

*United Nations*  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**



**FORTY-SECOND SESSION**

*Official Records\**

FOURTH COMMITTEE  
22nd meeting  
held on  
Wednesday, 28 October 1987  
at 10 a.m.  
New York

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 22nd MEETING**

Chairman: Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus)

**CONTENTS**

AGENDA ITEM 108: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 110: 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 111: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 112: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 113: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued)

\*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.

R7-56545 7195S (F)

20p.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.4/42/SR.22  
2 November 1987

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 108: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/42/23 (Part IV), chap. VII, para. 9)

Draft resolution

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Singapore, 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, Zambia.

Against: None.

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

2. The draft resolution was adopted by 134 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

3. Mr. IPOTO (Zaire) said that his delegation had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

4. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had abstained because the draft resolution implied, in paragraph 2, that it was for the General Assembly to decide when a Non-Self-Governing Territory had attained a certain measure of self-government. Such decisions should be left to those best able to judge, namely, the administering Power and the local government.

AGENDA ITEM 110: 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 (continued) (A/42/ (Part IV), chap. VI, para 24)

Draft resolution

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the delegation of Israel had requested that a separate vote should be taken on the word "Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

6. He invited those delegations which so wished to explain their vote before the vote.

7. Mr. BOGDANOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) stressed the importance of the activities of the United Nations agencies in support of colonial countries and peoples. His delegation shared the concern expressed with regard to the maintenance by IMF and the World Bank of links with South Africa. Those institutions continued to ignore United Nations resolutions on apartheid and the continued occupation of Namibia. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

8. Mr. PEKURI (Finland), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, said that, in addition to supporting the efforts of the specialized agencies, they had increased their own assistance to peoples who had yet to exercise their right to self-determination, in particular the people of Namibia. They had also decided to increase their humanitarian assistance to refugees, liberation movements and the victims and opponents of apartheid, and their assistance to the front-line States. They agreed that the granting of loans to South Africa, including IMF loans, should be prohibited or discouraged for as long as the apartheid system remained in existence.

9. While they supported the main thrust of the draft resolution, they had reservations with regard to certain fundamental aspects. They 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 irrelevant to the substance of the draft resolution. Furthermore, account should be taken of the statutes of the specialized agencies, which should retain their universal nature. The Nordic countries would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

10. Mr. JOFFE (Israel) said that a group of countries was singling out Israel as a means of diverting attention from those countries' own links with South Africa. On the other hand, the allegations made by his delegation with regard to some of the Arab oil-producing countries were based on data supplied by international research institutes and reputable maritime companies. Israel had not invented the information. Israel was blatantly singled out in the report of the Special Committee on decolonization (A/42/43 (Part IV)) and was mentioned specifically in the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which concerned collaboration with South Africa, together with "certain Western Powers" and "other countries". Although his delegation could probably identify some of those concerned, it did not approve of naming individual countries or groups of countries. Accordingly, it would vote against the inclusion of the word "Israel".

11. Mr. MAJLOOR (Netherlands) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. It certainly subscribed to the view that the specialized agencies and other institutions had been making an important contribution to decolonization; but it rejected the attempts in the nineteenth and twentieth preambular paragraphs and in paragraphs 8 and 9 to politicize IMF and the World Bank and, in essence, to interfere with the requirement that they should function as independent organizations. Concerning the relations of the World Bank with South Africa, his delegation recalled the explicit statement of the Bank's representative to the Committee that no loans had been granted to South Africa since 1966 and that none was outstanding.

12. The Netherlands further objected to the singling out of countries or groups of countries in the eighth preambular paragraph for allegedly encouraging the South African régime, while ignoring the fact that virtually all Western countries and the country which was mentioned by name had indeed taken measures to increase political and economic pressure on the régime.

13. The Netherlands had consistently supported the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence and acknowledged the major role of SWAPO in that regard. However, before free elections had been held in Namibia, no political group could claim to be the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

14. The Special Committee should endeavour another year to produce a more coherent and concise draft resolution on the subject. The Fourth Committee and the Special Committee should consider biennializing item 110 in alternation with the related item 109.

15. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution, which, as in previous years, was drafted in contentious terms that were irrelevant to the role of the specialized agencies in development. In the case of IMF and the World Bank, their key tasks were carefully defined: the former was to provide advice and resource to its member States to enable them to correct balance-of-payment problems without resorting to trade restrictions, and the latter was to stimulate economic growth in the developing countries. Yet the draft resolution made only passing reference to their primary functions, and focused instead on highly political matters relating to South Africa and Namibia.

(Mr. Smith, United Kingdom)

16. Moreover, implicit in the draft resolution was the unacceptable assumption that the General Assembly was empowered to give instructions to the specialized agencies and specifically to the international financial institutions, whereas they were autonomous bodies with their own statutes and funding structures. It was time that the Committee drafted a resolution that properly testified to the crucial role of the specialized agencies, in particular the World Bank and IMF, in international economic development.

17. Mr. BARILLARO (Italy) said that Italy would abstain in the vote because the draft resolution repeatedly raised irrelevant issues. It did not take due account of the functions of the specialized agencies and other institutions and did not seem to respect the autonomy they must enjoy in order to discharge their tasks, particularly in the economic field. Moreover, although the representative of the World Bank had rejected the allegations contained in the draft resolution and although his statement to the Committee had not been challenged, the criticism had been retained. Lastly, Italy could not accept having individual countries or groups of countries singled out as bearing responsibility for policies pursued by other Governments.

18. Ms. MILLAN (Colombia) said that her delegation, committed as it was to decolonization, would accordingly vote in favour of the draft resolution. It did not, however, believe that references should be made in United Nations documents to individual States or groups of States, and would therefore vote against the reference to Israel in the eighth preambular paragraph.

19. Mr. KIKUCHI (Japan) said that the specialized agencies and international organizations should be encouraged to take appropriate steps to help colonial Territories to achieve self-determination and independence. Each agency should, however, make its own decisions without intervention from the General Assembly. Some of the paragraphs of the draft resolution contained specific directives addressed to the specialized agencies, and the wording of those paragraphs appeared to disregard the principle of universality underlying their membership. His delegation could not support specific references to individual countries or groups of countries. Accordingly, it would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

20. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the reference to Israel in the eighth preambular paragraph because of the increasing collaboration between Israel and South Africa in all fields. A recent conference room paper of the Special Committee against Apartheid demonstrated the breadth of that co-operation.

21. Mr. JOFFE (Israel), speaking on a point of order, asked whether the document in question had been distributed, and questioned Syria's right to quote from it.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that the Syrian representative was speaking in explanation of vote and was entitled to refer to the documents upon which he based his explanation.

23. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the document in question referred to the visit to Pretoria of the Israeli Defence Minister to discuss co-operation with regard to nuclear tests, which indicated that Israel's decision to limit its links with South Africa in the light of the recent law enacted by the United States with regard to apartheid, was not a serious political one. In view of that continued co-operation, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

24. Mr. IPOTO (Zaire) said that his delegation supported some aspects of the draft resolution but it was not satisfactory to single out Israel in the preamble. Either that reference should be deleted or other countries implicated should also be named.

25. Ms. AL-MULLA (Kuwait) said that her delegation supported the draft resolution. Some explanations of vote seemed not to address the matter under consideration, in particular the explanation given by the representative of Israel, which was more relevant to the question of an oil embargo against South Africa, to be dealt with by the General Assembly under a different agenda item. In that connection, she noted that Israel had been one of the few countries to vote against General Assembly resolution 41/35 F. Furthermore, the Netherlands institution cited by the representative of Israel as the source of his information had stated categorically that the Israeli statistics were inaccurate and misrepresented its position.

26. Mr. AUGUSTE (Haiti) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution, but the mention of Israel alone in the preamble was clearly discriminatory. Although some aspects of the draft resolution appeared questionable, the principles on which it was based fully accorded with his country's foreign policy.

27. Mr. PALMA (Honduras) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution even though it regretted the mention of Israel in the preamble, which should be deleted.

28. At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on whether to retain the word "Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution in document A/42/23 (Part IV), chapter VI, paragraph 24.

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

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

Abstaining: Barbados, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Cyprus, Guinea, Lesotho, Mexico, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Venezuela.

29. The word "Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was retained by 72 votes to 52, with 21 abstentions.

30. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution in document A/42/23 (Part IV), chapter VI, paragraph 24, as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts 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, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, Zaire.

31. The draft resolution, as a whole, was adopted by 119 votes to 3, with 25 abstentions.

32. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) said that his delegation had intended to abstain on the question of whether to retain the reference to Israel in the preamble, but its vote had been wrongly recorded.

33. Mr. IDRIES (Sudan) said that his delegation had wished to support retention of the reference to Israel, but its vote too had been wrongly recorded.

34. Mr. SAMANIEGO (Panama), Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu), Mr. WOLFE (Jamaica) and Mr. ENRIQUEZ (Belize), said that their delegations had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

35. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his country was particularly interested in the fate of Namibia and therefore encouraged specialized agencies and international organizations associated with the United Nations to increase the volume and effectiveness of their assistance. His delegation agreed with the substance of the draft resolution but could not approve some aspects of it, such as the criticisms of certain international institutions that were responsible for their activities only under their own statutes. It had therefore abstained from voting on the resolution but hoped that it would be able to vote in 1988 for a more balanced draft free from controversial elements.

36. Mr. BLANC (France) said that the draft resolution contained unjustified criticisms of IMF and the World Bank and selective criticism of certain countries. His delegation had the most serious reservations about that, and had therefore voted against the reference to Israel in the preamble paragraph and abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

37. Ms. MILLER (Canada) said that her delegation had reservations about the references in the draft resolution to the international financial institutions and specialized agencies and its highly polemical content. She had already expressed concern over such matters and asked that the points raised should be addressed by those drafting future resolutions on the item under consideration. Her country questioned the validity of the accusations made against Western countries concerning support for South Africa. In conclusion, her delegation wished to reiterate support for the suggestion made in 1986 that items 109 and 110 should be considered in alternate years.

38. Mr. DRAKOULARAKOS (Greece) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because of the importance of the assistance of specialized agencies and other international institutions for the struggle of oppressed peoples. It had voted against retaining the reference to Israel because it was unfair to single out one country, but that should not be construed as affecting Greece's support for the Namibian people's struggle for independence.



39. Mr. DONOGHUE (Ireland) said that his delegation agreed with the thrust of the draft resolution but had abstained from voting because of the criticism of the World Bank and IMF in the text, which did not take the statutes of those institutions into account.

40. Mr. CISTERNAS (Chile) said that his delegation disagreed with the discriminatory reference in the draft resolution to Israel, a reference against which it had cast a negative vote; it also disagreed with the criticism of the World Bank and IMF in the operative part. However, it had voted for the draft resolution as a whole out of a sense of solidarity with the cause of freedom.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of item 110.

AGENDA ITEM 111: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.4/42/L.2

42. The CHAIRMAN said that the Philippines had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

43. The draft resolution was adopted without objection.

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

AGENDA ITEM 112: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.4/42/L.3

45. The draft resolution was adopted without objection.

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

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued)

47. Mrs. RIVES-NIESSEL (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretary-General had reviewed the recommendations by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples concerning the questions of New Caledonia, Anguilla, Montserrat, the British Virgin Islands, the Turks and Caicos Islands, Tokelau, the Cayman Islands, Bermuda, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands and St. Helena as contained in document A/42/23 (Part VI), chapter IX. It was estimated that implementation of those recommendations, for

(Mrs. Rives-Niessel)

which a provision had been made under section 3A of the proposed programme budget for 1988-1989, would not give rise to additional costs or programmatic changes.

48. With reference to draft resolution A/C.4/42/L.5, it was estimated that the technical mission to Western Sahara would be dispatched by the end of 1987 and its cost met from existing appropriations under section 1 of the 1986-1987 programme budget. The Secretary-General was currently not in a position to prepare estimates of the expenditures arising from paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, under which the United Nations would co-operate with OAU in implementing that organization's relevant decisions. Should expenditures become necessary, the Secretary-General would seek the concurrence of ACABQ to enter into the necessary commitments under the General Assembly resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for 1988-1989 to be approved during the current session.

Question of Gibraltar: draft consensus A/C.4/42/L.4

49. The draft consensus was adopted without objection.

Question of Western Sahara: draft resolution A/C.4/42/L.5

50. The CHAIRMAN said that Albania, Guinea-Bissau and Nigeria had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

51. Mr. RAKOTOZAFY (Madagascar), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, said that it was aimed at the genuine decolonization of Western Sahara. The good offices jointly exercised by the current Chairman of OAU and the Secretary-General to persuade the two parties to the conflict to reach a negotiated settlement had developed to everybody's satisfaction and deserved the fullest support. Any attempt to change the framework for those good offices would reflect a wish to create ambiguity as a means of evading the requirements for peace. Similarly, to claim that renewal of the same framework and mandate meant impeding the good offices process amounted to ignoring the collective judgement of the General Assembly.

52. Wishing to bring peace to Western Sahara, the sponsors had reproduced General Assembly resolution 41/16 in full in the new draft, thus showing their common concern to reinforce the role of the Chairman of OAU and the Secretary-General. The draft resolution also supported their efforts to achieve a credible referendum without any administrative or military constraints. Realization of that aim depended not only on the parties involved, but also on the support of Member States. That was why the sponsors were asking the Committee to adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

53. Mr. FINDANO (Burundi) said that his Government was one of the first to have recognized the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic and it had continued to support the Frente POLISARIO. Burundi would endorse all efforts to end the occupation of Western Sahara and to decolonize the Territory. It welcomed the idea of sending a technical mission to Western Sahara to gather the information necessary for the

(Mr. Findano, Burundi)

organization of a referendum. The question of Western Sahara could be settled only on the basis of OAU resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX).

54. Burundi deplored the erection by Morocco of a defensive wall along the Mauritanian border with Western Sahara and the increased settlement of Moroccans in Western Sahara, which jeopardized the good-offices process. It appealed to Morocco to withdraw its troops from Western Sahara so that the technical mission could work unimpeded.

55. The CHAIRMAN invited those members who wished to do so to explain their votes before the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/42/L.5.

56. Mr. HILMI (Iraq) said that the question of Western Sahara was a deplorable element of friction among Arabs, and Iraq hoped for an early settlement satisfactory to all parties. It applauded the intensive mediation undertaken by the United Nations Secretary-General as the best way to a peaceful solution. All parties involved should show goodwill and no obstacles should be put in the way of the Secretary-General. For that reason, Iraq would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

57. Mr. TROLLE (Sweden) said that the right of the people of Western Sahara to self-determination must be the paramount consideration in the settlement of the question. His Government commended the joint efforts to that end made by the Secretary-General and the OAU Chairman. Such increased involvement by the Secretary-General in resolving regional conflicts was a promising development, and he had taken an innovative approach, very much in the spirit of Chapter VIII of the Charter, in working jointly with a regional organization. That joint initiative provided a workable framework for negotiations on organizing a free and fair referendum. The technical survey mission which would shortly be sent to Western Sahara would no doubt be of vital importance in that process.

58. Even though the draft resolution had not given enough prominence to the progress made by the Secretary-General and especially the agreement of the parties to co-operate with the forthcoming technical survey mission, Sweden had decided to vote in favour of it.

59. Mr. YU Mengjia (China) said that his delegation would not participate in the vote on the draft resolution. It believed that the question of Western Sahara must be settled in accordance with the wishes of the people, who had a right to self-determination. China supported the joint United Nations/OAU good-offices mission and hoped that the parties would continue to seek a solution acceptable to all. Through patient consultations, it should be possible to arrive at a peaceful settlement that would pave the way for co-operation in the region.

60. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) observed that the reference to the report of the Secretary-General on the question of Western Sahara in the very first operative paragraph of the draft resolution was a distinct improvement over the insufficient attention given to the Secretary-General's diplomatic initiative in the previous

(Mr. Lasarte, Uruguay)

year's resolution on the question. Paragraph 6 also took note of a meaningful new development: the decision to send a technical mission to Western Sahara. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, and hoped that further progress would be made by the United Nations and OAU towards a settlement based on the exercise by the people of Western Sahara of their right to self-determination and independence.

61. Mr. DAPUL (Philippines) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, which generally reflected the Philippines' own position. Although the Philippines would have preferred a greater expression of support for the Secretary-General's initiatives, the text did refer to the joint good-offices process. As the Secretary-General had said in his report, the problem could be resolved only through a negotiated settlement in accordance with the Charter and the wishes of the people of the Territory.

62. Mr. ESSY (Côte d'Ivoire) said that his delegation welcomed the pragmatic way in which the Secretary-General, in conjunction with the OAU Chairman, was carrying out the delicate diplomatic mission in Western Sahara. He took note of the fact that Morocco had been co-operating with them. All parties had agreed that the organization of a fair referendum was the only suitable solution. The joint good-offices process required imagination and a wide latitude for manoeuvring. Member States must not tie the hands of the Secretary-General or the Chairman of OAU at any stage. Consequently, Côte d'Ivoire would abstain on that and all other draft resolutions on Western Sahara until a referendum had been held.

63. Mr. IPOTO (Zaire) said that the Chairman of OAU and the Secretary-General were to be congratulated on their joint good-offices mission. Its success depended on greater flexibility by the two parties to the conflict and on their refraining from any action that might block a negotiated settlement, and also on the co-operation of all Member States, which must adopt an attitude towards both parties to the conflict that was beyond all suspicion. The draft resolution, however, was not fully acceptable to one of the parties and could temporarily block the good-offices process. Therefore Zaire would abstain in the vote.

64. Mr. PETERS (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote because the draft resolution did not take into account certain positive developments such as the favourable response of the parties to the good-offices mission of the Secretary-General and the substantial progress made in the past year towards the organizing of a referendum. The draft resolution gave only token acknowledgement to the Secretary-General's efforts, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines could therefore not support it.

65. In addition, the cause of peace was not furthered by calling for direct negotiations between the parties. In so doing, the draft resolution failed to recognize the Secretary-General's contention that negotiations held separately with each of the parties offered a likelihood of success. Also, the text tended to minimize the results of the forthcoming technical mission. In its general thrust, the draft resolution was not constructive. A way should be found to bridge the gap between the debates in the Committee and the realities of the matter.

66. Mr. WIJEWARDENE (Sri Lanka), while warmly acknowledging the joint good-offices process initiated by the Secretary-General and the OAU Chairman, said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution because one of its important points was to invite Morocco to implement formulations to which it was not a party.

67. Mr. SLAOUI (Morocco) said that his country had always supported United Nations efforts to end the tensions in his country's region, and particularly the Secretary-General's efforts to organize a referendum on self-determination. The other side, however, was obstinately trying to block efforts at peace and to sow confusion. The good offices of the Secretary-General had resulted in some progress, and consensus should have been sought on the basis of the conclusions of his report (A/42/601). He regretted the intransigence of the Algerian delegation and its refusal to accept those conclusions. Such a stance only created obstacles and tied the hands of the mediators.

68. His delegation had complete confidence in the good offices of the Secretary-General and the OAU Chairman and in the outcome of a referendum but felt that the constructive provisions of the draft resolution - those concerning good offices and the technical mission - were beset with pre-conditions that undermined their substance. His country would co-operate with the Secretary-General, particularly in connection with the technical mission, but obviously could not endorse an effort to confuse matters and undermine the fundamental principles of the United Nations. His delegation would therefore not participate in the vote on the draft resolution.

69. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/42/L.5.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, 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: None.

Abstaining: Bahrain, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Pakistan, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, 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.

70. The draft resolution was adopted by 93 votes to none, with 49 abstentions.

71. The CHAIRMAN invited those delegations that wished to do so to explain their vote after the vote.

72. Miss BYRNE (United States of America) said she regretted the absence of a consensus resolution acceptable to both parties to the dispute. Morocco saw it as conferring an unfair advantage on Algeria and her delegation therefore had been unable to vote in favour of it. The draft resolution failed to reflect the progress reported in the Secretary-General's report on Western Sahara (A/42/601) and to build upon it. Morocco was prepared to abide by the outcome of a referendum on self-determination and the Frente POLISARIO was prepared to accept the sending of a technical mission, but the draft resolution failed to reflect those positive developments. Also, in calling upon the Secretary-General to persuade Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO to negotiate directly it irritated Morocco and circumscribed the Secretary-General's role.

73. In sum, the draft resolution tilted heavily toward the Algerian position and failed to accommodate the concerns of Morocco, and her delegation therefore had abstained in the vote. She urged all sides to be open to dialogue, because the only real solution was a negotiated settlement taking into account the realities of the situation and the preferences of the people affected.

74. Mr. PEKURI (Finland) said that his country supported decolonization and the efforts to reach a peaceful settlement in Western Sahara made by the Secretary-General and the OAU Chairman, as well as the decision to send a technical mission to the Territory. He regretted that the parties to the dispute had not reconciled their differences, but he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it appealed to them to seek a negotiated solution acceptable to all.

75. Mr. POTTS (Australia) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because of its positive aspects while objecting to those elements in it that prejudged the situation. It regretted the fact that a consensual text had not been found.

76. Mr. ELDON (Iceland) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution on the understanding that the Frente POLISARIO would co-operate with the Secretary-General with a view to achieving self-determination in Western Sahara.

77. Mr. SAVUT (Turkey) said that his delegation favoured self-determination by the people of Western Sahara and welcomed the encouraging efforts made in that direction by the Secretary-General and the OAU Chairman as well as the decision to send a technical mission. He had abstained from voting on the draft resolution, however, because it had failed to meet expectations, and he regretted the absence of a consensual text.

78. Mr. DONAGHUE (Ireland) said that his delegation favoured a consensual approach to the problem of Western Sahara and had therefore abstained on the relevant draft resolutions in previous years. He had voted for the current draft resolution, however, because his delegation supported the right of all peoples to self-determination and hoped that conditions would soon be established to implement that right in Western Sahara. A referendum was long overdue and should be expedited. All parties to the dispute should help the Secretary-General in a spirit of compromise so as to find a peaceful solution acceptable to all.

79. Ms. MILLER (Canada) said that her delegation urged all parties to the dispute to take advantage of the good offices made available to them to find a solution that would be acceptable to them and to the international community. It welcomed the agreement of the parties concerned to receive a technical mission and was prepared to provide technical advice if called upon to do so. Canada's abstention had been premised on the wish to leave the search for a solution to the parties involved and not to prejudge the matter.

80. Mr. FISCHER (Austria) said that he would have preferred a consensual text but had voted for the draft resolution because he favoured a peaceful solution acceptable to all. He particularly endorsed paragraphs 5 to 7 and welcomed the joint mediation process that had been started, as well as the decision to send a technical mission to Western Sahara.

81. Mr. JOHANSEN (Norway) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution but stressed that it did not take sides in the conflict, which had to be settled by the parties concerned. Its vote simply meant that his delegation favoured self-determination and supported the joint mediation efforts as well as the decision to send a technical mission.

82. Mr. IDRIES (Sudan) said that his country wanted a peaceful and mutually acceptable settlement of the dispute and appreciated the joint efforts of the Chairman of OAU and the Secretary-General in that regard, as well as the decision to send a technical mission. He particularly endorsed paragraph 26 of the Secretary-General's report (A/42/601), concerning assurances given by Morocco. In voting for the draft resolution, his delegation did not mean to take sides, because his country had good relations with both parties to the dispute.

83. Mr. BORG OLIVIER (Malta) said that his delegation had supported without reservation the positive elements of the draft resolution but felt that a settlement could be achieved only under conditions acceptable to all. Unfortunately, the operative part reflected certain difficulties in that connection and he welcomed the efforts of the Secretary-General and the OAU Chairman to

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

overcome them, including the sending of a technical mission. In that connection, he particularly endorsed paragraph 6. With those considerations in mind, his delegation had voted for the draft resolution.

Question of New Caledonia: draft resolution I (A/42/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 128)

84. Mr. HILMI (Iraq) said that his delegation supported national liberation movements everywhere, regardless of the size or location of the territory concerned and noted that the Special Committee on decolonization had decided to await the results of the referendum before acting on the question of New Caledonia. Now, however, the results of the referendum were available and showed that 98 per cent of the population favoured remaining with France. The people of New Caledonia had therefore expressed its will, which must be respected. He therefore supported the draft resolution.

85. Ms. MAUALA (Samoa), speaking as Chairman of the South Pacific Forum and explaining the vote of her delegation before the vote, said that the draft resolution basically reaffirmed the right of the people of New Caledonia to self-determination and independence. That was the same right as was enjoyed by the peoples of all dependent Territories and as had been freely exercised by many Members of the United Nations in their advancement to nationhood. The so-called referendum of 13 September 1987 had been presented by France as an exercise in self-determination. The question might, however, be asked why the General Assembly should accept such a presentation at face value and why members should accept the view only of the administering Power. If it was a valid exercise, why had the United Nations not been invited to be associated with it? In the view of her delegation the so-called referendum was a thoroughly flawed exercise which could jeopardize New Caledonia's future. If the General Assembly was prepared to accept as valid any so-called act of self-determination which any administering Power might unilaterally organize and present in any way it chose, it might well be asked what role remained for the United Nations itself in the process of decolonization.

86. Rejection of the draft resolution would signal the acceptance of unwarranted pressures and the end of impartiality and objectivity when the interests of certain Member States were involved. It would signal a retreat from principle and perhaps end the Territory's final opportunity to evolve peacefully to the status to which it was entitled. Equally important was what the draft resolution did not contain: there was no condemnation of France, no mention of the exercise of 13 September and no restriction of future options available to the people of New Caledonia.

87. One might conclude that the administering Power claimed the privilege to ignore the Assembly when it suited it and to refrain from submitting information as required by Article 73 e of the Charter. The very principles called into question were those which the General Assembly had sanctified through consistent usage since the adoption of resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV). Not one delegation had spoken in support of the administering Power during the general debate; clearly, the silent minority could find little to say which would stand up to the clear light of day in the Fourth Committee.



(Ms. Mauala, Samoa)

88. The people of New Caledonia deserved the same rights as the peoples of other colonial Territories. The draft resolution simply applied the hallowed principles of decolonization to the people of New Caledonia. It was for those reasons that the South Pacific delegations strongly supported the draft resolution.

89. Mr. MAJOOR (Netherlands) said that his delegation could not support the draft resolution. His Government had taken due note of the outcome of the referendum, which should be respected. It was, however, convinced that the problems in the Territory could not be solved by referendum alone. It therefore welcomed the fact that France had indicated its willingness to pursue a dialogue with all concerned, including the pro-independence groups, and had in fact already formulated some proposals to that end. His delegation urged all parties concerned to participate in the talks in order to create, as soon as possible, in an open and democratic way, a society in which peaceful development and prosperity was guaranteed in a context of greater autonomy.

90. Mr. TILLET (Belize) noted that the General Assembly, in its resolution 41/41 A, had affirmed the inalienable right of the people of New Caledonia to self-determination and independence in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV). It had also requested the administering Power to extend its co-operation to the Special Committee in implementing the resolution.

91. In his delegation's view, the administering Power had made no effort to comply with that resolution, nor had it recognized the right and obligation of the United Nations to concern itself with the situation in New Caledonia. The draft resolution before the Fourth Committee was necessary to protect the rights of all the peoples of New Caledonia as well as to encourage the administering Power to co-operate with the United Nations. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

92. Mr. SAEMALA (Solomon Islands) said that, in the view of his delegation, the draft resolution was non-confrontational and realistic. Its most important proposal was to commence the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/41 A with United Nations involvement. The Special Committee had emphasized the need to establish dialogue on the question of New Caledonia between the administering Power and the colonized people; between France and the South Pacific Forum countries; and between the administering Power and the United Nations.

93. In that connection, it had been encouraging to learn that the Foreign Minister of Japan had requested France to engage in a dialogue with the Forum countries and with the Kanak independence groups, to grant greater scope for self-government to New Caledonia and to provide relevant information to the United Nations, and had recently received a reply from France confirming its positive attitude to those suggestions. His delegation would closely monitor the follow-up to those assurances.

(Mr. Saemala, Solomon Islands)

94. The draft resolution accorded with all the principles contained in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. His delegation therefore supported the draft resolution and urged others to do likewise.

95. Mr. BLANC (France) said that the society of New Caledonia was multi-ethnic and represented a balanced unit in which every citizen had equal rights and was free to determine his own destiny. The Melanesian community comprised 43 per cent of the population and was in no way submitted to arbitrary colonial rule. Twenty-six out of the 48 members of the Territorial Congress, four of the six members of the Executive Council, and three of the four regional presidents were of Melanesian origin. The entire population participated in French political life, including the election of the President of the French Republic; they also sent deputies to the French Parliament, two thirds of them being Melanesians.

96. such statistics disproved the claims of the South Pacific Forum countries, which continued to support the Front de libération nationale Kanak socialiste (FLNKS), describing it as the oppressed representative of the Kanak people. That view was incorrect: FLNKS was a legal political party favouring independence for New Caledonia; it enjoyed the widest freedom within the institutions of the French Republic and participated openly in the political life of New Caledonia. FLNKS had never enjoyed majority support: it was a minority party whose membership was falling, as the latest electoral results had shown. If a majority of the people of New Caledonia had voted for independence, they would have obtained it immediately. Such a majority did not exist. It was not possible to impose on the population of New Caledonia a future which a majority of them had rejected.

97. The existence of an independence movement in New Caledonia had led to the holding of a referendum in which the only relevant question put to concerned voters had been whether they wished to be independent or to remain within the French Republic. The referendum held on 13 September 1987 had been carried out meticulously; its results had been clear in that a clear majority of the people of New Caledonia had indicated their wish to build their future within the French Republic. France must respect that choice and draw the appropriate conclusions.

98. The draft resolution before the Fourth Committee was unacceptable because it took no account of that basic reality. Moreover, it had been considered by the Special Committee during its August session, before the referendum of 13 September, and had not subsequently been amended. It therefore ignored the clear and democratic choice freely expressed by the voters.

99. The United Nations was not an appellate forum with universal suffrage. On the contrary, the purpose of the United Nations was to ensure that the principle of "one man, one vote" should prevail. The sponsors of the draft resolution clearly wished to set that principle aside. For that reason his delegation would vote against the draft resolution and urged all democratically minded States to do likewise.

100. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu) said that power could never impose itself permanently on people who had decided to be free. Nothing in the Charter or in General Assembly resolutions was as clear and unequivocal as the pronouncement on the question of colonialism. Not until the last vestiges of colonialism had been eliminated would the peoples of the world be truly free. His delegation agreed with the representatives of Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Belize and others that had supported the draft resolution. The draft was a modified text which had been amended to meet the needs of some dissenters. If those dissenters would not accept the revised draft, his delegation wondered what they really wanted.

101. Vanuatu was as vulnerable in the economic sense as any country represented in the Fourth Committee. Nevertheless, nothing would stop Vanuatu from supporting New Caledonia in its effort to free itself. New Caledonia's future would be determined in the Territory itself by its people. France might claim that New Caledonia's independence movement was in eclipse. Nothing could be further from the truth. The wish for independence remained and any suggestion to the contrary was no more than wishful thinking. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, and would also like to ask the French representative whether France would ever report to the United Nations as was required under Article 73 e of the Charter.

102. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution I in document A/42/23 (Part VI).

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Central African Republic, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Honduras, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Netherlands, Niger, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Spain, Togo, Zaire.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan,

Mali, Malta, Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen.

103. The draft resolution was adopted by 69 votes to 27, with 46 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.