



**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 18th MEETING**

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

**CONTENTS**

**REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS**

**AGENDA ITEM 36: QUESTION OF NAMIBIA (continued)**

Hearing of petitioners

**AGENDA ITEM 104: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)**

**AGENDA ITEM 106: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)**

**AGENDA ITEM 107: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)**

**AGENDA ITEM 108: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)**

**AGENDA ITEM 19: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (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 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.4/41/SR.18**  
**27 October 1986**

**ORIGINAL: ENGLISH**

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/C.4/41/4/Add.10 and 11, A/C.4/41/9/Add.1 and 2)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to grant the requests for hearings on the question of Namibia contained in documents A/C.4/41/4/Add.10 and 11, and on the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) contained in documents A/C.4/41/9 and Add.1 and 2.

2. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 36: QUESTION OF NAMIBIA (continued)

Hearing of petitioners (A/C.4/41/4/Add.10 and 11)

3. At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms. Woods (Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization) took a place at the petitioners' table.

4. Ms. WOODS (Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization) said that Namibian independence seemed no nearer than it had been at the previous session of the General Assembly. The Pretoria régime had made it clear that it would make no concessions to world public opinion. Apparently, force was the only language that the régime and its collaborators understood. Although 20 years had elapsed since its Mandate had been terminated and Namibia had become the direct responsibility of the United Nations through the Council for Namibia, South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory, with all its attendant atrocities, continued. The plunder and rapid depletion of the country's natural resources persisted and, in flagrant defiance of the relevant Security Council resolutions, South Africa had imposed a so-called interim government in a vain attempt to find a neo-colonialist solution to the Namibian problem. The undeclared war of destabilization against the front-line States, particularly Angola, also continued, with Namibia being used openly as a training ground for such aggression. The Reagan Administration had made such a situation possible through its policy of "constructive engagement", of which "linkage" was a key component. The latter concept had even been incorporated into the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986, in which the United States Congress declared its intention of working towards "the removal of all foreign forces in the region".

5. The question of Namibian independence was a simple matter of decolonization and perhaps the most clear-cut issue currently before the United Nations. The special session of the General Assembly devoted to Namibia, held in September 1986, had called on the Council for Namibia to take immediate practical measures to establish its administration in Namibia, including stringent measures to enforce Decree No. 1. Such initiatives should receive the full support of all United Nations Member States and bodies.

6. The United States and its allies profited immeasurably from Pretoria's illegal occupation. As a result, they were attempting to present the question of Namibia as part of the East-West conflict. Such attempts, like the concept of linkage, must be rejected by the international community and the authors denounced by name. The States which were collaborating in the suffering of the Namibian people must be isolated.

(Ms. Woods)

7. One hundred years of colonialism, racism and genocide were more than enough. Namibian independence was a major test of the United Nations in the current critical period of world history. It must not be allowed to fail.

8. Ms. Woods withdrew.

9. At the invitation of the Chairman, Miss Kazombaue (Council of Churches in Namibia) took a place at the petitioners' table.

10. Miss KAZOMBAUE (Council of Churches in Namibia) said that the blackout on information to the outside world about South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia was intended to distract the international community's attention from South Africa's atrocities there. The linkage insisted upon by the United States Administration and by South Africa was being used for the same reasons and in order to deny the Namibian people their long overdue independence.

11. South Africa was enforcing military rule in Namibia, where there was one South African soldier for every 10 people. Police had been trained as soldiers and a so-called South-West Africa Territory Force had been created through compulsory military conscription of Namibian black males, thus forcing a civil war on the Namibian people. The people living in the northern part of Namibia, in particular, were suffering from the intensified militarization of that area, which was largely populated by women, children and the aged since able-bodied men were migrant workers in the towns. Women had been raped and children tortured, crops had been destroyed and houses burnt down by South African soldiers.

12. The South African army focused especially on Namibian youth. Cadet systems had been introduced in black schools and children received military training and anti-SWAPO indoctrination. Cultural differences were stressed at seminars organized for young people and the progressive churches were discredited while young people were recruited for pro-apartheid church programmes.

13. The so-called interim government installed by South Africa in Namibia in 1985 had no support whatsoever and was yet another instrument for the oppression and repression of the Namibian people. The repressive measures imposed by South Africa included a curfew, martial law, restrictions on meetings and detention without trial. Apartheid had also been imposed in Namibia. Health, social and educational services were segregated on an ethnic basis. Whites had not been segregated into ethnic groups but, among blacks, ethnicity had been overemphasized in order to divide and rule. The black ethnic Bantustans had no funds to provide social services while the white administration had a surplus. In many parts of the country, white schools were empty while black schools were overcrowded.

14. The war of repression in Namibia was being waged in a number of ways. Depo Provera, an injectable contraceptive that had been proved to cause cancer and other side effects, was being administered to black women at hospitals and clinics throughout the country. Some secondary schools in the ethnic Bantustans had forced all young girls of childbearing age to use the contraceptive without the consent of their parents. In a country of less than 2 million people, that was tantamount to genocide.

(Miss Kazombaue)

15. The church in Namibia was deeply involved in the struggle for national independence. In an effort to silence it, the South African Defense Force had engaged in acts of sabotage against it. Life was deliberately made unbearable for those who spoke out against the atrocities committed by South Africa in Namibia. Government and private sector workers were dismissed out of hand if suspected of being anti-government or belonging to SWAPO. People were denied travel documents, placed under house arrest, detained for indefinite periods without trial, or simply disappeared.

16. Namibia's natural resources were taken out of the country as raw materials and therefore did not create industries in Namibia or employment for the people. South Africa used Namibia as a market for its own products.

17. South Africa would undoubtedly misuse Namibia in order to sidestep the sanctions imposed upon it. Namibia should therefore be included in the sanctions. Pretoria controlled the Territory and its harbours and about 15,000 South African officials occupied key positions in the Namibian administration. Whites were loyal to South Africa rather than Namibia. Immediate and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was required in order to end the illegal occupation of Namibia and the suffering of its people.

18. Miss Kazombaue withdrew.

AGENDA ITEM 104: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

Draft resolution (A/41/23 (Part IV), chap. VII, para. 9)

19. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolution relating to information from Non-Self-Governing Territories set out in chapter VII, paragraph 9, of the report of the Special Committee (A/41/23 (Part IV)).

20. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution on information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations, contained in chapter VII, paragraph 9, of document A/41/23 (Part IV).

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbador, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary,

/...

Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

21. The draft resolution was adopted by 143 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

22. Ms. WALPOLE (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that her delegation had abstained in the vote because it did not accept the assertion in operative paragraph 2 of the resolution that it was for the General Assembly to decide at what point a Non-Self-Governing Territory had attained a full measure of self-government sufficient to absolve the administering Power of the obligation to transmit information under Article 73 of the Charter. Her delegation believed that such decisions should be left to the administering Power and the local government of the Non-Self-Governing Territory concerned.

23. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 104.

AGENDA ITEM 106: 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 (A/41/23 (Part IV and Corr.1), chap. VI, para. 18)

24. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolution on the 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 set out in chapter VI, paragraph 18, of the report of the Special Committee (A/41/23 (Part IV and Corr.1)). He noted that the delegation of Israel had requested a separate vote on the words "and Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph.

25. Mr. JOFFE (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation had already maintained in plenary meetings of the General Assembly and in the Fourth Committee that a group of countries was resorting to singling out Member States as collaborators with South Africa in order to shield their own secret and lucrative links with that country. The latest report of the Special Committee against Apartheid (A/41/22, annex IV) listed South Africa's main trading partners. The figures given did not, however, include trade in gold, arms and oil. Moreover, Israel was not one of the 13 countries mentioned. His delegation would vote against the words "and Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph and hoped that a sufficient number of delegations would join it to ensure that they were deleted.

26. Mr. MAJOOR (Netherlands) regretted that his delegation would be forced to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, although it appreciated the contribution made by the specialized agencies and international institutions to the decolonization process. His delegation was becoming increasingly concerned about the form and length of the draft resolution presented each year on the item. The superfluous material included and the incoherent and repetitious structure made it counter-productive. He hoped that the Special Committee would be able to put forward a more concise draft in future. In line with his delegation's statement on the resolution under agenda item 105, he suggested that item 106 should also be considered every other year so that the two related items could be alternated, as a first step towards shortening the Fourth Committee's agenda.

27. His delegation also objected to the singling out of certain Western countries for allegedly encouraging and strengthening the South African régime in its occupation, militarization and exploitation of Namibia. The fact that virtually all Western countries had increased their political and economic pressure on the South African Government was ignored. Those countries could not be held responsible for South Africa's refusal to end its illegal occupation. The Netherlands firmly believed that the people of Namibia must be enabled to exercise their right to self-determination without further delays or pre-conditions, in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions.

28. The Netherlands Government recognized the major role played by SWAPO in the independence process but, as his delegation had explained on many occasions, it considered that, until free elections were held, no political group should be designated as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, as was done in the seventh preambular paragraph. Lastly, his delegation rejected the attempts in the 20th and 21st preambular paragraphs and in operative paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 to politicize the IMF and the World Bank. Actions must be avoided which might divert those institutions from their true purpose of assisting Member countries in their economic development and facilitating the expansion and balancing of trade. Under its Articles of Agreement, the IMF was, and was required to function as, an independent international organization.

29. Ms. WALPOLE (United Kingdom) said that her delegation would vote against the draft resolution which, as in previous years, was drafted in contentious and irrelevant terms. The specialized agencies had an important role to play and the functions of the IMF and the World Bank were carefully defined, yet the resolution

(Ms. Walpole, United Kingdom)

focused on highly political matters, and more specifically on South Africa and Namibia, with hardly a mention of the other dependent Territories. The implicit assumption that the General Assembly was empowered to give instructions and advice to the specialized agencies, and in particular to the international financial institutions, was unacceptable, since the specialized agencies were autonomous bodies with their own statutes and funding structures. Their integrity and autonomy must be respected if their decisions were to continue to be taken on grounds of economic need rather than political expediency, otherwise they would cease to be effective as independent operators. It was time that the Committee drafted a resolution that testified to the crucial role played by the specialized agencies, in particular the World Bank and IMF, in the process of international economic development.

30. Mr. RASMUSSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, said that for many years the Nordic countries had actively supported the efforts of the specialized agencies to provide assistance, within their particular sphere of competence, to peoples struggling for freedom and self-determination and had themselves provided humanitarian, technical and educational assistance. They were among the largest contributors to United Nations programmes for Namibia, in particular the United Nations Fund for Namibia. In a new joint programme of action against South Africa, the Nordic countries had in 1985 committed themselves to increasing their humanitarian assistance to the peoples of southern Africa and to prohibiting or discouraging loans, including international loans and loans from the IMF, to South Africa. Although the Nordic countries supported the main thrust of the draft resolution, they had reservations of principle with regard to formulations that were too sweeping or inaccurate and would therefore have to abstain in the vote.

31. The Nordic countries deplored the singling out of individual countries or groups of countries as being allegedly responsible for the policies pursued by the South African Government, and opposed the inclusion of paragraphs relevant to the subject-matter.

32. Finally, the statutes of the specialized agencies should be duly taken into account and those institutions should retain their universal character.

33. Mr. BARRILLARO (Italy) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. Although it shared a number of views reflected in that resolution, it had serious reservations about controversial formulations, most of which were only distantly related to the issue under consideration and merely prevented the attainment of a consensus on the draft resolution. The draft resolution did not take into account the autonomy that the specialized agencies and international institutions must enjoy in discharging their functions, in accordance with the principles set out in their statutes. Moreover, his delegation could not accept that individual countries or groups of countries should be singled out selectively as bearing particular responsibility for the policies pursued by other Governments.

14. Mr. TAGA (Japan) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. Given the importance of achieving self-determination and independence in the colonial Territories, each specialized agency and international organization should be encouraged to take effective steps according to its specific area of competence. Some paragraphs of the draft resolution disregarded the principle of the universality of the specialized agencies. Moreover, his delegation could not support selective name-calling of individual countries or groups of countries.

35. Miss MILLAN (Colombia) said that her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution but, in accordance with the general principles of Colombia's foreign policy, was opposed to specific references to certain countries and groups of countries. It believed that the specific reference in the eighth preambular paragraph should be eliminated.

36. Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and in favour of the inclusion of the words "and Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph. The relationship between Israel and South Africa in the economic, political and nuclear fields was well known to everyone. The Arab countries of the Gulf region were strongly opposed to South Africa and supported the independence movements of southern Africa. Oman had no relations with the South African régime in any sphere. It did not need to export petroleum to South Africa and was not responsible for other countries' attempts to do so. It believed that the reference in operative paragraph 15 to assistance to national liberation movements referred only to those movements which had observer status with the United Nations.

37. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution fully. The specialized agencies should continue to implement United Nations resolutions relating to decolonization. All General Assembly resolutions had confirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of colonial peoples and countries until they achieved independence. General Assembly resolutions calling for the isolation of the Pretoria régime must be implemented. The co-operation between South Africa and Israel, including co-operation in the military and nuclear fields, was known to everyone.

38. Mr. CASTILLO-ARRIOLA (Guatemala) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution because it believed in its principles and purposes. It could not agree, however, that the United Nations should continue a practice of confrontation and discrimination by referring to countries by name, as it did, in particular, in the eighth preambular paragraph.

39. Mr. TCHANKOU (Cameroon) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution although, as in previous years, it had difficulty with the references to specific countries. Everyone knew which countries were collaborating with South Africa and there was no need to list them. If there was a list, it should mention all the countries involved. The time had come, individually and collectively, to assume responsibility for southern Africa.



(Mr. Tchankou, Cameroon)

40. In 1986, Cameroon had hosted a seminar on assistance to the peoples struggling against racism, racial discrimination and apartheid and, as a token of its active solidarity, had invited Mr. Sam Nujoma of SWAPO, who had been assured of Cameroon's support for the sacred cause of Namibian independence.

41. His delegation would vote against the inclusion of the words "and Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph, but that vote in no way altered its uncompromising position on South Africa and was simply a way of calling on the international community to show greater firmness in its approach to the subject.

42. Mr. BAGRENI ADEITO (Zaire) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution but, for reasons of justice and equity, would abstain in the separate vote on the eighth preambular paragraph. If specific countries were to be mentioned, all countries which had special relations with Pretoria should be named.

43. At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on the inclusion of the words "and Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Gabon, Guyana, Lesotho, Liberia, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela.

44. The inclusion of the words "and Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph was approved by 72 votes to 49, with 24 abstentions.

45. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, 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, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

46. The draft resolution was adopted by 122 votes to 4, with 23 abstentions.

47. Ms. PANTING (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that, although New Zealand welcomed the support that the specialized agencies were giving to the Non-Self-Governing Territories in preparing their peoples for independence, it had been forced to abstain in the vote on the resolution. Her

/...

(Ms. Panting, New Zealand)

delegation had already expressed New Zealand's total opposition to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and its abhorrence of apartheid. However, it believed that the specialized agencies and the World Bank and IMF must be guided by their own statutes and functional mandates, and not by outside political considerations. Her delegation disagreed with the practice of singling out Member States by name, and with the substance of the reference made in the eighth preambular paragraph of the resolution.

48. The need for the activities of the specialized agencies in Non-Self-Governing Territories to be co-ordinated and the central role of UNDP in the technical assistance activities of the United Nations must be recognized in future resolutions on the item. UNDP had worked very closely with New Zealand and with the people of Tokelau in implementing the country programme for Tokelau under the current UNDP programming cycle. In June 1986, New Zealand had supported UNDP's endorsement of a further study programme for Tokelau for the period 1987-1991. It hoped that that close working relationship would continue.

49. Miss O'FARRELL (Ireland) said that since her delegation had always recognized the important role played by the specialized agencies in the field of decolonization, it was in agreement with the general thrust of the resolution but had been obliged to abstain in the vote because of the criticisms of the IMF and World Bank and the failure of the resolution to take into account the statutes of those institutions.

50. Mr. TALX (France) said that he wished to reaffirm France's attachment to the principles of the universality and independence of the specialized agencies, which must be respected. The resolution just adopted contained unjustified criticisms of the World Bank and IMF. France also had serious reservations about the selective criticism of certain countries. It had therefore voted against the specific reference in the eighth preambular paragraph and had abstained in the vote on the resolution as a whole.

51. Mr. PISCHINAS (Greece) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution because it believed that the assistance provided by the specialized agencies and other international institutions could be of great importance to the struggle of colonial peoples to achieve their right to self-determination. As a matter of principle, however, Greece felt that it was unfair to single out countries selectively, and had therefore voted against the inclusion of the words "and Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph. That vote should not be construed as altering its continuing and unreserved support for the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence.

52. Mr. SVOBGDA (Canada) said that, as a matter of principle, his delegation was opposed to the gratuitous and arbitrary citation of individual countries and had therefore voted against the inclusion of the words "and Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph, which further politicized an already tendentious paragraph. It also questioned the validity of continued and generalized accusations against Western countries concerning their support for South Africa. Canada, along with virtually all other Western nations, had adopted strong measures against the Government of South Africa, actions which surely invalidated many of the stale accusations made.

(Mr. Svoboda, Canada)

53. The resolution called into question both the independence of the international financial institutions and the specialized agencies, and their valued contribution to the process of decolonization. While Canada fully supported the main principles underlying the resolution, it could not accept a convoluted and highly polemical disquisition and had therefore abstained in the vote. Instead of reproducing the same tired text year after year, the Committee should in future resolutions address its true concerns so that a positive vote could be taken. His delegation supported the suggestion by the representative of the Netherlands that the consideration of items 105 and 106 should be alternated.

54. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted for the resolution, in reaffirmation of the stand it had taken at previous sessions. Since the resolution was substantially similar to previous General Assembly resolutions on the same subject, he referred to the reservations made by his delegation in the past when those resolutions had been adopted.

55. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) said that his delegation had voted for the resolution because it supported the valuable assistance provided to Non-Self-Governing Territories by the specialized agencies. However, it could not agree with the practice of singling out selected countries for condemnation.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 106.

AGENDA ITEM 107: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.4/41/L.3

57. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt draft resolution A/C.4/41/L.3 without a vote.

58. Draft resolution A/C.4/41/L.3 was adopted.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 107.

AGENDA ITEM 108: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.4/41/L.5

60. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt draft resolution A/C.4/41/L.5 without a vote.

61. Draft resolution A/C.4/41/L.5 was adopted.

/...

62. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 108.

AGENDA ITEM 19: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued)

Question of Western Sahara: draft resolution (A/C.4/41/L.2)

63. Mr. TANAKA (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretary-General was not yet in a position to prepare estimates of the expenditures arising from operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/41/L.2. Should it become necessary to incur expenditures in that connection, the Secretary-General would seek the concurrence of ACABQ to enter into the necessary commitments under the terms of General Assembly resolution 40/254 on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses. With respect to the sending of missions to specific Territories referred to in chapters IX and XI of the report of the Special Committee on decolonization, the Secretary-General did not foresee any programme budget implications.

64. Mr. SOGLO (Benin) introduced draft resolution A/C.4/41/L.2, which expressed its sponsors' whole-hearted support for the joint good offices process entrusted to the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU and reaffirmed resolution 40/50 in its entirety as the basis of the joint good offices. It also called on Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO to demonstrate the political will necessary for the implementation of resolution 40/50 and OAU resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX), thereby reflecting the moral and political commitment of the General Assembly to support for the joint action of the United Nations and OAU and to encouragement of the two parties to find a peaceful solution.

65. Mr. DAMODARAN (India) said that there was no intention on the part of the sponsors to diminish the essence of the Secretary-General's initiative.

66. He expressed the earnest hope that the party to the conflict which had chosen not to participate in the debate would join in the collective endeavour mirrored in the draft resolution to seek a just and definitive solution to the question of Western Sahara. Instances where a particular nation chose not to take part in the proceedings of the Committee signalled a step backwards in the democratic process of debate and discussion.

67. Mr. SOUDANI (Iraq) said that the question of Western Sahara was causing division and antagonism between Arab brothers. He looked forward to seeing the conflict ended promptly, in a way that was acceptable to all the parties concerned. The best hope for a solution lay in lending support to the Secretary-General's commendable efforts, as recorded in his excellent and comprehensive report. Such support would reinforce international legitimacy and strengthen the role of the United Nations in solving problems through peaceful means, safeguarding security, justice and stability for all. Determination and good will were necessary in order to consolidate the efforts for the realization of peace and stability in that region.

68. Mr. PHEDONOS-VADET (Cyprus) said that the draft resolution was not of a polemical nature. With the self-determination of the Saharan people as its sole objective, it provided necessary support for the commendable efforts of the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU to encourage the two parties to the conflict to negotiate a cease-fire designed to create the pre-conditions for a just and peaceful referendum. The fact that Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO had accepted to participate in the process envisaged in resolution 40/50 was already an encouraging sign that the search for a negotiated, just and lasting solution was on the right track.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that as there were no further comments on the draft resolution, he invited those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote before voting, to do so.

70. Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Peru) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution as a matter of principle, because it supported the Saharan people's right to self-determination. His delegation would, however, have liked a more explicit reference in the draft resolution to the important new developments, in particular the acceptance by both sides of the result of the referendum and its organization and implementation by the United Nations, together with a specific reference to the proposals to be presented by the Secretary-General with a view to promoting an agreement.

71. Mr. STRÖMHOLM (Sweden) said that his delegation had decided to support the text, even though it would have preferred a consensus draft resolution. In particular, more account should have been taken of the growing consensus among the parties with regard to the Secretary-General's proposals. He commended the Secretary-General on his search for a solution in co-operation with the Chairman of OAU, in a joint effort which was truly in the spirit of Chapter VII of the Charter. Sweden attached particular importance to the efforts to find satisfactory modalities for a free and fair referendum.

72. Miss MILLAN (Colombia) said that although her delegation was voting for the resolution, which contained many positive elements, it could not lend its support to the text in its entirety, since greater balance would be more conducive to an early agreement between the parties to the conflict. In addition, more emphasis should have been placed on the initiatives and good offices of the Secretary-General, since support of that kind would strengthen the machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

73. Mr. WALTERS (United States of America) said that his delegation had hoped for a consensus resolution acceptable to both Algeria and the Kingdom of Morocco and reflecting the headway being made under the Secretary-General's aegis.

74. The heated and ultimately sterile debates which had been going on in the United Nations since 1965 had only served to exacerbate the problem, with all sides seeking to settle it in their own unilateral fashion. The Fourth Committee should be engaged in more constructive work and was not currently in a position to make a meaningful contribution to a solution. As the United States representative had

(Mr. Walters, United States)

stated at the fortieth session, United Nations resolutions could be meaningful only if perceived by all parties as contributing to a solution. The draft resolution under examination was heavily biased in favour of the Algerian position, failed to accommodate certain legitimate concerns of the Kingdom of Morocco and took too little account of the progress made by the Secretary-General. Accordingly, his delegation would reluctantly abstain from voting.

75. Mr. CASTILLO-ARRIOLA (Guatemala) said that his delegation would also abstain, on the ground that the parties involved should be allowed to find their own solution to their dispute, acting freely and exercising their right to decide for themselves. While his delegation supported the basic principles and resolutions on decolonization, as well as the exercise by the Secretary-General of his good offices under the Charter to find peaceful settlements to disputes, the exact nature of those good offices had to be borne in mind. He was confident that the two parties were well on the way to finding a satisfactory solution.

76. Mr. BROWNE (New Zealand) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution in order to reaffirm its support for the principle of self-determination and in the belief that the question of Western Sahara should be resolved through an act of self-determination under United Nations auspices. Its vote would also be an expression of support for the commendable way in which the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU had brought their influence to bear. Both should continue to explore all avenues towards a peaceful settlement with the parties concerned, who were also to be commended for their co-operation thus far.

77. Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) said that his delegation would abstain on the draft resolution because the text reflected none of the extremely positive developments which had taken place since the Secretary-General had begun his laudable personal contacts with the parties to the Western Sahara dispute in April 1986. Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, for instance, requested Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO to undertake direct negotiations; even though, in fact, thanks to the efforts of the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU, they had already done so. Paragraph 10 invited the Secretary-General to follow the situation in Western Sahara closely, when instead it should be congratulating him for having done so and asking him to continue the good work. The time for polemics on Western Sahara was past, and the process that had been set in motion must be given every chance to succeed.

78. Mr. ALI (Somalia) said that while his country had consistently supported the right of the Saharan people to determine their political future, in accordance with the terms set out in General Assembly resolution 40/50, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution because it failed to take into account the intensive discussions involving the parties to the conflict that had already taken place thanks to the good offices of the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU. Their constructive role must be allowed to continue because it would break the impasse and make a negotiated settlement of the question of Western Sahara possible.

79. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/41/L.2.

/...

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

Against: Central African Republic, Chile.

Abstaining: Bahrain, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Netherlands, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

80. Draft resolution A/C.4/41/L.2 was adopted by 92 votes to 2, with 46 abstentions.

81. Mr. CHANTARASAP (Thailand), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation had no difficulty with the thrust of the draft resolution just adopted but, because Thailand did not recognize the Fronte POLISARIO, it had had to abstain. Thailand unqualifiedly supported the Saharan people's right to self-determination, which could be exercised only through a free referendum. He took note of document A/41/673, particularly paragraphs 19 and 21, outlining the commendable efforts which the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU had made to overcome the obstacles to settlement of the question. Both parties to the conflict must be more accommodating and must go on negotiating in a spirit of compromise.

82. Mr. PEKURI (Finland) welcomed the excellent initiatives which the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU had taken to engage the parties to the conflict in a series of talks, thus establishing a credible framework for negotiations. At the same time, it was a matter for regret that the positions of the parties had so far remained far apart. Finland had none the less voted in favour of the draft resolution since it made an appeal to both parties to display the necessary political will to find a negotiated solution.



83. Mr. BOECK (Austria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it welcomed the calls for negotiations towards a peaceful settlement. Austria believed that a political solution to the conflict in Western Sahara fell primarily within the scope of OAU, although the Secretary-General also had a primary role to play. Both the Chairman of OAU and the Secretary-General should continue their commendable initiatives in the ongoing negotiating process.

84. Mr. MORAGA (Chile) said that, although his delegation supported the principles behind the draft resolution, it had voted against it because neither its form nor its content facilitated the negotiations, begun thanks to the Secretary-General. It believed that the success of the negotiations should be the Committee's primary goal.

85. Mr. POTTS (Australia), observing that significant common ground between the parties to the conflict had emerged in the course of the consultations arranged by the Secretary-General, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because of Australia's strong support for self-determination in the Territory. It was, however, opposed to any formulations which prejudged the outcome of any act of self-determination. It urged all concerned to negotiate an agreement which would allow the people to determine freely their own future.

86. Mr. ERKMENOGU (Turkey) said that Turkey endorsed the principle of self-determination as the basis for resolving the conflict in Western Sahara, as did the parties to the conflict themselves and the majority of the members of the Committee. He welcomed the promising efforts made by the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU. In view of their stated plan to submit to the parties a number of proposals for a way out of the impasse, his delegation had preferred to abstain on the draft resolution, which did not conform to the expectations of all the parties concerned.

87. Mr. SIMAS MAGALHÃES (Brazil) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because Brazil supported the exercise of self-determination by the Saharan people and believed that the text of the draft resolution would allow negotiations to continue. The text should, however, have referred to important 1986 developments, especially the role of the Secretary-General in arranging for negotiations and the proposals he was intending to put before the parties.

88. Ms. BREIE (Norway) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it supported the right of all peoples to self-determination. That did not, however, imply that it had taken sides in the conflict. The issue must be solved by the parties themselves. It commended the efforts of the Secretary-General and urged the parties involved to co-operate with him.

89. Mr. AMR (Egypt) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it reiterated points already made in resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX) of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU and in General Assembly resolution 40/50. It would, however, have preferred the text to reflect recent promising developments resulting from the Secretary-General's efforts, in co-operation with the Chairman of OAU, to bring together the parties involved in the dispute and to overcome their differences. Those commendable efforts should be encouraged.

90. Mr. McLEAN (Canada) said that his delegation's abstention in the vote should in no way be interpreted as a sign of indifference to the unfortunate conflict in Western Sahara. Canada commended the Secretary-General for his efforts and urged the parties involved to take advantage of all the good offices at their disposal to reach a mutually acceptable and an internationally credible solution.

91. Mr. HAMRA (Sudan) commended the Secretary-General's initiative on the question of Western Sahara, noting that the initiative had the approval of the Moroccan Government, as indicated in paragraph 14 of the Secretary-General's report.

92. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it was in line with the efforts aimed at reaching the goals of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and the Non-Aligned Movement. It would have been preferable, however, if the text had included a reference to the conclusions reached after contacts between the Secretary-General and the parties. The Sudan took a neutral position towards the parties, and felt that they should be brought closer to reconciliation.

93. Mr. AL-FANA (Oman) said that his delegation had not participated in the vote on the draft resolution, because it took the position that the parties concerned were its brothers. It hoped that they would come to a peaceful settlement within the Arab family, and that the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the Chairman of OAU, would continue his good offices to that end.

94. Mr. YU Mongjai (China) said that China had not participated in the vote on the draft resolution, since it felt that the issue should be settled by the people of Western Sahara themselves, exercising their right to self-determination. China hoped that both sides would, through patient negotiations, reach a settlement conducive to peace and stability and to unity among African countries. It supported the Secretary-General's efforts towards such a settlement.

95. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, even though the text should have fully reflected the important progress made thanks to the work of the Secretary-General in conjunction with the Chairman of OAU. They should pursue their efforts, since there was no other viable diplomatic alternative in sight.

Question of Gibraltar: draft consensus (A/C.4/41/L.4)

96. Draft consensus A/C.4/41/L.4 was adopted.

Question of Anguilla: draft resolution I (A/41/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 86)

97. Draft resolution I was adopted.

Question of Bermuda: draft resolution II (A/41/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 86)

98. Draft resolution II was adopted.

Question of the British Virgin Islands: draft resolution III (A/41/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 86)

99. Draft resolution III was adopted.

Question of the Cayman Islands: draft resolution IV (A/41/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 86)

100. Draft resolution IV was adopted.

Question of Montserrat: draft resolution V (A/41/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 86)

101. Draft resolution V was adopted.

Question of the Turks and Caicos Islands: draft resolution VI (A/41/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 86)

102. Draft resolution VI was adopted.

Question of American Samoa: draft resolution VII (A/41/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 86)

103. Draft resolution VII was adopted.

Question of the United States Virgin Islands: draft resolution VIII (A/41/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 86)

104. Draft resolution VIII was adopted.

Question of Guam: draft resolution IX (A/41/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 86)

105. Draft resolution IX was adopted.

Question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: draft resolution X (A/41/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 86)

106. The CHAIRMAN said that, on the basis of consultations with the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee on decolonization, he wished to suggest that the Fourth Committee should not take any action at that stage on draft resolution X.

107. It was so decided.

Question of Pitcairn: draft decision I (A/41/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 87)

108. Draft decision I was adopted.

Question of St. Helena: draft decision II (A/41/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 87)

109. The CHAIRMAN said that the United Kingdom had requested a recorded vote on draft decision II and a separate vote on the sixth sentence of that draft decision.

110. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote to delete the sixth sentence of the draft decision and would vote against the draft decision as a whole if that sentence was not deleted. That was the fourth year that his delegation had been compelled to call for a vote on a disobliging reference to military installations on Ascension Island, an island that was uninhabited - and consequently not under the purview of the Committee - and 700 miles distant from St. Helena. Any links between the two were administrative, for it clearly made sense to administer an uninhabited territory from the nearest inhabited Territory. The so-called military facilities in question, moreover, were only staging facilities for transport aircraft and it was difficult to see why they should be considered a threat to anyone, least of all St. Helena. The sixth sentence of the draft decision before the Committee now registered "deep" concern over the matter, however. A new idea had also been introduced into the fourth sentence of the draft decision, which noted with concern the trade and transportation dependency of St. Helena on South Africa. St. Helena was dependent on South Africa because of geographical proximity, not political choice, and therefore looked to it for supplies. His delegation questioned the motives of those who had introduced that particular issue and wondered whether the United Kingdom was expected to tow the island away to sea to satisfy them. The economic and social welfare of the inhabitants of St. Helena should be the concern of the Committee, but not such irrelevant absurdities.

111. A recorded vote was taken on the sixth sentence of draft decision II.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sudan, 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, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Gambia, Guatemala, Jamaica, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Singapore, Spain, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Zaire.

112. The sixth sentence of draft decision II was adopted by 75 votes to 30, with 21 abstentions.

113. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) explained that, in casting a favourable vote, his delegation had intended to support deletion of the sixth sentence of draft decision II, and asked that his position be recorded correctly.

114. A recorded vote was taken on draft decision II as a whole.

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

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

115. Draft decision II as a whole was adopted by 108 votes to 2, with 26 abstentions.

Question of Tokelau: draft resolution (A/41/23 (Part VIII), chap. XI, para. 15)

116. The draft resolution on the question of Tokelau was adopted.

117. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 19.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

118. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that, at its next meeting, it would hear petitioners on the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), and suggested that any further requests for hearings received on that question should be circulated as Committee documents for consideration at that meeting.

119. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.