



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 23rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus)

CONTENTS

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)

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

AGENDA ITEM 36: QUESTION OF NAMIBIA (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.

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

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)

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

1. Mr. PEKURI (Finland), explaining his vote after the vote, said that it reflected Finland's unreserved support for Article 73 of the Charter and for the right of peoples to self-determination. He deplored the failure of the administering Power to transmit information under Chapter XI of the Charter. Views on the way the referendum had been organized in September 1987 could differ, but the results could not be ignored. He hoped that it would not impair the relations between the ethnic communities and that the administering Power would establish a dialogue with all sectors of the population.
2. Mr. DRAKOULARAKOS (Greece), explaining his vote after the vote, said that his delegation had abstained since, although it considered that New Caledonia was certainly a Non-Self-Governing Territory, it was nevertheless true that the organizers of the referendum had not intended to exclude any ethnic group. Greece noted that the French Government intended to pursue the dialogue with all interested parties, including the pro-independence party, in order to promote development and prosperity, as well as increasing autonomy for the Territory.
3. Mr. SVOBODA (Canada), explaining his vote after the vote, said that he had abstained, as he had the previous year, because there was nothing to indicate that the administering Power was denying self-determination for the inhabitants of the Territory. Although it was doubtful if the referendum had provided a durable solution to the problem of New Caledonia, it should be noted that the French Government intended to consult all the interested parties in order to grant the Territory a status which provided a large measure of autonomy acceptable to all. Canada therefore urged France to pursue a constructive, meaningful dialogue with the indigenous inhabitants of New Caledonia consistent with the principles and practices of the United Nations.
4. Mr. KIKUCHI (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained at the current session - unlike the preceding year - because it considered that the draft resolution prejudged the results of the self-determination exercise in New Caledonia. An attempt to settle the conflict too hastily might aggravate it. Nor should the fact that the French Government had tried to resume a dialogue be overlooked. Japan requested France to keep the United Nations informed of events as well as to pursue the dialogue with the States members of the South Pacific Forum and with the pro-independence party. France should also make provisions for granting broad autonomy to New Caledonia. Japan would follow the development of the situation closely, because it attached great importance to its relations with the countries composing the Forum and wished to encourage dialogue between all the parties concerned in order to settle that important question.

/...

5. Mr. KERPEIS (Suriname) said that he had abstained because he considered that new facts had come to light in New Caledonia. In the referendum organized in September 1987, a majority of New Caledonia had voted in favour of integration in the French Republic; integration was a valid choice under General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).
6. Mr. TROLLE (Sweden) said that he, like the representatives of the other Nordic countries, had abstained because, although it was regrettable that France had failed to transmit information to the United Nations, the fact that a referendum had been organized in New Caledonia should be taken into account. If a separate vote had been taken on paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, Sweden would have voted in favour, but the draft resolution as a whole did not reflect the true state of affairs.
7. Mr. BORG-OLIVIER (Malta) said that he had abstained because it should not be overlooked that a referendum had been organized in New Caledonia, and its results could not be disregarded. The questions at stake were complex and Malta did not feel qualified to decide if the referendum and its results did or did not meet United Nations requirements with respect to self-determination.
8. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea), speaking on behalf of the States members of the South Pacific Forum, said that the liberation of the peoples of the world had not yet been completed and that the efforts being made for Namibia, apartheid South Africa and Western Sahara should also be made for the small nations of the Pacific. Those countries, which had become aware of their rightful place in the world, asked nothing more than to live freely and calmly within the family of nations. The international community must learn from past experience and, eschewing exploitation and racial segregation, build a world of peace and harmony based on General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV).
9. Mr. TAEB (Afghanistan) requested that it should be officially stated in the summary record that his delegation had intended to vote in favour of draft resolution I, contrary to what appeared on the voting sheet.

Question of Anguilla: draft resolution II (A/42/23 (Part VI) chap. IX, para. 128)

10. Draft resolution II on Anguilla was adopted.

Question of Montserrat: draft resolution III (A/42/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 128)

11. Draft resolution III on Montserrat was adopted.

Question of the British Virgin Islands: draft resolution IV (A/42/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 128)

12. Draft resolution IV on the British Virgin Islands was adopted.

Question of the Turks and Caicos Islands: draft resolution V (A/42/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 128)

13. Draft resolution V on the Turks and Caicos Islands was adopted.

14. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said that his Government had not raised any objection to the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution on the Turks and Caicos Islands. But he wished to point out an omission in that draft resolution. In the draft resolutions on Anquilla and Montserrat (para. 5) the General Assembly reaffirmed that it was ultimately for the people of the Territory themselves to determine their future political status; the administering Power was asked to launch programmes to inform the population of the possibilities open to them in the exercise of their right to self-determination and independence. But nothing of the sort had been mentioned in the draft resolution on the Turks and Caicos Islands. Did that mean that the Committee intended to deny the population of the Turks and Caicos Islands its basic right to self-determination? Such provisions must be applied to all territories equally. His delegation hoped that the omission would be remedied in the future.

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

15. Draft resolution VI on Tokelau was adopted.

Question of the Cayman Islands: draft resolution VII (A/42/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 128)

16. Draft resolution VII on the Cayman Islands was adopted.

Question of Bermuda: draft resolution VIII (A/42/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 128)

17. Draft resolution VIII on Bermuda was adopted.

18. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said that, as in previous years, the United Kingdom delegation had joined the consensus, but it raised a number of objections with regard to certain parts of the text, in particular paragraphs 6 and 7. In paragraph 6, the General Assembly reaffirmed that the presence of military bases and installations could constitute a major obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration and that it was the responsibility of the administering Power to ensure that the existence of such bases and installations did not hinder the population of the Territory from exercising its right to self-determination and independence. Such bases and installations, which in actual fact were very limited, in no way constituted an obstacle to the self-determination of the population of the Territory. They had been there since the Second World War, and the military authorities ran the civilian airport, which represented very great savings for Bermuda.

19. In paragraph 7 of the same draft resolution, the administering Power was urged to continue to take all necessary measures not to involve Bermuda in any offensive acts or interference against other States and to comply fully with the purposes and

(Mr. Smith, United Kingdom)

principles of the Charter and other pertinent texts relating to military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration. That was precisely what the United Kingdom had always done, and there had never been any reason to remind the United Kingdom of its obligations in the matter. There was no need to teach someone to do something that he was already doing perfectly well. It was to be hoped that the authors of future draft resolutions on the question would bear that in mind.

20. Ms. MILLER (Canada) said that, for technical reasons, Canada had a small, very limited military presence on Bermuda which in no way constituted an obstacle to the democratic process in the Territory.

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

21. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking as Rapporteur of the Special Committee on decolonization, said that, after consultations, it had been agreed that paragraph 6 of the text on Guam would read as follows:

"6. Urges the administering Power to continue to take all necessary measures not to involve the Territory in any offensive acts or interference against other States and to comply fully with the purposes and principles of the Charter, the Declaration and the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly relating to military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration;"

22. It being understood that all resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly relating to military activities and arrangements were included, the members of the Special Committee had agreed to revert to the identical text as adopted unanimously by the General Assembly at its previous session.

23. Draft resolution IX, as corrected, was adopted.

Question of American Samoa: draft resolution X (A/42/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 128)

24. Draft resolution X on American Samoa was adopted.

Question of the United States Virgin Islands: draft resolution XI (A/42/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 128)

25. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking as Rapporteur of the Special Committee on decolonization, drew attention to paragraph 11 of draft resolution XI. The members of the Special Committee had agreed to retain the identical text as that adopted unanimously by the General Assembly at its previous session, and which read as follows:

"11. Urges the administering Power to continue to take all necessary measures to comply fully with the purposes and principles of the Charter, the

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

Declaration and the relevant resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly relating to military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration;".

In so doing, the Special Committee had been guided by the same considerations as in the case of the draft resolution on Guam.

26. The Russian text of that paragraph differed from the texts in the other languages.

27. Draft resolution XI, as corrected, was adopted.

Question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: draft resolution XII (A/42/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 128)

28. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, following consultations with the Chairman of the Special Committee on decolonization and other delegations, the Fourth Committee should take no decision at the current stage on draft resolution XII.

29. It was so decided.

Question of Pitcairn: draft decision I (A/42/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 129)

30. Draft decision I on Pitcairn was adopted.

Question of Saint Helena: draft decision II (A/42/23 (Part VI), chap. IX, para. 129)

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

32. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, referred to the sixth sentence of the draft decision: "The Assembly notes with deep concern the continued presence of military facilities on the dependency of Ascension Island". For the past five years that sentence had appeared in all draft decisions concerning St. Helena, even though Ascension Island was 1,120 kilometres from St. Helena, and had only administrative links with the latter. Furthermore, the island had no indigenous population and the military facilities were extremely limited, with very few personnel. That small base could not be of interest to anybody, least of all to St. Helena, and not even to the contractual personnel who constituted its only population. As to the next sentence, his delegation took exception to the proposal that the General Assembly should urge the administering Power to take all necessary measures not to involve the Territory in any offensive acts or interference against neighbouring States, by the racist régime of South Africa. That was the first time the sentence had appeared in the draft resolution, and he did not see what the purpose of the sentence could be. The very idea that the United Kingdom might involve the Territory in "offensive acts or interference" was quite absurd. The United Kingdom did not need to be reminded of its duties. He therefore requested a separate vote on the sixth sentence of draft decision II

(Mr. Smith, United Kingdom)

adding that, if the sentence were retained, his delegation would vote against the draft as a whole. If the Committee agreed to delete the sentence, his delegation would then also request a separate vote on the sentence concerning "offensive acts".

33. Furthermore, regarding the fourth sentence, in which the General Assembly noted with concern the trade and transport dependency of the Territory on South Africa, he pointed out that, given St. Helena's geographical location, it was natural for it to have relations with South Africa, but that to speak of "dependency" was totally absurd. In that regard he cited the report prepared by the Special Committee of 24 itself (A/AC.109/913/Add.1), in which the Special Committee said: "Its [St. Helena's] main trading partners remain the United Kingdom and South Africa. Others include the Canary Islands, Ghana, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Japan, Brazil and Denmark". No more needed to be said.

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Mauritius, Niger, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Singapore, Spain, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Zaire.

35. The sixth sentence of draft decision II was adopted by 73 votes to 31, with 27 abstentions.

36. A recorded vote was taken on draft decision II 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, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey, Zaire.

37. Draft decision II was adopted by 112 votes to 2, with 29 abstentions.

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)

38. Mr. PALMA (Honduras), recalling the resolution adopted at the previous meeting, referred to the separate vote on the retention or deletion of the reference to Israel in the preamble to the draft. There had been a malfunction in the electronic voting system; his delegation had in fact voted in favour of deleting that name in the preamble and also, in accordance with its traditional position on that question, in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

39. Mr. FLAVIA (Dominican Republic) said that his delegation also had voted for the deletion of the name "Israel" in the draft resolution.

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

40. Mr. LAWSON (Sierra Leone) told the Committee that, had he been present for the vote on the draft resolution on the question (A/42/23 (Part IV), chap. VIII, para. 9), he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

AGENDA ITEM 36: QUESTION OF NAMIBIA (continued)

41. Mr. SAVUT (Turkey), speaking on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, said that, despite the great victories the United Nations had achieved in the area of decolonization and the transition from an old world of colonial empires to the current community of independent nations - one of the greatest changes in the history of mankind - the situation in Namibia had not evolved in the same way.

42. Despite years of effort and struggle, Namibia had not achieved independence nor had it been spared violence and the worst form of subjugation. The Council for Namibia, like other United Nations bodies, such as the Fourth Committee, was convinced that settlement of the question of Namibia was of overriding importance for the future peace and prosperity of the whole region, and that the international community could not afford to set the issue aside any longer. The situation in southern Africa had been called one of the gravest challenges to the authority of the United Nations, and united action was therefore needed to face that challenge. The international community should redouble its efforts to obtain Namibia's liberation and to contribute to the development of stable and harmonious international relations. It must not falter in its support for the Namibian people who had shown courage and determination in its struggle for liberty, independence and human dignity.

43. The Council for Namibia commended the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts to implement the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on the question of Namibia, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In the light of those endeavours, the growing support of the Fourth Committee and other United Nations bodies and the moral resolve of the international community, the Council could not help but believe that the day of justice, honour and freedom for the Namibian people was close at hand and that an independent Namibia would soon take its rightful place in the United Nations.

44. He urged the members of the Fourth Committee to participate actively in the debate to be held in plenary on the situation in Namibia and to give their full support to the draft resolution which the Council would prepare on the subject.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

45. The CHAIRMAN told the Committee that, on 17 November, the Committee would hold a hearing of bodies and individuals interested in the question of the Falkland

(The Chairman:

Islands (Malvinas) concurrently with the consideration of that question by the United Nations. He suggested that any new request for a hearing received on that question should be distributed as a Committee document for consideration at that meeting.

46. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.