

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION

*Official Records**



NOV 17 1982

FOURTH COMMITTEE
21st meeting
held on
Monday, 9 November 1981
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

UN/SA COLLECTION

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 21st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. JAMAL (Qatar)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 19: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 96: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 93: QUESTION OF EAST TIMOR (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 95: 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)

* 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.

81-57746

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/36/SR.21
17 November 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 11.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 19: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/C.4/36/L.8/Rev.1, L.18)

Question of Western Sahara (A/C.4/36/8 and 9; A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1, L.19)

1. Mr. NG'ENY (Kenya), introducing draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19, reminded members that the decision of the OAU Implementation Committee on Western Sahara (A/36/512, Annex) included a provision for co-operation between the United Nations and OAU in the organization of a referendum in Western Sahara, and said that draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19 was therefore a purely procedural one designed to make that co-operation possible. He urged the Committee to adopt it by consensus because it was not controversial and because the parties to the dispute in Western Sahara had accepted it. He also stressed that their acceptance of the draft decision was predicated on the clear understanding that it was not in competition with any draft resolution before the Committee.
2. The CHAIRMAN announced that Mauritania had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1 and invited members to explain their vote on that draft resolution before the vote and to comment on draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19.
3. Miss FORT (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that those States welcomed and supported the decision taken by OAU on the question of Western Sahara because it paved the way for a peaceful solution by enabling the people of Western Sahara to exercise their right to self-determination through a referendum. Although they had hoped that the Committee would have before it a single draft resolution, based on the OAU decision and agreed to by the parties concerned, one which could have been adopted by consensus, they nevertheless continued to support the OAU initiative and urged the parties concerned to respect the OAU decision. They would therefore join a consensus in favour of draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19.
4. Mr. LEVITTE (France) said that his delegation favoured a referendum for the people of Western Sahara to decide its own future and had therefore welcomed the OAU decision as one offering a peaceful solution to the problem. It also supported the subsequent efforts of OAU to implement that decision and was prepared to support any follow-up proposal to the extent that it had the support of the parties concerned.
5. Draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1, however, while referring to the OAU decisions, introduced elements which did not have that support, and his country would therefore abstain in the vote on it. Draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19, on the other hand, was in accord with the spirit and letter of the OAU decision and enjoyed the support of the parties concerned, and his delegation was therefore prepared to vote for it or to join in a consensus.
6. Mr. ZENTAR (Morocco) said that draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1 had been submitted by the Algerian delegation and a number of sponsors despite the decision taken at the Nairobi session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of

/...

(Mr. Zentar, Morocco)

OAU and despite the formal commitments taken by the Heads of State to help OAU and its Implementation Committee accomplish its difficult task and to do nothing to complicate it. The political and legal objectives reflected in its wording particularly in paragraphs 5, 6, 8 and 9, led to the inescapable conclusion that the delegation behind it had no wish to permit the Implementation Committee to exercise its mandate in accordance with the decision of OAU. That decision provided for the organization of a free and democratic referendum to enable the population to determine its own future and implied no intention of bypassing the population to be consulted. In the Implementation Committee's decision, the current Chairman of OAU was requested to consult with the United Nations to determine the extent to which the latter would co-operate in implementing it, but that in no way implied transferring to another international body the responsibility for executing the Implementation Committee's mandate, which remained primarily an African task.

7. Consultation by referendum was meaningless if it meant prior and external determination of who was to do what on behalf of the population concerned. OAU had established the Implementation Committee with full powers precisely with a view to retaining control of the operation. Yet the draft resolution was designed to pre-empt not only the free and democratic choice of the people but also the responsibility and mandate of the Implementation Committee and even of OAU, including its responsibility under Article 33 of the United Nations Charter, which gave priority to regional organizations in the settlement of regional problems. With a view to contributing to the credibility of the action of OAU to re-establish peace in the area, his country, unlike Algeria, had responded to the appeal of the Chairman of OAU and withdrawn its own draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.2, and, out of respect for OAU and the commendable efforts of its Chairman, would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1.

8. Mr. LINDAHL (Sweden) said that his delegation had long supported OAU efforts to solve the problem of Western Sahara by allowing the people of the Territory to decide its own future and exercise its right of self-determination, and he therefore welcomed the compromise resolution adopted by the OAU Assembly in Nairobi as well as the decision of the Implementation Committee. His delegation regretted that the crucial elements in those decisions were not accurately reflected in draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1 and that the Implementation Committee had been unable to produce a compromise text. It therefore felt obliged to abstain in the vote, but hoped that the Implementation Committee would be able to carry out its work and that all parties concerned would co-operate fully with it to that end.

9. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation supported draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19 because it approved of the request that the Secretary-General, in co-operation with OAU, should assist the Implementation Committee in the discharge of its mandate. It could not, however, support draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1, because by attempting to prejudge the situation and failing to recognize the need for procedural flexibility where voting was concerned, it had precluded the desired consensus. His delegation regretted that it had not been withdrawn, as had draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.2.

/...

10. Mr. NG'ENY (Kenya) said that his country, which currently occupied the Chair of OAU and of its Implementation Committee, had made every effort to secure the preparation of a draft resolution acceptable to both parties to the conflict in Western Sahara and noted that those parties had accepted the decision of the Implementation Committee (A/36/512, Annex). Although it was unfortunate that each had submitted a different draft resolution on the referendum, both contained the necessary enabling clauses which could have been included in a non-controversial one.

11. The differences between the parties should not, however, materially affect the work of the Implementation Committee and he appealed to those delegations that had worked closely with his to continue their efforts to reconcile the parties in order to facilitate the conduct of the referendum and to encourage them to pursue their peaceful efforts and to respond promptly when the Implementation Committee next met to negotiate a cease-fire and arrange a referendum.

12. Irrespective of the merits of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1 and in order to preserve the capacity of the Chairman of the Implementation Committee to reconcile the parties, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

13. Mr. NINGATA (Central African Republic) said that his delegation regretted that persisting divergences had made it impossible to produce a single draft resolution on the problem of Western Sahara and he would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1 because it would not facilitate the work of the Implementation Committee. However, he supported draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19.

14. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran, Jamaica, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Surinam, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Morocco, Senegal, United States of America, Zaire.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany (Federal Republic of), Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay.

15. Draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1 was adopted by 73 votes to 7, with 54 abstentions.

16. Draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19 was adopted by consensus.

17. Mr. FAFOWORA (Nigeria), speaking in explanation of vote, said that he had abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1 since he had some reservations on it despite broad agreement in substance. After long and difficult negotiations, OAU had secured an agreement from the parties concerned to a cease-fire and to the holding of a referendum in Western Sahara. It was essential that that spirit of conciliation should be maintained. It was clear from the OAU decisions that the referendum was to be conducted by the OAU Implementation Committee and the cease-fire to be held under its auspices. In that respect, the draft was defective.

18. The simple, direct draft decision produced by Kenya provided a way around that one obstacle and facilitated the next step, which was the attainment of a cease-fire. Any draft resolution without the unanimous support of the Committee and the parties to the conflict would be counterproductive and would unduly prolong the sufferings of the people of the Western Sahara. As a member of both the OAU Ad Hoc Committee and the OAU Implementation Committee on Western Sahara, Nigeria had not been able to support the draft resolution, even though it fully supported the principle of self-determination in Western Sahara. It was necessary for all to work together, and his delegation deeply regretted any division.

19. Mr. SALONEN (Finland) said that his delegation had gladly supported the recent decision of the OAU Implementation Committee, a historic decision because a unanimous one. It offered a real possibility for achieving a peaceful, just and definitive solution of the problem of Western Sahara through regional efforts. In response, the United Nations should have reached a consensus on a text that was strictly in accordance with the OAU decision. Finland regretted that that was not the case and had therefore abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1 in order to avoid a prolongation of negotiations. It had, on the other hand, been happy to support draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19.

20. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan) said that it had been the consistent position of the Sudan to support OAU as the organization in the best position to achieve a settlement of disputes among Africans; and also to insist on the vital link between OAU and the United Nations in any effort towards peaceful and positive co-operation among African States. Acting on such convictions, Sudan had maintained a policy of open-mindedness and impartiality.

(Mr. El Sheikh, Sudan)

21. OAU and its Implementation Committee had found a sound basis for an agreement on Western Sahara. His delegation was therefore prepared to support any initiative that was in accord with the letter and spirit of the Nairobi decisions and promoted the vital link between the United Nations and OAU. The Committee should have given strong backing to OAU by adopting a draft resolution that reflected recent developments and did not depart from the language of the OAU decisions, which had been the result of delicate negotiations. His delegation had difficulty on that score with some paragraphs of the draft resolution and had therefore abstained in the voting. It was, however, gratified that draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19 had been adopted by consensus.

22. Mr. RICARDES (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1 since it had seen no incompatibility between it and draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19.

23. The question of Western Sahara must be resolved in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter, by peaceful means, allowing the people themselves to exercise their right to self-determination freely within the framework of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the recent OAU decisions. To that end, his delegation appealed once again to the parties to the conflict to observe an immediate cease-fire and to agree as quickly as possible on terms for holding a referendum.

24. Mr. SKOGMO (Norway) said that his delegation had consistently given its full support to the principle of self-determination as endorsed in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and to efforts by the Organization of African Unity to find a solution to the conflict in Western Sahara. It had therefore welcomed the decision of the OAU Implementation Committee to hold a referendum to allow the people themselves to decide their future. His delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1, which, it felt, prejudged the peace process. For the same reason, it was happy to join in the consensus on draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19.

25. Mr. PFANZELTER (Austria) said that Austria had followed the conflict in Western Sahara with growing concern in recent years. Faithful to its adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter, especially the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, Austria had sincerely supported the efforts of the Organization of African Unity, which had succeeded in achieving preliminary agreement on a peaceful solution. The OAU achievements provided the best and perhaps the only road to a negotiated solution to the problem, and Austria regretted that OAU had not taken the initiative in submitting to the Committee a draft resolution including all the points agreed upon.

26. The draft resolution just adopted by the Committee, although it contained important and valuable principles for a solution, in some respects went beyond the agreement reached at Nairobi and introduced elements that jeopardized that consensus. Out of support for the regional organization, Austria had therefore decided to abstain.

27. Mr. BURAYZAT (Jordan) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1 and had supported draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19, consistent with the appeal by the current Chairman of OAU.
28. OAU and its Chairman must be given every chance to succeed in their efforts to conduct a referendum allowing the people of Western Sahara to decide their future without intervention. The question of Western Sahara involved two principles: the application of the sacred right to self-determination only in the context of a sincere will to further the interests of the people concerned, and the principle of Arab unity, which was the greatest dream of every Arab.
29. Mr. HAMAMI (Tunisia) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1. The fraternal countries of Morocco and Algeria were familiar with the position of Tunisia. It supported the praiseworthy efforts of OAU to solve the question of Western Sahara, and was eager, on the one hand, to safeguard all chances for the success of the OAU Implementation Committee's initiatives, and, on the other, to preserve relations based on century-old bonds. Tunisia had always nurtured the hope that fraternity, understanding and co-operation would prevail in the Maghreb.
30. Mr. DAVIN (Gabon) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1 in the belief that it went beyond the terms of the Nairobi agreements and undermined the spirit of those agreements. It believed further the Fourth Committee should have heeded the appeal by the Chairman of OAU and agreed on a single draft resolution that met with general approval.
31. Draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19, on the other hand, was in perfect accord with the letter and the spirit of the OAU decisions, and his delegation had therefore joined the consensus.
32. Mr. LAL (Fiji) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.3/Rev.1 because it supported the right of colonial peoples to self-determination. It had also joined in the consensus on draft decision A/C.4/36/L.19. It was convinced that holding a referendum would enable the people of Western Sahara to exercise their right to self-determination, and it therefore supported the decision of the OAU Implementation Committee as a means to a peaceful solution and to the exercise of that right. If viewed in that light, the two drafts were not contradictory.
- AGENDA ITEM 96: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued) (A/C.4/36/L.5)
33. The CHAIRMAN announced that Australia and Romania had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.5.
34. Draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.5 was adopted without a vote.
35. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 96.

AGENDA ITEM 93: QUESTION OF EAST TIMOR (continued) (A/C.4/36/L.7)

36. Mr. SULAIMAN (Oman), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.7 regarding the question of East Timor, said that the continued consideration by the Committee of the so-called question of East Timor was an intervention in the internal affairs of a Member State and, as such, contrary to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. It was difficult to find any justification for such action, in view of the fact that the Regional Popular Assembly of East Timor, duly elected by a majority of the people, had in 1976 affirmed the desire for integration with Indonesia and had done so without outside coercion, and that Indonesia had made a sovereign decision to accept that request for integration, a decision upon which the United Nations had no right to cast doubt. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

37. Mr. SCHAEFER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, as in previous years, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution on East Timor. In view of the sufferings of the East Timorese since 1975, the humanitarian aspect of the problem was of particular concern to his Government. It had welcomed certain positive developments in the past year; on the basis of the information available from international organizations involved, the situation in human terms was not deteriorating. That was in part the result of the continued co-operation between the Indonesian Government and international relief organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Catholic Relief Services. Other United Nations forums had recognized the improved conditions in East Timor. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights had, for instance, now dropped the Indonesian question from its agenda.

38. The Indonesian Government had declared its readiness to negotiate seriously with the Portuguese Government on outstanding problems in East Timor in the humanitarian as well as the economic, cultural and political fields, and his Government encouraged both sides to take the necessary steps to find a solution that was in the interests of the people concerned.

39. Mr. CHARLES (Haiti) said that Haiti's support for peoples struggling for their independence was part of its historical tradition. Its foreign policy was one of moderation: what mattered was that the wishes of the majority should be respected and that any reasonable initiative for a peaceful solution should be endorsed. It urged the parties concerned in the question of East Timor to hold negotiations which would serve the interests of the people of East Timor and enable them to realize their aspirations. His delegation therefore intended to vote in support of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.7, even though it did not necessarily endorse all its provisions.

40. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.7.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, Iran, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, New Zealand, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sudan, Surinam, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Burma, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

41. Draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.7 was adopted by 58 votes to 40, with 42 abstentions.

42. Mr. LINDAHL (Sweden), explaining his vote, said that, as in the past, Sweden had abstained on the draft resolution on East Timor, but that did not mean that it did not support realistic initiatives to safeguard the welfare and cultural heritage of the people of East Timor and to solve the existing refugee problem, particularly with regard to family reunification. Sweden had contributed significantly to the assistance programme carried out in East Timor by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in co-operation with the Indonesian Red Cross during the period from 1979 to 1981. ICRC, although it had terminated its operations in April 1981, was still sending regular inspection missions to the island, and according to the reports from the latest mission there was no indication of a new food crisis. Should one develop, sufficient relief supplies had been stored in East Timor to cope with it. His Government would continue to support ICRC in any new relief efforts that might be necessary, and it appealed to the Government of Indonesia to keep the assistance channels open.

43. Mr. SALONEN (Finland) said that, as in previous years, his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on East Timor. Prolonged political controversies hampered efforts to alleviate the suffering of the people in East Timor by making it more difficult to channel the needed humanitarian assistance to the area. As yet, the welcome initiative by the Portuguese Government, which in September 1980 had called for wide consultations on that issue, had unfortunately not yet had any results. Finland was following Portugal's diplomatic effects with keen interest.

44. There were conflicting reports about a food and medical crisis in East Timor. What was clear was that the East Timorese needed continued international humanitarian assistance, and Finland stood ready to provide it.

45. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 93.

AGENDA ITEM 95: 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) (A/C.4/36/L.9)

46. Mr. de LUSIGNAN (World Bank) said that his organization took note of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.9 with regret. The position of the World Bank had been made clear on earlier occasions and especially by his predecessor when he had spoken to the Special Committee of 24 on 13 August 1981. Member countries of the Bank knew that South Africa had not been represented among the Executive Directors since 1972 and, as a matter of public record, the World Bank provided no assistance whatsoever, financial or technical, to South Africa. The link described in the draft resolution was the fact of South Africa's membership and nothing more. He would, as in the past, convey through the secretariat of the World Bank any views and recommendations of the Fourth Committee to the Board of Executive Directors. It was, of course, for the member Governments of the Bank to determine what action, if any, they wished to take. Where such action would entail amending the charter of the Bank, that would be only on the decision of member Governments acting as the Board of Governors of the Bank.

47. As for the reference in the draft resolution to the formulation of specific programmes beneficial to the peoples of colonial Territories, particularly Namibia, he wished to point out that on previous occasions, whenever a country was on the point of becoming independent and had expressed an interest in joining the Bank, the Bank did its utmost to act speedily and to familiarize itself with that country's economy. That enabled the Bank to draw up a substantial programme of assistance as soon as possible, as had been the case with Zimbabwe. There was no reason, if and when Namibia so wished, why the Bank would not formulate a programme of assistance as it had done for other countries.

48. Mr. ZEGERS (International Monetary Fund (IMF)) said that draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.9 would, if adopted by the General Assembly, be brought to the attention of the Executive Board of IMF. All previous resolutions on the subject had received similar attention. Indeed, it was customary that any such resolution was accompanied by an internal report on the circumstances surrounding its drafting, a discussion of the draft and the manner in which the voting took place. It was not his intention

(Mr. Zegers, IMF)

to discuss the merits of the draft resolution or, indeed, whether it had any merit. That was the prerogative of the member countries of IMF. He noted, however, that a great number of the sponsors were not members of IMF and that those particular sponsors had been the most active. Others had also been active and had provided material supposedly damaging to IMF and had orchestrated a campaign against it rather than in favour of Namibia. He found it difficult to believe, but had been told by many, that among those campaigners from the very beginning had been a particular member of the United Nations Secretariat.

49. Mr. MIKAYA (Malawi) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.9 but wished to place on record its reservations on the sixteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 20.

50. The CHAIRMAN announced that Cape Verde had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.9.

51. Miss FORT (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the members of the European Economic Community, said that in the past the agenda item under consideration had provided the opportunity for a resolution of value to the remaining dependent Territories. Previously, the members of EEC had voted in favour of such resolutions because all recognized the important work which the specialized agencies carried out in that field. It was therefore a matter of considerable regret that the draft under consideration contained new, inappropriate and divisive elements, which meant that the ten members of EEC could not support it. They did not agree to the terms in which IMF and the World Bank were referred to in the sixteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 6, 7 and 8. They rejected the criticism of the work and activities of those international institutions and the attempts to politicize them, actions which were outside the competence of the General Assembly. Certain paragraphs of the draft resolution purported to call into question South Africa's membership in IMF and the World Bank.

52. The members of EEC wished to reaffirm their support for the principle of universality and their respect for the independence of the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations. They wished to recall their view that the Namibian people ought to be in the position without further delay to choose on equal terms their own representatives in free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

53. Mr. AKSUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution because of the important role which the specialized agencies and international institutions were to play in the implementation of the Declaration and in combating racism and apartheid. Most of those agencies and institutions had made real contributions in implementing the Declaration. At the same time, studies carried out in October 1981 had shown that IMF gave substantial financial and diplomatic support to racist South Africa, which received relatively more assistance than other African countries. The \$2.2 billion in assistance from IMF would help South Africa to solve its balance-of-payments problems. Furthermore, the diplomatic support given to South Africa and the tacit approval of its occupation of Namibia by IMF, which combined its statistics on Namibia with those on South Africa, were unjustified.

/...

54. The occupation of Namibia was a threat to peace and IMF assistance was used to increase South Africa's military power in its undeclared war against African countries. His delegation therefore agreed with the criticisms in the draft resolution of IMF and the World Bank and others that assisted South Africa. Those organizations should cut off all assistance to the South African régime and proceed to implement the Declaration.

55. Mrs. DUBRA (Uruguay) said that her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution since it believed that the role of the specialized agencies and international institutions in the implementation of the Declaration was not only necessary but positive. However, it rejected some paragraphs in the draft which referred to IMF and the World Bank, because those agencies were governed by technical agreements and any attempts to politicize them would reduce the effectiveness and distort the purposes of the draft resolution.

56. Mr. KINNEY (United States of America) said that his delegation rejected the unfounded charges in the draft resolution of all-round support for South Africa. The United States supported assistance to the Namibian people specifically for the United Nations Institute for Namibia and the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, but was opposed to the specialized agencies' giving aid to national liberation movements. It had always objected to the politicization of the specialized agencies implicit in the draft resolution.

57. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.9.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Germany (Federal Republic of), Israel, Luxembourg, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden.

58. Draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.9 was adopted by 115 votes to 6, with 22 abstentions.

59. Mr. ULRICH (Denmark), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the delegations of Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, and his own, said that in previous years the Nordic countries had voted in favour of similar draft resolutions because they supported peoples in need and struggling for self-determination and independence. While they recognized the role which the specialized agencies and international institutions had to play in that regard, they regretted that the draft resolution under consideration contained new elements which had caused problems for their delegations and had obliged them to abstain. They believed that the specialized agencies should retain their universal feature and deplored the singling out of certain countries for criticism in the draft resolution. They also believed that no party with popular support in Namibia should be excluded from the talks aimed at finding a solution to the problem there.

60. Mr. LAL (Fiji) said that, as in previous years, Fiji had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it agreed with its main thrust that the specialized agencies and international institutions must render all possible aid in the implementation of the Declaration. His delegation, however, had difficulties with paragraphs 6 and 7, especially in view of the statements made by the representatives of IMF and the World Bank.

61. Mr. RICARDES (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it agreed generally with its basic principle. It had, however, reservations on the explicit reference to States because it believed that such reference detracted from the effectiveness of the draft resolution.

62. Mr. MONTEIRO (Portugal) said that, in the past, his delegation had always supported similar resolutions on the item. Those resolutions constituted a valuable contribution in enabling peoples under colonial rule to achieve self-determination and independence according to their freely expressed wishes. His delegation had always expressed formal reservations with respect to paragraphs concerning the World Bank and IMF. While it shared the concern of the sponsors of the previous resolutions, it was convinced that the language used would not serve the interests of the aid recipients, which should be the Committee's only concern in that regard. His delegation regretted that draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.9 contained controversial references and discriminatory recommendations, and that had prevented his delegation from supporting it, as would have been the case had the Committee been presented with a balanced text.

63. Mr. BUSTANI (Brazil) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it supported its basic thrust. It believed, however, that some paragraphs could have been improved and felt that paragraph 16 should not set a precedent for other United Nations bodies.

64. Mr. PFANZELTER (Austria) said that his delegation had always maintained that all organizations in the United Nations system should participate in the process of peaceful decolonization in the spirit of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). It was for that reason that it had, in the past, supported resolutions under the item. Draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.9, however, particularly paragraphs 6, 7 and 21, contained recommendations which interfered with the independence of the specialized agencies and it was for that reason that his delegation had abstained during the vote.

65. Mr. ABDULLAH (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft because of its positive thrust. However, it felt that the references in paragraphs 6 and 7 were not in strict accordance with the facts.

66. Mr. GARRIGUES (Spain) said that, in the past, his delegation had supported draft resolutions on the role of the specialized agencies and international institutions in the implementation of the Declaration. The current draft, however, introduced new considerations and it was for that reason that his delegation had abstained. Spain had always supported humanitarian resolutions, in particular those concerning Namibia, and it recognized the important role which the international institutions had to play in that regard. However, the current draft contained discriminatory references to some countries and to IMF and the World Bank and it was for that reason that his delegation had been unable to support it.

67. Ms. LUCAS (New Zealand) said that traditionally New Zealand had always supported similar draft resolutions on the item because it agreed with the basic objectives. However, it had had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.9 because of the inappropriate criticisms made with respect to IMF and the World Bank.

68. Mr. TANÇ (Turkey) said that, had his delegation been present during the vote, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution in line with Turkey's commitment to efforts aimed at eliminating colonialism, apartheid and racism. However, it had reservations regarding certain paragraphs which referred to certain regions because such reference detracted from the objectivity and effectiveness of the draft resolution.

69. Ms. MORRISON (Lesotho) said that her delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution should not be interpreted as an endorsement of the negative references to IMF and the World Bank.

70. Mr. MSIBI (Swaziland) said that, in the past, his delegation had supported similar draft resolutions. However, after taking note of the statements by the representatives of IMF and the World Bank, it had abstained because it did not believe that those agencies should be politicized. That did not, however, mean that Swaziland did not support activities in behalf of the Namibian people.

71. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Sri Lanka) said that, as in the past, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolutions on the item because it was convinced that the co-operation of the specialized agencies in implementing the Declaration was both relevant and necessary. It would have preferred, however, if the sponsors had

(Mr. Kanakarathne, Sri Lanka)

refrained from referring to IMF and the World Bank, which were technical institutions and whose statutes would prevent them from implementing some General Assembly resolutions, since they had their own governing structures. It was to those governing structures that the General Assembly should address itself.

72. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution even though it was not satisfied with the paragraphs referring to IMF and the World Bank.

73. Mr. FLEMMING (Saint Lucia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, it had reservations with respect to paragraphs 6 and 7 because they did not tell the full truth.

74. Mr. SALGUEIRO (Bolivia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. He did not, however, agree with the paragraphs which referred to IMF and the World Bank because those were technical and financial institutions.

75. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Fourth Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 95.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.