

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION  
Official Records\*



FOURTH COMMITTEE  
22nd meeting  
held on  
Monday, 16 November 1981  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 22nd MEETING

UN LIBRARY

Chairman: Mr. JAMAL (Qatar)

DEC 2 1981

CONTENTS

UN/SA COLLECTION

AGENDA ITEM 94: 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 92: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 97: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (continued)

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

\* 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 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.

81-57787

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.4/36/SR.22  
24 November 1981  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 94: 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.4/36/L.4 and Corr.1, L.20)

AGENDA ITEM 92: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/C.4/36/L.10)

AGENDA ITEM 97: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES. (continued) (A/C.4/36/L.11)

AGENDA ITEM 19: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued) (A/C.4/36/L.18, L.24)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the statement of administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure (A/C.4/36/L.20).
2. Mr. SERAO (Angola), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the length of the debate on item 94 testified to the importance of the question for the purposes of eliminating colonialism and racial discrimination, and reflected the concern of Member States to protect the natural resources and all the other vital interests of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories from the abuses of the colonial Powers and the transnational corporations. The activities of foreign interests, particularly in southern Africa, contributed to the maintenance of the colonial system and apartheid and to oppression in Namibia and South Africa, and enabled the Pretoria régime to continue to defy United Nations resolutions.
3. It was regrettable, however, that certain Western countries, as well as Israel and the transnational corporations, had intensified their activities in the colonial Territories, thereby thwarting the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of those Territories. Indeed, certain States no longer concealed their sympathy for the apartheid system and their opposition to the independence of Namibia and to the elimination of racial discrimination in southern Africa, openly declaring themselves to be allies of South Africa.
4. That was why the sponsors of the draft resolution would have the General Assembly condemn the collusion of those States with the Pretoria racist régime and the military activities of the colonial Powers and of South Africa in Namibia and in all other colonial Territories which were prejudicial to the interests of the peoples of those Territories and to their right to self-determination and independence. Furthermore, in view of the negative role played by the transnational corporations in many colonial Territories, the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations should prepare a register of the profits which those corporations derived from their activities in the colonial Territories.

/...

5. Miss FORT (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Economic Community, said that those States had always condemned the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were contrary to the free exercise of the right of self-determination of peoples and had welcomed the new efforts of the Western contact group to find a negotiated solution to the problem of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). They had repeatedly expressed their abhorrence for apartheid.
6. The 10 States found it particularly offensive that the draft resolution contained unjustified and arbitrary attacks against certain Member States, and they rejected the tendentious and inaccurate references to military activities and facilities.
7. The lack of balance in the draft resolution derived from the confusion between the situations in the small Territories, in Namibia, and in South Africa. The problems in South Africa did not arise from a colonial situation; the ten therefore maintained basic reservations concerning certain paragraphs of the draft resolution. They were also disappointed that a draft resolution which ought to address the whole range of problems facing the remaining dependent Territories should take so little account of the real needs of their peoples for investment and economic development.
8. The ten also regretted that the draft resolution lacked constructive proposals on that serious subject. In view of those reservations, the ten would be unable to support the draft resolution when it was put to a vote.
9. Mr. SEZAKI (Japan) said that his country had always opposed the apartheid régime and had systematically supported international efforts aimed at eliminating that scourge.
10. His delegation could not accept paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, which called upon all States, including Japan, to take measures to terminate all collaboration with South Africa in the political, diplomatic, economic, trade, military and nuclear fields.
11. He pointed out that Japan had no diplomatic relations with South Africa; his Government had prohibited direct investment in South Africa, including the establishment of branches of corporate bodies under Japanese jurisdiction. In accordance with the relevant United Nations resolution, it had also called upon Japanese banks to refrain from extending any loans to South Africa. Trade relations between Japan and South Africa were of a limited nature; indeed, Japan was seeking to reduce its imports of South African products.
12. Furthermore, there was absolutely no military or nuclear co-operation between Japan and South Africa. Japan rigorously observed the Security Council's arms embargo.
13. Japan had also decided in principle to issue no visas to South Africans for the purpose of cultural or sports exchanges.

/...

(Mr. Sezaki, Japan)

14. With regard to the question of Namibian uranium, the working paper prepared by the Secretariat (A/AC.109/656) contained baseless allegations against Japan and took no account of the information provided on the measures it had taken in that regard. Investigations had indicated the falseness of the charges levelled against Japan at the hearings on Namibian uranium conducted by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

15. For those reasons, his delegation considered that the reference to Japan in paragraph 10 of the draft resolution was arbitrary and entirely without foundation; Japan would therefore be unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution, although it shared most of the views expressed therein.

16. Mr. TANÇ (Turkey) said that his delegation supported the fundamental principles contained in the draft resolution. It opposed the exploitation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories by some foreign interests. It maintained no relations with South Africa in the political, diplomatic, commercial, military or any other fields and was committed to efforts being made to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa.

17. However, he regretted that the draft resolution contained paragraphs in which certain countries were mentioned by name. He would have preferred a more objective text, avoiding all discriminatory condemnation. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote.

18. Mr. HUTCHINSON (Ireland) said that his delegation condemned without reservation the exploitation of the human and natural resources of Non-Self-Governing Territories and the activities of foreign economic and other interests which impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

19. However, draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 failed to deal adequately with the issues confronting the small Territories. Economic development was an important factor in bringing those Territories to independence; foreign economic interests should not all be condemned out of hand. The administering Powers had the obligation to ensure that those economic interests, rather than impeding the implementation of the Declaration, enhanced the long-term development of the Territories.

20. His delegation regretted that the draft resolution did not constitute a fair and balanced approach and did not offer realistic and constructive proposals. His delegation also deplored the selective condemnation of particular countries, especially when some of them had denied the allegations.

21. Mr. van WELL (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his country was committed to contributing to the process of decolonization within the framework of the United Nations and, as a member of the Contact Group, was endeavouring to bring about the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) designed to achieve independence for Namibia. His delegation regretted that, in view of the great

/...



(Mr. van Well, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

political, economic and social challenges facing the world, the debate in the Committee had not been more constructive and had not furthered the development of friendly relations among nations.

22. To condemn all foreign economic interests in colonial territories as impeding the implementation of the Declaration was tantamount to saying that those territories did not or should not benefit from facilities and economic capacities built up with the aid of foreign capital. Rather than engaging in ideological rhetoric, it would have been better to try to resolve the specific difficulties in a spirit of co-operation and mutual respect.

23. He deplored the absence of constructive ideas in many parts of the draft resolution and rejected in the strongest terms the accusation of collusion with South Africa in the nuclear field levelled again in 1981 against the Federal Republic of Germany. His country had applied a voluntary embargo on arms to South Africa since 1963; it had always scrupulously implemented Security Council resolution 418; it had in 1954 renounced the manufacture of atomic, biological and chemical weapons and had accepted the appropriate controls. It pursued a non-proliferation policy and there was no nuclear co-operation between it and South Africa. In that connexion, the sponsors of the draft resolution under consideration should have taken account of the serious and unbiased study of the Secretary-General (A/35/402) which made a commendable effort to be objective and separate facts from allegations.

24. His delegation rejected the term "collusion" in the draft resolution; it was a monstrous allegation and an insult. The adoption of the draft resolution by countries with which the Federal Republic of Germany had friendly relations would have an adverse effect on public opinion at a time when the Bonn Government was relying on it to uphold its efforts to co-operate with the third world and provide development aid to the least developed countries.

25. For the foregoing reasons his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

26. Mr. LEVITTE (France) said that draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 covered a wide range of diverse issues. It dealt in part with Namibia, a Territory which France considered to be illegally occupied by South Africa. In order to put an end to that occupation and to promote the independence of the Territory, France, together with four other countries had proposed a settlement plan which had been endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 and, as a member of the Contact Group, it was pursuing its efforts to have it implemented.

27. France did not recognize the validity of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia because it dealt with an issue over which the United Nations Charter assigned exclusive authority to the Security Council. None the less, his Government discouraged French enterprises from investing in and trading with the Territory.

/...

(Mr. Levitte, France)

Such activities were not covered by any price-increase guarantees and did not receive any export subsidies.

28. With regard to the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, which were dealt with in another part of the draft resolution, that issue had lost much of its urgency owing to the very fact that many Territories had become independent, among them Vanuatu, Belize and Antigua and Barbuda in the course of 1981. France could not in any case accept an automatic condemnation of the activities of foreign enterprises in Territories still under colonial domination. While it was certainly undeniable that such activities were detrimental to the interests of the indigenous population when the foreign enterprises exploited natural resources with no concern for the living and working conditions of the local labour force or for the economic fabric of the Territory concerned, hasty generalizations must be avoided. The real problem lay in the disarray of markets and the lack of balance in the relations between developing and industrialized countries. His own country was well aware of that situation and the establishment of a new economic order that would be more just and more equitable for the most disadvantaged countries was therefore one of the priority objectives of its foreign policy.

29. His delegation was grateful for the efforts made by the African Group of States to improve the text of the draft resolutions and, in that connexion, appreciated the friendly gesture towards France and its new Government. It could not, however, subscribe to many provisions in the text and took issue with its underlying general philosophy which mixed together very different situations and with its selective condemnation of certain countries.

30. Other aspects of the draft resolution seemed illogical or unrealistic. The countries members of the Contact Group, and France in particular, were being asked to break diplomatic relations with South Africa even as they were being urged to induce the Pretoria régime to accept the implementation of Security Council resolution 435. How could that be done if they did not maintain relations with South Africa?

31. France was also being asked to terminate all collaboration with South Africa in the economic, trade and nuclear fields. That seemed unrealistic; contracts had been concluded and commitments assumed by France which the new Government was bound to honour. There could be some choice in the matter only when it came to new transactions.

32. Draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 certainly contained some positive elements but, in view of the injunctions and unfair accusations it contained, his delegation was obliged to vote against it.

33. Miss DEVER (Belgium) said that since the process of decolonization had begun more than 30 years earlier, many Non-Self-Governing Territories had become independent. Belgium congratulated itself on having steadfastly supported that just and irreversible trend.

/...

(Miss Dever, Belgium)

34. Only a few Territories remained under foreign administration. Hence the usefulness could be questioned of submitting draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, in its present form and wording, for adoption by the General Assembly. The question of Namibia already appeared as agenda item 36 of the General Assembly and had been considered by the Assembly at its emergency special session in 1981. Similarly, apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa came under agenda item 32. It was therefore clear that the questions dealt with in the draft resolution under agenda item 94 had already been considered by the Fourth Committee under other items or would be taken up by the plenary Assembly.

35. Moreover, the question of South Africa was not a decolonization issue. The real aim was to bring about the establishment of a multiracial, democratic and just society. Belgium had always condemned the policy of apartheid in the strongest terms, but it remained convinced that it was not by ostracizing South Africa that the international community would hasten the elimination of that racial practice. It was important to maintain a dialogue with that country so as to influence the Pretoria Government and make it accept a peaceful and balanced solution.

36. The draft resolution contained provisions in which certain countries were singled out by name and condemned for their relations with South Africa. The selection was clearly inspired by political considerations.

37. With regard to investments in and transfers of capital to Non-Self-Governing Territories, his delegation refused to consider them automatically pernicious and always detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants.

38. Rather than engaging in polemics and levelling accusations, it would be preferable to initiate a constructive dialogue in which all parties would participate, in the interest of all the peoples in the southern African region. In view of the foregoing reservations, her delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4.

39. Mr. ULRICH (Denmark) reaffirmed his country's long-standing support for any realistic steps taken within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations, to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as well as for the efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid, and racial discrimination in southern Africa.

40. The main thrust of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 was the explosive situation prevailing in southern Africa for which the Government of South Africa bore the principal responsibility.

41. His delegation deeply deplored the fact that the draft resolution to be voted upon had been worded in such a way that it detracted from the seriousness of the issue. His Government strongly believed that the totally unjustified accusations against explicitly named countries, could only be detrimental to the fulfilment of the worthy objectives underlying item 94, which was before the Fourth Committee. Those allegations were unacceptable and his delegation rejected them in the strongest possible terms.

/...

42. Mr. THAMAE (Lesotho) congratulated the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 on the spirit of co-operation and compromise they had displayed during the negotiations leading to the drafting of the resolution.

43. Although his delegation unreservedly supported the draft resolution in substance, it would abstain in the vote because of some provisions which it deemed unacceptable.

44. Mr. LINDAHL (Sweden) said that draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 dealt with one of the most important aspects of decolonization. It highlighted many dangers that might arise from the activities of foreign economic and other interests in colonial Territories. In view of the vulnerability of those Territories, the United Nations should do its utmost to contribute to the protection and defence of the rights of their inhabitants. Sweden condemned the activities of foreign interests which impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; in that connexion, it had passed a law prohibiting new investments in South Africa and Namibia by firms under Swedish jurisdiction.

45. The main thrust of the draft resolution was the serious situation prevailing in southern Africa. The unstable situation in that region was the result of South Africa's apartheid policy and its illegal occupation of Namibia.

46. In his delegation's opinion, the draft resolution before the Committee contained language that was, in some respects, rather too sweeping. His delegation did not consider all foreign economic and other activities in the colonial Territories as necessarily being detrimental to the interests of the inhabitants. Those activities undoubtedly contributed, in certain cases, to the promotion of the industrial development of the Territories.

47. The main specific objections of his delegation referred to paragraphs 9 and 10, in which some countries were arbitrarily named; his delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on that draft resolution. That was all the more regrettable because it fully shared the deep concern of the international community and the Committee about the conditions in southern Africa and supported the general political objective behind the text to be voted on.

48. Mr. ORON (Israel) said that the draft resolution before the Committee was unacceptable to his delegation owing to its broad generalizations; moreover, the singling out of Israel in the text was not only unjust but also unwarranted, for the reasons that his delegation had previously set out. The condemnation of Israel was obviously generated by considerations which were extraneous to the issues that were the subject of the draft resolution.

49. Ms. LUCAS (New Zealand) said that her delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4. The general condemnatory tone of the text was unacceptable to her delegation, as was the selected criticism of countries by name. Her delegation also challenged the idea that all foreign economic and other activities were, in themselves, detrimental to the interests of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

50. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, because it could not accept the proposition on which that draft resolution was based, namely, that the activities of foreign economic and other interests were all bad and that the presence of military bases in Non-Self-Governing Territories was automatically a hindrance to self-determination.

51. With respect to Namibia and apartheid, his delegation supported any efforts to bring about peaceful changes in southern Africa, and that was why it once again rejected the call for total sanctions against South Africa. His delegation also rejected the condemnation of the United States Government for its nuclear collaboration with South Africa, since his Government had permitted no export of nuclear fuel or facilities to South Africa for the previous five years. Furthermore, his Government and several others were singled out for their trade relations with the Pretoria régime, while in fact many other Governments represented in the Fourth Committee traded directly or indirectly with South Africa, often through their own State trading organizations.

52. With respect to the register requested of the Centre on Transnational Corporations under paragraph 21 of the draft resolution, his delegation considered that it would be an inappropriate and time-consuming use of the Centre's resources.

53. The only positive point in the draft resolution was the fact that, by condemning those engaged in the illegal exploitation of Namibia's marine resources, the General Assembly indirectly drew attention to the fishing activities of the Soviet Union off the Namibian coast.

54. Mr. BEESLEY (Canada) recalled that his country was actively participating in the efforts to reach an internationally acceptable settlement in Namibia. It was therefore deeply regrettable that the draft resolution as it stood contained a number of principles and propositions that were unacceptable to his delegation, which would therefore be forced to vote against the text when it was put to the vote.

55. The issue of the extraterritorial application of domestic economic and commercial law was of fundamental importance to his delegation. One of the basic tenets of international trade and investment was the home Governments of transnational corporations might not exercise their national laws in an extraterritorial manner. Canada, which was a major host country of foreign transnational corporations, was firmly attached to that principle. Paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 contradicted that position; accordingly, his delegation could not subscribe to it. Neither could it accept the proposition in paragraph 4, which would have the General Assembly indiscriminately condemn all activities of foreign economic and other interests in the colonial Territories.

56. His delegation deplored the level of rhetoric used in the draft resolution and its generalizations, which detracted from its serious intent. The sponsors should have focused their attention on specific aspects of the question,



(Mr. Beesley, Canada)

especially on conditions of employment and access to training, in an effort to achieve practical results. Such an approach would undoubtedly have made it possible to contribute, in a practical fashion, towards the improvement of the living conditions of many South Africans.

57. Although his delegation could not accept all the provisions of the draft resolution before the Committee, it continued to give its strong support to the goals of economic and human justice in southern Africa.

58. Mr. FEITH (Netherlands) said that his delegation fully subscribed to the statement just made by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Economic Community. The Netherlands, too, had reservations with respect to agenda item 94 as well as to the wording of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, and would vote against it. However, that decision did not imply that his Government rejected all the elements in the draft resolution, because it continued to attach great importance to the early implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

59. His Government rejected the argument, which had been repeatedly advanced in the course of the debate, that all activities of foreign economic and other interests were in themselves detrimental to the inhabitants of dependent Territories. Wherever the operations of transnational corporations were harmful to the process of decolonization they should be rightfully exposed; in general, however, investments and the transfer of technology benefited the inhabitants of those Territories. The draft resolution devoted considerable importance to the situation in Namibia and the activities of foreign economic interests in that Territory, which continued to be illegally occupied by South Africa. In that connexion, his delegation recognized the competence of the United Nations Council for Namibia to issue Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.

60. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Sri Lanka) said that, since Sri Lanka had become a Member of the United Nations, it had always firmly supported the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples consistent with the corresponding Declaration adopted by the General Assembly in 1960.

61. His Government strongly condemned the odious policy of apartheid practised by South Africa and denounced the attitude of the Pretoria régime towards Namibia as well as certain activities of foreign economic interests in the colonial Territories. The right of colonial peoples to self-determination affected not only the political independence of those peoples but also their legitimate right to their natural resources. His delegation therefore supported draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 as a whole although it had reservations in regard to the wording of certain paragraphs in which the activities of several countries were condemned and criticized on a selective basis.

62. His delegation was fully aware that a number of Governments had not paid strict respect to the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions,

/...



(Mr. Kanakarathne, Sri Lanka)

particularly in regard to certain activities of transnational corporations within their jurisdiction; it appealed to all countries to do everything possible to ensure respect for those resolutions in accordance with their obligations as State Members of the United Nations.

63. His delegation would therefore vote for the draft resolution under consideration in the hope that, in future, the members of the Fourth Committee would not lose sight of their objectives, which comprised the elimination of the last vestiges of racism, the ending of the pernicious activities of certain foreign economic interests in the colonial Territories and protection of the sovereign rights of the Governments and peoples over their natural resources.

64. Mrs. DUBRA (Uruguay) said that her delegation would vote for draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 because it supported the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and independence; it reaffirmed the obligation of administering Powers to promote the economic, social, political and cultural progress of the inhabitants of the Territories which they administered and to protect their human and natural resources, which were the heritage of the peoples of those Territories.

65. Her delegation nevertheless regretted that the text of the draft resolution was not sufficiently balanced to achieve unanimous acceptance within the Committee. In particular, she had reservations in regard to certain paragraphs which explicitly condemned a number of countries in a selective manner and without concrete proof. Her delegation would not have voted for those paragraphs if they had been voted on separately.

66. Mr. MPOUEL (United Republic of Cameroon) said that his delegation had always condemned without reservation the policy of apartheid practised by the South African racist régime. In accordance with the principles enshrined in the Cameroonian Constitution, as well as in the United Nations Charter and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, his Government had adopted the measures recommended by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination; it did not have any relations with South Africa, and South African aircraft were prohibited from entering Cameroonian airspace.

67. His delegation would continue to support any action designed to achieve the economic and diplomatic isolation of South Africa and to eliminate apartheid, which represented a crime against humanity.

68. He would accordingly vote for draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, although he found it difficult to support paragraph 10, which mentioned certain States explicitly while maintaining silence in regard to other States which had also collaborated in a number of fields with the South African régime.

69. Mr. COULIBALY (Mali) said that his delegation strongly condemned all forms of collusion with racist South Africa and would vote for draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4. It nevertheless had reservations in regard to paragraphs 9 and 10, which did not deal with all aspects of the problem.

/...

70. Mr. NONSRICHAJ (Thailand) said that his delegation gave its unreserved support to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples as well as to all efforts designed to eliminate colonialism, apartheid, racial discrimination and racism in South Africa; it had always voted for the resolutions on that issue.

71. Nevertheless, if paragraphs 9 and 10 of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 had been voted on separately, his delegation would have abstained although it would have voted for the draft resolution as a whole. As those paragraphs havenot been voted on separately, his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

72. His Government would nevertheless continue to appeal to all States to refrain from having relations with South Africa, as such relations would represent a violation of the relevant resolutions and decisions adopted by the United Nations and by the Organization of African Unity.

73. Miss ZONICLE (Bahamas) said that her delegation would support draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, as it had always opposed all activities which might encourage the policy of apartheid and racial discrimination practised by South Africa, and it attached great importance to the right to self-determination of peoples which had expressed their desire to choose their own destiny freely.

74. Her delegation nevertheless reserved its position on paragraphs 9 and 10 of the draft resolution under consideration, because no effort had been made to verify the truth of the allegations contained in those paragraphs, particularly those allegations which had been refuted by the States concerned; nor had any effort been made to distinguish between the positive and negative activities of certain Member States in order to encourage them to renounce such relations with South Africa as represented an obstacle to the right of the peoples of southern Africa to self-determination.

75. Mrs. OSODE (Liberia) said that, although her delegation supported the principles enunciated in draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, she regretted that she had been obliged to abstain in the vote. The activities of foreign economic and other interests were not necessarily detrimental to the interests of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Moreover, the adoption of a draft resolution which condemned certain States by name because of their activities risked defeating the very purpose which the draft resolution was intended to serve.

76. Her delegation considered that it would have been preferable for the Committee to request the States which, in paragraph 9, had been accused of collusion with South Africa in the nuclear field, to advise the Secretary-General on the course of action they had taken or intended to take.

77. Concerning paragraph 10, her delegation did not believe that States should be arbitrarily called upon by name to sever relations with South Africa, as such a strategy of putting States in the full blaze of publicity had not proved successful.

78. Her delegation hoped that its comments would assist the Fourth Committee to achieve its envisaged goal in the field of decolonization.

/...

79. Mr. FLEMMING (Saint Lucia) said that his delegation supported without reservation the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and categorically rejected the odious practice of apartheid. Nevertheless, certain provisions of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, particularly paragraph 10, defeated the purpose of a search for an immediate solution to the problem of South Africa's occupation of Namibia. It was not possible, on the one hand, to encourage the members of the Western contact group to bring political pressure to bear on the South Africa régime and, on the other hand, to expect them to sever all political relations with that régime.
80. His delegation would therefore be compelled to abstain during the vote on the draft resolution. Such abstention did not, however, in any way mean that Saint Lucia had withdrawn its support from the Namibian people in their struggle, nor did it approve of the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.
81. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation condemned all activities which violated the right of peoples to self-determination and that it supported the over-all substance of the draft resolution under consideration. However, his delegation would abstain in the vote since it had reservations about certain paragraphs which had prevented a consensus being achieved.
82. Mr. KA (Senegal) said that his delegation would vote for draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4. However, it wished to express its formal reservations on paragraphs 9 and 10, which condemned certain countries in a selective, discriminatory and scarcely realistic way.
83. Mr. BARANYANDUZA (Burundi) said that his delegation would vote for draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 but wished to voice its reservations on the provisions of paragraphs 9 and 10.
84. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Ukrainian SSR had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4.
85. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan,

Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Upper Volta.

86. Draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 was adopted by 93 votes to 16, with 28 abstentions.

87. Mr. DJELOU (Togo), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation wholly shared the opinion that the activities of foreign economic and other interests were harming the efforts being made by the international community to force the South African racist régime to end its illegal occupation of Namibia. There was no doubt that the role of transnational corporations in that Territory and the collaboration of certain countries with the South African régime in the nuclear field only strengthened the policy of domination and oppression pursued by the white racists in Pretoria.

88. That was why his delegation strongly condemned the collusion of those countries with the South African racist régime and had supported the draft resolution which had just been adopted, as a whole. However, it could not approve the discriminatory nature of paragraphs 9 and 10 and still thought that, since the Fourth Committee had not been able to cite all the countries involved, it should have refrained from presenting a selective list of countries in those paragraphs out of regard for fairness.

89. Mr. DORN (Suriname) said that his delegation unreservedly supported the principles expressed in draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4. However, his delegation wished to state that it would have liked paragraph 9 to be worded differently and that if paragraph had been voted on separately, it would have abstained in the vote.

90. Mr. HUTCHENS (Australia) said that his delegation had opposed draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, which was ill-conceived, badly worded and unsatisfactory from the point of view of both facts and logic. It was sad to see how far consideration of the topic in question had degenerated in recent years. Without reiterating his delegation's point of view on the matter, which was well known, he wished simply to reaffirm that his country was still strongly in favour of

(Mr. Hutchens, Australia)

Namibia's accession to independence and of the principle of the elimination of apartheid. But the draft resolution just adopted would do precious little for that cause and, in the case of small Non-Self-Governing Territories, even risked having negative consequences.

91. Mr. ILUNGA KALAMBAY (Zaire) said that his delegation, which had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, would express its reservations when the draft resolution was being adopted in the plenary Assembly.

92. Mr. ABDELWAHAB (Sudan) said that his country had always condemned all economic and other activities which impeded the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). His delegation had already had occasion, in the Fourth Committee, to condemn the outrageous collaboration between the racist régime in Pretoria and the Zionist régime in Tel Aviv, and it had stated repeatedly that an exhaustive list of all activities which were impeding implementation of the Declaration should be drawn up. His delegation would therefore have preferred paragraph 9 to be formulated differently, but could nevertheless accept it as it stood.

93. Mr. LAL (Fiji) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 because it was convinced that foreign economic and other interests and the existence of military bases must not impede the decolonization process. However, his delegation did not consider that all the activities were an obstacle to the exercise of the peoples' right to self-determination, unless the peoples concerned themselves decided that they were. For his country, it was in that context that paragraphs 4 and 15 were to be understood. Moreover, the express mention of certain countries in paragraphs 9 and 10 impaired the effect of the draft resolution as a whole.

94. Mr. LESETEDI (Botswana) voiced reservations on paragraph 8, where supplies of oil to South Africa were mentioned, and on paragraphs 10, 18 and 24.

95. Mr. RICARDES (Argentina) said that his delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 because it subscribed to the principles on which the draft was based. But, as his country had repeatedly stated, it was regrettable that certain States had been explicitly mentioned because that damaged the effectiveness of the document.

96. Mr. MONTEIRO (Portugal) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 with regret, since it had often openly denounced the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were obstructing the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). But in his country's view, foreign investments could promote the social and economic development of the territories and countries in which they were made, provided that they were properly controlled and used.

97. As the text just adopted did not take account of that factor and contained arbitrary condemnations and discriminatory appeals, his delegation had not been



(Mr. Monteiro, Portugal)

able to accept it. It would have been preferable to tackle the problem in a more balanced way; any realistic initiative aimed at promoting the welfare of the population in the dependent Territories and at putting an end to all forms of economic, social and political domination would enjoy his country's support.

98. Mr. VALLIM GUERREIRO (Brazil) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted, because it wished to eliminate colonialism and foreign domination. However, the wording of certain provisions made the text as a whole less effective.

99. Mr. SALONEN (Finland) said that his Government had always supported the colonial peoples aspiring to self-determination and independence, and did not hesitate to condemn the activities of foreign economic interests whenever they impeded efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination or prevented the enjoyment of the natural resources by the peoples of the Territories in question.

100. However, the draft resolution just adopted was too sweeping in some respects. Though certain economic activities might be detrimental to the interests of the colonial peoples, not all such interests were necessarily harmful. He deplored the mention in paragraphs 9 and 10 of individual Member States on insufficient evidence. Moreover, certain paragraphs concerned questions on which, according to the Charter, decisions could be taken only by the Security Council. His delegation had therefore abstained in the voting, as in previous years, on the draft resolution concerned.

101. Mr. MONSALVE (Chile) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4 because it did not agree with the statement that all foreign economic interests impeded the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Such a generalization conflicted not only with the interests of the colonial peoples but also with other resolutions of the Special Committee of 24, and even with those of the Fourth Committee, which urged the colonial Powers to ensure the economic viability of the colonial Territories they administered.

102. Moreover, his delegation had serious reservations regarding paragraphs 9 and 10, believing that the reference to individual Member States by name was discriminatory and did nothing to encourage the spirit of understanding and co-operation essential in solving the problems of southern Africa.

103. Mr. WAYARABI (Indonesia) said that his delegation had always opposed the exploitation of the peoples and their natural resources in the colonial Territories either by the occupying Power or by foreign economic interests, and had therefore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, being in basic agreement with its general thrust and goals. Nevertheless, Indonesia regretted that paragraphs 9 and 10 singled out certain countries or groups of countries by name for condemnation. If those paragraphs had been voted on separately, Indonesia would have abstained.

/...



104. Mr. NGUEMA-MVE (Gabon) said that his delegation had expressed its concern over the economic and other activities impeding the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) earlier, when the draft resolution just adopted had been considered by the African Group. However, it was regrettable that certain countries had been singled out in paragraphs 9 and 10, which limited the scope of the draft resolution as a whole. His delegation had therefore been obliged to abstain in the vote.

105. Mr. SKOGMO (Norway) said that, in view of the vulnerability of the colonial Territories and their peoples as compared to foreign economic interests, the United Nations should exercise special care in protecting and defending them. That applied particularly in the case of southern Africa, in view of South Africa's policy of apartheid and its illegal occupation of Namibia. Norway, together with the other Nordic countries, had accordingly adopted a joint programme against South Africa, advocating the prohibition or discouragement of new investments in South Africa and the formulation of proposals in the Security Council which could result in the banning of investments in and trade with that country.

106. However, his delegation considered that the draft resolution adopted by the Committee was unsatisfactory in several respects. In particular, paragraphs 9 and 10 were unacceptable because they contained unjustified allegations against explicitly named countries. Moreover, the language of the draft resolution was too sweeping, since not all foreign economic activities in the Territories concerned were necessarily harmful. In some cases they could undoubtedly help to promote the industrial development of the Territories and provide employment for the inhabitants.

107. Lastly, his delegation reiterated its reservations about certain paragraphs that did not respect the provisions of the Charter on the division of competence between the main organs of the United Nations. His delegation found it all the more regrettable that it had been obliged to abstain in the vote, because it was deeply concerned about the conditions in southern Africa and supported the general aim of the text in question.

108. Mr. GYAW (Burma) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution as a whole, as at previous sessions. However, it regretted that paragraph 9 had singled out certain States for condemnation.

109. Mr. TALEB (Morocco) said that his country had voted for the draft resolution just adopted, being convinced that all the activities of foreign interests that impeded the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) should be condemned. However, his delegation considered that it was unjust to make specific reference in paragraphs 9 and 10 to certain countries while omitting others.

110. Mr. NINGATA (Central African Republic) said that his country supported the struggle of the people of Namibia for their independence, opposed colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa, and supported all efforts to promote the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence

(Mr. Ningata, Central African Republic)

to Colonial Countires and Peoples. The Central African Republic had therefore voted for draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, although it had specific reservations about paragraphs 9 and 10, which singled out certain countries for condemnation.

111. Mr. LEE (Singapore), Mr. BAYONA (Peru) and Mr. AKHTAR (Bangladesh) said that they had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, although they had reservations about paragraphs 9 and 10, which condemned certain countries.

112. Mr. PERALTA (Philippines) said that, although his delegation had voted for the draft resolution just adopted, it had doubts about the logic and appropriateness of paragraphs 9 and 10. If there had been a separate vote on those paragraphs his delegation would have abstained.

113. Mr. KHALAF (Somalia) said that his delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.4, as it had always supported the draft resolutions submitted on the same question in the past. However, paragraphs 9 and 10 went against the aims of the draft resolution, and the list of countries named in them was far from exhaustive.

114. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of item 94. He also announced that Romania had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.10; Romania and Fiji had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.11; Ethiopia had become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.4/36/L.14, L.15 and L.15; Australia, the Bahamas, Denmark, Fiji, the Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.17; the Bahamas and Liberia, of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.21; and Liberia and Norway, of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.22.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.