



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 86: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

REPORTS OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

UN LIBRARY

JAN 25 1981

UN/SA COLLECTION

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), 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.4/35/SR.27
25 November 1980
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

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

AGENDA ITEM 86: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued) (A/C.4/35/L.17)

1. Mr. SAID (Malaysia), speaking in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17 adopted at the preceding meeting, said that Malaysia fully subscribed to efforts by the United Nations to end all collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa and had voted in favour of the draft resolution. His delegation had certain reservations with regard to operative paragraphs 9 and 10 in which certain countries were singled out as maintaining relations with South Africa; had there been separate votes on those paragraphs, his delegation would have abstained on them.

2. Mr. WAYARABI (Indonesia) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution since he supported its objectives. Nevertheless, he regretted that paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 singled out certain countries; had there been separate votes on those paragraphs, his delegation would have abstained on them.

3. Mr. GUERREIRO (Brazil) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. Brazil had only one aim: the elimination of colonialism and apartheid in southern Africa. But he felt that certain parts of the draft resolution were not likely to contribute to finding a solution for the problem under discussion.

4. Mr. LAL (Fiji) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but believed that certain activities undertaken by foreign interests in consultation with the people of the Non-Self-Governing Territories could be a factor in helping the socio-economic development of those Territories. His delegation had certain reservations with regard to operative paragraphs 9 and 10 which did not help towards the search for a consensus.

5. Mr. HASLUND (Denmark) emphasized that his Government was ready to support any realistic step towards implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and condemning the activities of foreign economic interests which impeded the implementation of the Declaration. Essentially, the draft resolution focused on the situation in southern Africa where the Pretoria régime bore the principal responsibility; the position of the Danish Government in that regard was well known. His Government therefore deeply deplored that a question of such paramount importance had been presented to the Organization by means of the resolution adopted. It only detracted from the seriousness of the issue and from the objectives behind agenda item 86. Besides, the totally unjustified accusations against explicitly named countries could only be detrimental to the fulfilment of those objectives. The condemnation in operative paragraphs 8 and 9 was so arbitrary and indiscriminate that every country in the world was implicated, and he therefore rejected it in the strongest possible terms.

/...

(Mr. Haslund, Denmark)

6. While appreciating the efforts made to produce a more acceptable draft, the Danish delegation had abstained in the vote.

7. Mr. MRA (Burma) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in spite of its reservations with regard to operative paragraph 9.

8. Mr. DE ALBUQUERQUE (Portugal) said he would have liked to have been able to participate in a realistic initiative aimed at the economic, social and political development of the colonial countries. But the draft resolution, which contained abusive generalities and arbitrary charges, did not conform to that aim and he had voted against it. He shared the view of the representative of Sierra Leone who had urged members of the Committee to avoid useless and sterile confrontations and to work in a true spirit of co-operation.

9. Mr. RICARDES (Argentina) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution since he supported the principles on which it was based. But he regretted that it singled out certain States.

10. Mr. SALONEN (Finland) said that he had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution even though his Government supported the legitimate aspirations of the colonial peoples to self-determination and independence, vigorously condemned all forms of economic activity which impeded the elimination of colonialism and was concerned about the dangers to which South Africa's acquisition of nuclear capacity exposed them. He found it regrettable that the resolution contained elements which made it less effective, particularly operative paragraphs 9 and 10 and the twelfth preambular paragraph as well as certain other paragraphs concerning questions on which decisions could only be taken by the Security Council.

11. Mr. REMEDI (Uruguay) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution which was in accordance with the policy of the Uruguayan Government to encourage colonial Powers to accelerate the accession of their Territories to independence and to protect their natural resources. He supported the objectives set out in operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution aimed at strengthening and diversifying the economy of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the interests of the indigenous population, but he had certain doubts as to paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 which contained abusive condemnations of certain administering Powers. The mere fact of maintaining diplomatic relations with a country did not imply approval of its internal or foreign policies. Had there been separate votes on those three paragraphs, his delegation would have abstained on them.

12. Mr. GARRIGUES (Spain) said he had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. He deplored that the activities of foreign interests in the colonial countries had been condemned en bloc since in some cases their activities helped the economic development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. He found it regrettable that operative paragraphs 9 and 10 singled out certain countries; had there been separate votes on those paragraphs, he would have abstained on them.

13. Mr. BOCOUM (Mali) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution as he supported its objectives; but he regretted that operative paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 had singled out certain countries. Had there been separate votes on those paragraphs, he would have abstained on them.

/...

14. Mr. CAPUNAY (Peru) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution. But he could not give his approval to the paragraphs which singled out certain countries; such a procedure was contrary to the objectives sought by the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

15. Mrs. DAES (Greece) said she had abstained on the vote. She supported the principles on which the draft resolution was based but did not think it should persist in condemning certain countries which had rejected the charges levelled against them.

16. Mr. TIMOTHY (Papua New Guinea) said he had abstained in the vote as he considered that the sixth and eighteenth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 were not acceptable. As to the form of the operative paragraphs, he regretted the use of the word "condemn" instead of "appeal to". With regard to the substance, he regretted that all the activities of foreign interests had been condemned en bloc since they were often helpful to the economic development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. He also regretted the condemnation of certain countries whose co-operation with South Africa was in fact negligible.

17. Mr. VILLAREAL (Panama) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution but had reservations with regard to paragraph 9.

18. Mr. ZAMIR (Bangladesh) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution; but he wished his reservations with regard to operative paragraph 9 to be noted.

19. Mr. DEL ROSARIO (Philippines) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution but did not believe that operative paragraphs 9 and 10 were of a nature to help the work of the Committee.

20. Mrs. OSODE (Liberia) said she had abstained in the vote. But her delegation found that the twelfth preambular paragraph was too general and did not give recognition to the progress made by the administering Powers in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. She did not agree with the naming of certain States in operative paragraphs 9 and 10 which was liable to give rise to antagonism among States; she also found the list by no means exhaustive. A vote for a resolution of that nature could only serve to prolong the suffering of the colonial countries.

21. Mr. RIVERA (Bolivia) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution but had certain reservations with regard to operative paragraphs 8, 9 and 10.

22. Miss SELATO (Botswana) said she had voted in favour of the draft resolution even though she could not agree with paragraphs 2, 13 and 21.

23. Mr. NABHAN (Iraq), exercising his right of reply, categorically rejected the charges made by the representative of the Zionist entity against his country in his statement to the preceding meeting on the subject of the national policy of Iraq and the dispute between Iraq and Iran. In any case, a discussion on the subject was outside the mandate of the Committee; the matter had been taken up by the Security Council where every effort was being made to reach an equitable settlement.

24. Mr. MIR MOTAHARI (Iran), speaking on a point of order, said that the statement by the representative of Iraq had nothing to do with the item on the agenda which concerned the activities of foreign economic and other interests.
25. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of Iraq to keep to the question under consideration.
26. Mr. NABHAN (Iraq) said that the representative of the Zionist entity was attempting, as usual, to lead the members of the Committee astray and to divert their attention by raising points which had nothing to do with the agenda item.
27. The Zionist entity, with a policy based on oppression, still occupied Arab territories in addition to Palestine. It was thus the last to be able to criticize the policy followed by the Iraqi Government which respected the freedom and sovereignty of States in accordance with the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations.
28. Nuclear and military collaboration between the Zionist entity and the South African racist entity was an irrefutable fact, and represented a serious threat to international peace and security.
29. He recalled that his delegation had been absent at the time of the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/35/L.17 and requested that it be added to the list of delegations which had voted in favour of the draft resolution.
30. Mr. BURAYZAT (Jordan), in exercise of the right of reply, referred to the remarks made at the previous meeting by the representative of Israel, who had denied all nuclear collaboration between his country and South Africa. In fact it was well known that Israel and South Africa did collaborate in that field, as had been irrefutably demonstrated on many occasions by the United Nations.
31. Not only had the Israeli delegation attempted to lead the members of the Committee astray, but it had also attacked the Arab States, and the President of the Republic of Iraq in particular.
32. Mr. ERELL (Israel), in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had in no way sought to attack the President of Iraq, but had confined himself to quoting from a statement made by him, which had appeared in an Associated Press report of 4 November. In any event the Jordanian delegation should exercise prudence on the question of arms deliveries to South Africa, since Jordan itself sold tanks to that country. Rather than engage in baseless speculation, it would be better to keep to the conclusions contained in the Secretary-General's reports.
33. Mr. MIR MOTAHARI (Iran), in exercise of the right of reply, said that Iraq had either not followed the Committee's deliberations or was not familiar with the rules of procedure. The Committee was currently considering the activities of foreign economic and other interests which impeded the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization, which had nothing to do with the aggression which Iran had suffered. The representative of Iraq should therefore limit his statement to that agenda item.

(Mr. Mir Motahari, Iran)

34. Nevertheless, it was grotesque to hear Iraq speak of justice for the peoples of southern Africa and of decolonization while it was massacring thousands of civilians in Iran and while its own people was subjected to a new form of colonialism.

35. The CHAIRMAN requested the representatives of Iran and Iraq to confine their statements to the question before the Committee, without bringing up the conflict opposing their two countries.

36. Mr. SEMICHI (Algeria) said that it was encouraging that the Committee had adopted the resolution on the activities of foreign interests (A/C.4/35/L.17) by 91 votes to 16, with 26 abstentions, while the resolution adopted at the previous session on the same subject had been adopted by 88 votes to 15, with 33 abstentions. However, at the Committee's last meeting, it had been stated that the delegations which had sponsored the draft resolution had been irresponsible and discriminatory and that the text amounted to propaganda. It had also been stated that the draft resolution had been drawn up in complete secrecy. All that was false. The sole aim of the sponsors of the draft resolution had been to work on behalf of peoples under colonial domination. Copies of the draft resolution had been sent to every group at each stage of drafting. The draft resolution had been drawn up in a fully objective manner owing to the efforts of the African Group. It was also false to claim that no distinction had been made between the situation in southern Africa and that in small Territories. Paragraph 7, in particular, indicated the contrary.

37. Finally, the representatives of the Zionist entity, who attacked other members of the Committee by referring to the Secretary-General's reports, would do well to implement the recommendations contained in those reports themselves. Co-operation between Israel and South Africa, especially in the nuclear sphere, had been conclusively proved in the reports of the Special Committee and of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 86.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/35/23 (Part VI))

Question of the Turks and Caicos Islands (A/C.4/35/L.19)

39. Mr. CHAN (Australia), introducing the amendment contained in document A/C.4/35/L.19, said that paragraph 4 of the draft resolution on the Turks and Caicos Islands proposed in paragraph 19 of chapter XXVIII of the report of the Special Committee (A/35/23 (Part VI)) contained a new formulation, since it stated that the presence of military bases and other installations "constituted" an impediment to the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization. That was

(Mr. Chan, Australia)

not in accordance with the formulation which the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee had traditionally used in their decisions on small Territories, where it had been stated that the presence of such bases "could constitute" an impediment to the implementation of the Declaration.

40. There had been a misunderstanding which had arisen because, when the Special Committee had considered the draft resolution on the Turks and Caicos Islands, oral amendments had been introduced and accepted by the Committee without any written text. As Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, he wished to rectify the error by rewording paragraph 4 of the draft resolution to read "could constitute". Without that amendment the draft resolution was unlikely to be adopted by consensus, which would be at variance with the practice followed for several years.

41. Mr. YERE (Ivory Coast) said that the wording of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution proposed by the Special Committee to the General Assembly was not in accordance with the traditional formulation used by the Committee, nor with the text of the decision on Guam adopted at the previous meeting. While there was little doubt that the presence of military bases could constitute an impediment to the implementation of the Declaration, it could not be stated that they certainly did so.

42. He had recently returned from the Turks and Caicos Islands, where he had been at the head of a United Nations Visiting Mission. When questioned on the military bases, the governing party in the Territory had stated that those bases did not necessarily guarantee the security of the Islands. On the other hand, the opposition party's view was that the presence of the bases had positive aspects, especially given the rent paid by the United States and the employment provided for the population. It should be recalled that the Government of the Territory had taken part in the negotiations on the military bases and in determining the rent in question.

43. The Special Committee's draft resolution had been based on the report of the first Visiting Mission, which had gone to the Turks and Caicos Islands in April 1980. His delegation was thus in favour of the Australian amendment, which would rectify a simple drafting error.

44. Mr. HASLUND (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that he supported the Australian amendment, which would permit the retention of a formulation which the Committee had always adopted by consensus.

45. Mr. LE ANH KIET (Viet Nam) reiterated that the presence of military bases in colonial Territories prevented the peoples of those Territories from exercising their right to self-determination and independence. Thus, he could not accept the proposed amendment.

46. Mr. GARCIA ALMEIDA (Cuba) recalled that his delegation had always taken a constructive position in the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee, so that resolutions on small Territories could be adopted by consensus. Yet, considering

/...

(Mr. Garcia Almeida, Cuba)

that consensus was a means and not an end for the Committee's work, his delegation stressed that consensus could not be transmuted into permanent pressure to extract concessions to the detriment of the interests of colonial peoples and Territories.

47. The wording of the draft resolution corresponded to that of the programme of action adopted in 1970 on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Furthermore, the results of the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries left no doubt as to the impediment to the implementation of the Declaration represented by the presence of military bases. In addition, the draft resolution on the Turks and Caicos Islands had been adopted by consensus in the Special Committee. His delegation was thus opposed to its being amended and would vote against the amendment.

48. Mr. EVRIVIADES (Cyprus) asked whether the draft resolution had been adopted in its existing form by the Special Committee or whether there had been a misunderstanding.

49. Mr. TUROT (France) said that, if the Committee rejected the proposed amendment - which would make the text of paragraph 4 conform to that normally adopted by the Committee - the resolutions on Guam and the Turks and Caicos Islands would differ on that issue; such a situation would be illogical.

50. Mr. CHAN (Australia), speaking as Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, reminded the Committee that the traditional formula which had enabled the Committee to reach a consensus was the wording contained in the amendment (A/C.4/35/L.19). If the Special Committee had adopted a different wording, it was because the amendments had been submitted orally and had therefore led to misunderstandings.

51. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka) said that he understood the position of Cuba. As Sri Lanka had attained its independence while bases continued to exist on its territory, his country could bear witness to the fact that the presence of foreign bases did not necessarily represent an obstacle to independence. With a view to reaching a consensus, his delegation would support the Australian amendment.

52. Mr. MACLAY (United Kingdom) observed that the wording of the draft resolution was not that which was normally used by the Special Committee. Moreover, the Government of the Turks and Caicos Islands had discussed the contents of the draft resolution and had expressed a desire to retain the military bases for economic reasons. His delegation could not, therefore, accept the unusual wording of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

53. Mr. PEŇAŽKA (Czechoslovakia), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, pointed out that the draft resolution in document A/35/23 (Part VI), had been adopted by consensus by the Special Committee. Moreover, the wording concerning military bases, in paragraph 4, was not new; it had already been used in other documents, particularly the programme of action for the full implementation of the

/...

(Mr. Peňažka, Czechoslovakia)

Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV), which had been adopted virtually unanimously by Member States, with the exception of five colonial Powers.

54. Czechoslovakia considered that military activities and bases in colonial Territories represented a serious obstacle to the exercise of the inalienable right of colonial peoples and Territories to self-determination and independence and hindered the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). His delegation would therefore vote against the Australian amendment.

55. Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Australian amendment would lead to a modification of the General Assembly's position on the inadmissibility of military bases in colonial Territories. Contrary to the statements of certain representatives, the formula in its current version contained no new element. The programme of action adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 2621 (XXV) had stipulated that Member States should carry out a sustained and vigorous campaign against all military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration, as such activities constituted an obstacle to the full implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). The justice of that wording was clear, since the deliberate intent of the administering Powers to retain complete control over bases in colonial Territories had prevented the colonial peoples from controlling their own territory. Such bases could, moreover, be enlarged and consequently represented a threat to the security of neighbouring territories and to international peace and security. Many examples could be cited in that connexion.

56. To argue that the adoption of paragraph 4 was the result of a technical error did not correspond to reality. His delegation therefore considered that the Australian amendment ran counter to the Special Committee's decision. He had been surprised by the objections raised by delegations which had earlier spoken in favour of the draft resolution.

57. Mr. SCHLEICHER (German Democratic Republic) said he supported the statement of the Soviet delegation and would therefore vote against the proposed amendment.

58. Mr. NIKULIN (Bulgaria) said he supported the statement of the Soviet Union and added that the draft resolution had been adopted by the Special Committee following detailed consultations in which all the members of the Visiting Mission as well as other delegations had taken part. He had himself participated in those consultations and could confirm that there had been no mistake during the drafting of the draft resolution or during the voting on it. He reminded the Committee that, following the adoption of resolution 2621 (XXV), all members had expressed their opposition to the presence of military bases. His delegation would therefore vote against the Australian amendment.

59. A recorded vote was taken on the amendment contained in document A/C.4/35/L.19.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Camercon, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Panama, Poland, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Bhutan, Cape Verde, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Nepal, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia.

60. The amendment contained in document A/C.4/35/L.19 was adopted by 70 votes to 40, with 17 abstentions.

61. The draft resolution contained in document A/35/23 (Part VI), paragraph 19, as amended, was adopted.

62. Mr. FALEIRO (India), speaking in explanation of vote, reminded the Committee that all members of the Visiting Mission had agreed to the text contained in document A/35/23 (Part VI), which had been approved without reservation. In the absence of general agreement on the text, he considered that it would have been better to try to reach a consensus. He wished nevertheless to draw attention to the fact that the Committee had always opposed the establishment of military bases, which undoubtedly impeded the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). His delegation had therefore voted against the Australian amendment.

63. Mr. SANGSOMSAK (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. NIKULIN (Bulgaria) and Mr. SCHLEICHER (German Democratic Republic) expressed the most serious reservations regarding paragraph 4 of the resolution just adopted.

Question of Brunei

Question of Pitcairn

64. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly postpone consideration of those two questions until its thirty-sixth session and request the Special Committee to submit a progress report on the situation in the two Territories.

65. It was so decided.

Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)

66. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that negotiations were currently under way between the Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina regarding the future of the Territory in question. He therefore suggested that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly postpone its consideration of the question until its next session and request the Special Committee to submit a progress report on the situation in the Territory.

67. It was so decided.

Question of Antigua and St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla

68. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly consider the question at its thirty-sixth session.

69. It was so decided.

70. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had completed its work for the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

REPORTS OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

71. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in accordance with the usual practice, the Committee should authorize the Rapporteur to submit his reports directly to the General Assembly as soon as possible.

72. It was so decided.

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

73. The CHAIRMAN said that it had been a source of satisfaction that, during the current year, the United Nations had made significant advances in the field of decolonization.

74. In the first place, Zimbabwe's independence had been a source of encouragement to all colonial Territories and an example of what a people could achieve through serious negotiations when it was mobilized and organized in defence of its freedom. The independence of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and of Vanuatu, if less dramatic, had still been of special significance.

75. At the same time, there were still some colonial situations in the world which were a challenge to the dignity of mankind, the authority of the Charter and the valiant efforts of the international community.

(The Chairman)

76. In that connexion, Namibia at once came to mind, a Territory of which the United Nations Council for Namibia was the Administering Authority until independence, in accordance with its mandate from the General Assembly. The Pretoria régime was consolidating its presence in the Territory - although the United Nations had declared that presence to be illegal - and had refused to co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Committee was deeply concerned about the tragic delays imposed on the liberation of Namibia by the apartheid régime, since the situation in the Territory was one of the most flagrant demonstrations of colonial power, a plague on the human conscience and a threat to peace in southern Africa and the whole world.

77. The international community must mobilize itself to establish justice and freedom in the Territory, thus demonstrating its willingness to defend the values the United Nations professed to uphold.

78. The General Assembly would shortly be considering the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in plenary meeting and he planned, in his dual capacity as representative of Guyana and Chairman of the Fourth Committee, to give a detailed review of the Committee's achievements and to submit important recommendations prepared by the Committee for action by the Assembly regarding the colonial situations which had not yet been settled.

79. It was essential for the Declaration on decolonization to be implemented in full in respect of all colonial peoples, according to their particular wishes and whatever the size, population or geographical situation of their respective Territories.

80. The Committee had likewise affirmed in one particular case that differences between the administering Power and another State in respect of the dependent Territory should not prejudice the right of the people of that Territory to self-determination and independence. In that connexion, it had called for concrete steps to be taken for the Territory's independence within a specified time limit.

81. The Committee had also called for an end to those activities of foreign economic and other interests which created or perpetuated relations of dependence or exploitation.

82. In view of the vital role of education in preparing for nationhood, States Members must assist the peoples of the dependent Territories by increasing their offers of training and study facilities.

83. The Committee had always maintained that the transition to independence should be accomplished peacefully and, where the issue of self-determination had become the subject of armed conflict, it had consistently welcomed diplomatic initiatives and encouraged negotiation.

84. The international community's tasks in respect of decolonization were far from completed, despite important victories during the year; the United Nations must rise to the challenge. Anachronistic attitudes must be changed and all States must

/...

(The Chairman)

recognize the pre-eminence of the interests of the peoples of colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories and take practical measures to promote them in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

85. The Committee must continue to mobilize world public opinion in support of the colonial peoples' struggle for self-determination and independence. In that respect, it was significant that most of its recommendations had been adopted unanimously or by consensus. The members of the Committee would do well to seek to reduce areas of disagreement so that the interests of the colonial peoples would be better served.

86. He sincerely thanked the members of the Committee for their solidarity, support, encouragement and friendship and the officers of the Committee for their valuable contribution to the Committee's work.

87. Mr. DJERMAKOYE (Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Trusteeship and Decolonization) commended the Chairman on the vitality, authority, tact, ability and organizing skill which he had shown throughout the Committee's work. He also expressed his deep appreciation to the officers of the Committee, who had spared neither time nor effort in helping him in his task.

88. The questions dealt with by the Committee had certainly been delicate and the debates at times difficult, but it had completed its work on a hopeful note, since its discussion would help to advance the international community's efforts on behalf of the countries fighting for their freedom. In particular there was hope for a peaceful solution of the Namibian problem before the next session of the General Assembly.

89. On the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, he reaffirmed that the Secretariat would spare no effort to help the Committee to fulfil its noble mission until the last, smallest Territory had exercised its right to dignity, freedom and justice.

90. After an exchange of courtesies the CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee had completed its work for the thirty-fifth session.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.