradicate colonialism, however, it would have preferred the resolution to make a clear distinction between activities which really impeded the process of decolonization and those which did not. Turkey had also voted in favour of the draft decision on military activities, even though it believed that paragraphs 2, 3 and 11 could have been drafted in a more balanced way. Lastly, his delegation did not approve of the express mention of certain countries when responsibilities could not be imputed to them with any certainty.

111. Miss PANTING (New Zealand) said that while her country could not accept that all foreign investment was, of necessity, detrimental to progress towards independence, it had supported the draft resolution because there were examples which proved that a good number of economic interests did in fact impede such progress.

112. The resolution rightly drew attention to the situation in Namibia but her delegation regretted that, while due concern was paid to the plunder of Namibia's mineral resources, no mention was made of the plunder of the Territory's marine resources by certain fishing nations.

(Miss Panting, New Zealand)

113. The resolution had no relevance to Tokelau, the one remaining Territory under New Zealand's administration, because there were no foreign companies operating in that Territory. Some of the concerns expressed were shared by the people of Tokelau, however, including those in the fifteenth preambular paragraph appealing for restrictions on the sale of land to foreigners. In that connection, she drew the Committee's attention to the fact that, in 1986, the New Zealand Parliament had passed legislation imposing precisely such restrictions on the sale of land in Tokelau.

114. New Zealand had abstained in the vote on the draft decision concerning military activities because the assertion that military activities necessarily impeded decolonization was, in its view, too sweeping. There were, incidentally, no activities of a military nature in Tokelau.

115. Mrs. NAVCHIA (Mongolia) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and the draft decision, since both drafts reflected its position of principle on the subject. It would, however, have preferred stronger wording against colonial Powers and their economic, military and other activities in the colonial Territories, particularly Namibia. Both drafts should also have made more specific reference to the countries supporting the Pretoria régime. Lastly, the draft resolution would have been significantly stronger if it had included a provision calling for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa.

116. Mr. MORAGA (Chile) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution on activities of foreign economic and other interests in Namibia and the other colonial Territories but considered it inappropriate to regard foreign investments *per se* as an impediment to attaining the objectives of decolonization. His delegation believed that, as a general rule, foreign investments could in fact promote the development of certain regions, strengthen their economic infrastructure, facilitate their access to world markets and stimulate their progress. Moreover, his delegation found it unacceptable that both the draft resolution and the draft decision named certain countries or groups of countries as being responsible for the depletion of the natural resources of the Territories which they were supposed to protect. An objective analysis of the situation revealed that there were many countries which had very definite and profitable agreements with the countries that they attacked publicly.

117. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) said that, in keeping with its position of principle, his delegation had voted for the draft resolution. It wished to state formally, however, that its vote must not be construed as meaning that Fiji agreed with the resolution in its entirety or that it believed that all foreign economic activities necessarily impeded the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization. Some clauses of those texts were unacceptable and, if a separate vote had been taken on them, Fiji would have voted against them. He urged that the reservations expressed at the current meeting by several delegations should be taken into consideration so that, in future, resolutions and decisions were acceptable to a larger number of delegations.

118. Mr. POSTOWICZ (Poland), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, in its statement at the previous meeting, the United Kingdom delegation had mentioned Polish activities in Namibia's offshore fishery. Poland was surprised that the United Kingdom should have so much to say about Namibia's relatively small fishing sector, while making no mention of the depletion of its non-renewable mineral resources by several Western countries and corporations, in violation of Decree No. 1. He wished to recall that fishing represented only 2 per cent of Namibia's GNP.

119. Furthermore, the United Kingdom delegation and other delegations had presented a distorted view of fishing in Namibia's offshore fishery. He wished to emphasize certain facts: the International Commission for the Southeast Atlantic Fisheries had been established by a convention lodged with FAO in Rome. That Commission operated in complete conformity with international law and, more precisely, with Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. According to the FAO report cited by the representative of the United Kingdom, the functions of that Commission were to gather, study and analyse scientific information on that part of the Atlantic and to make recommendations for the management of fishing resources, including the fixing of catch quotas. Furthermore, the authors of that report had expressed their satisfaction with the considerable work done by the secretariat and member countries of the Commission in gathering information and analysing data on fishing in that region.

120. Mr. HERNANDEZ-MACHADO (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that fishing in the South-East Atlantic was regulated by an international commission which fixed quotas that Cuba respected scrupulously. His country had never done anything that could harm Namibia's interests; on the contrary, it gave Namibia all the assistance it could. He recommended that the United Kingdom concern itself instead with settling the Namibian problem by agreeing to the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, which the latter amply deserved, in order to help the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, their only authentic representative, to free themselves from apartheid and gain control over their natural resources.

121. As for the statement by the United States representative concerning Cuban troops in Angola, he recalled that the concept of "linkage" had been rejected by the General Assembly by an overwhelming majority and reiterated that Cuba would not withdraw its internationalist forces as long as Angola needed aid and South Africa posed a threat to peace and security in Angola, the region and the world. Moreover, that question was for Angola and Cuba alone to decide and his country found it unacceptable that others should seek to use it as a pre-condition for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

122. Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was not the first time that certain Western countries had tried to hush up the Governments' relations with South Africa and to minimize the responsibility of the transnational corporations that were plundering Namibia. It was definitely the first time, however, that a member of the Committee had been heard to propose that the question be eliminated from the General Assembly's agenda. Such a proposal could be explained only by the desire to give transnational corporations a free hand and a plenary indulgence. Member States would remain deaf to the proposal, however.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

123. The United Kingdom representative had likewise tried to present condemnation of the activities of transnational corporations as the result of East-West confrontation. In reality, everyone knew that it was not East and West that were confronting one another on the issue but rather those who were in favour of Namibia's genuine independence and against apartheid and those who were collaborating with Pretoria. In order to justify themselves, certain Western countries and Israel did not hesitate to produce alleged evidence of Soviet co-operation with South Africa. In fact, that was only a tissue of lies woven by the secret services and should be regarded as nothing more than disinformation. The Soviet Union emphasized once again that it maintained no relations of any kind, either direct or indirect, with South Africa.

124. Miss BINH THANH (Viet Nam), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, rejected categorically the slanderous allegations made against her country by Malaysia and suggested that instead of accusing others, that country should examine its own conscience and ask itself which side it had taken when Viet Nam had been put to fire and the sword by imperialist forces. The answer was clear: Malaysia had always taken the side of imperialism and colonialism in crushing the Vietnamese people's just struggle for independence. Even today, Malaysia was a zealous supporter of those who had perpetrated genocide against the Kampuchean people. She wished to point out to the representative of Malaysia that the time for acrimonious debate among South-East Asian countries was past and that it was now time for a serious and constructive exchange of views in order to find an appropriate solution to the region's problems.

125. Mr. MORTIMEK (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his statement at the previous meeting seemed to have touched the Soviet delegation on a particularly raw nerve. It was customary for Soviet diplomats in such cases to either joke or discredit criticisms by asserting that they were based on fabrications by Western intelligence services. If one kept to the substance of the matter, however, the Soviet representative, despite his flights of oratory, had attacked the Western countries in order to avoid replying to an extremely important question raised by the United Kingdom at the previous meeting. Many members of the Committee were concerned at the depletion of Namibia's fishing resources and would be happy to hear the Soviet Union, Poland and Cuba say that they would immediately stop exploiting Namibia's fisheries.

126. As for the rejection of the United Kingdom delegation's assertion about collusion between South Africa and the Soviet Union over the sale of gold and diamonds, although he could not substantiate his allegations he would be very surprised if there could be so much smoke without fire. Lenin himself had said in 1921 that the Soviet Union must sell gold at the highest possible price in order to buy goods at the lowest possible price, and that was precisely what it was doing. The Committee and the Secretariat should produce documents containing a more balanced evaluation of the collaboration between certain countries and South Africa instead of the steady anti-Western diatribe so characteristic of the present forum.

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

127. The representative of Poland seemed to have taken it upon himself to qualify Namibia's fishing sector as unimportant. That representative was in a rather poor position to do so but, even if that was true, it was no justification for exploiting Namibia's fisheries. It was hardly surprising that fishing represented only 2 per cent of Namibia's GNP, given the way in which the Soviet Union and Poland were exploiting its fishery resources. He was none the less grateful to the Polish representative for having cited the FAO report and hoped that he would do likewise in the United Nations Council for Namibia, in order to ensure detailed, in-depth consideration of that important question.

128. Mr. TENDRO (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out to the representatives of Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Ukrainian SSR and Afghanistan that under Article 83 (3) of the United Nations Charter, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Micronesia) was a strategic Trust Territory and did not therefore fall within the competence of the Fourth Committee. He also wished to recall that the population of Micronesia, in a legitimate act of self-determination, had decided in a United Nations-supervised plebiscite to terminate the Trusteeship Agreement, and that that process was under way.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

129. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 10^a and suggested to members of the Committee that they authorize the Rapporteur to present his report on the item directly to the General Assembly.

130. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.