

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records*



FOURTH COMMITTEE
23rd meeting
held on
Monday, 15 November 1982
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 23rd MEETING

UN LIBRARY

DEC 10 1982

Chairman: Mr. ROA KOURI (Cuba)

UN/DA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

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

AGENDA ITEM 96: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

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

AGENDA ITEM 97: QUESTION OF EAST TIMOR (continued)

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

AGENDA ITEM 99: 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) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

/...

* 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.

/...

CONTENTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 100: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 101: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

General debate (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (Territories not considered under other agenda items) (continued) (A/37/23 (Part V)/Add.1, chaps. XIII to XXIV, A/37/23 (Part V)/Add.3, A/37/23 (Part III)/Add.1, A/C.4/37/L.6/Rev.1, L.8 and L.11)

AGENDA ITEM 96: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

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

AGENDA ITEM 97: QUESTION OF EAST TIMOR (continued) (A/AC.109/715, A/C.4/37/6, A/C.4/37/L.8)

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

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 99: 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) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 100: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 101: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. HERMIDA CASTILLO (Nicaragua) said that the struggle against colonialism had from the outset been given priority by the United Nations, and proof of its

(Mr. Hermida Castillo, Nicaragua)

success was provided by the growing number of independent States - all representing new hopes for the pursuit of peace - that joined the Organization. However, there were major obstacles to the decolonization process and the responsibility of the United Nations was greater than ever before. Indeed, the persistence of colonialist enclaves had serious adverse consequences for peace, since it prevented peoples from fully enjoying their inalienable rights.

2. The Sandinist popular revolution, which had emerged from a struggle for national liberation, could not forget the ideals uniting peoples who were struggling for genuine independence, nor could it forget that the Somoza military dictatorship had been the direct result of the imperialist and neo-colonialist military intervention in Nicaragua. Since July 1979, Nicaragua had considered that it was its duty in the realm of foreign policy to help put an end to the colonial situation in the world, in accordance with the principles contained in the United Nations Charter and those of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

3. The question of Western Sahara was a good example of a situation in which a people was denied the exercise of its inalienable rights to self-determination and independence. That situation could not continue, and the Nicaraguan Government was accordingly sponsoring draft resolution A/C.4/37/L.6/Rev.1. Nicaragua congratulated the Mauritanian people and Government for their sincere contribution to the settlement of the problem and hoped that the Moroccan Government would immediately undertake direct negotiations with the Frente POLISARIO since that was the only possible way of achieving a peaceful solution and the restoration of peace in that troubled region. The Nicaraguan delegation reiterated its support for the fraternal Saharan people in its struggle for the liberation of Western Sahara and for the Frente POLISARIO, its sole legitimate representative, as well as for the young Saharan Arab Democratic Republic, with which the Government of Nicaragua maintained the most fraternal diplomatic ties. He had no doubt that justice would prevail and that the Saharan people would achieve their ideals of freedom.

4. With regard to East Timor, the Nicaraguan delegation considered that the population of that Territory was in a colonial situation, and it urged the Indonesian Government to withdraw its troops and to allow the East Timorese people to exercise freely and fully its inalienable rights to self-determination and independence. For that reason, the Nicaraguan delegation had co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.4/37/L.8, in which the parties directly concerned were requested to initiate consultations to achieve a just and comprehensive settlement of the problem.

5. In Latin America itself, the brother people of Puerto Rico had since 1898 been denied the exercise of its inalienable rights. That exception to the decolonization process could not be allowed to continue, and Nicaragua was convinced that sooner or later the objective of decolonization would be achieved. The United States should not control the destinies of the Puerto Rican people any longer.

6. Mr. POPAL (Afghanistan) said that the tragic loss of Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, was a great misfortune for all the people of the world. His delegation expressed its deepest condolences and sorrow to the delegations of the Soviet Union, the Byelorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR. Brezhnev had died, but his ideals of peace, détente, disarmament and human brotherhood would be etched in the memory of progressive mankind.

7. The manner in which the colonial Powers had carried out their responsibilities in the small Non-Self-Governing Territories, where they had ostensibly been developing the economy and helping the people to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, had betrayed the trust that the United Nations had placed in them, for they had done the exact opposite of what those responsibilities required. They had deliberately weakened the economies of the dependent Territories, exploited their natural and human resources and used those Territories for strategic military purposes and as bases for aggression against neighbouring regions.

8. Although the system of colonialism had entirely collapsed, the colonial Powers had tried to recolonize the Territories and re-establish the colonial system without regard to the fact that the anti-colonialist struggle was undefeatable and the process of decolonization irreversible. There were many examples of that situation: the Government of the United States was trying to annex the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico, Pretoria was illegally ruling in Namibia, the Malvinas Islands had been recolonized, and the people of Diego Garcia had been expelled from their homeland, the purpose in all cases being to enable the colonial Powers to renew and modernize their military bases and installations in the Pacific, the Indian Ocean, the Atlantic and the Caribbean.

9. The apartheid régime of South Africa, with the support of certain NATO member countries, had continued to occupy Namibia illegally, to apply its policy of oppression, torture and imprisonment and to launch attacks against SWAPO, the legitimate leader of Namibia, and against Angola and the other front-line States and the Seychelles. The escalation of collaboration between the Western countries and the Pretoria régime was particularly dangerous in the current situation, and the world community had proclaimed 1982 as the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa. His delegation strongly condemned the criminal activities of the South African régime and its economic, military and political supporters, while, on the other hand, it fully supported the assistance being given by the international troops of Cuba to the Angolan people.

10. In the case of Micronesia, the United States was using that Territory as a testing ground for its nuclear weapons - thus endangering the local populations - and was attempting to divide the unity and territorial integrity of the territory and to militarize it for its own expansionist goals. Under the pretext of "free association", which would better be called "free annexation", United States imperialism was planning to make that Territory an integral part of the United States in flagrant violation of the Trusteeship Agreement and the relevant Security Council resolution. Such a policy darkened the future political status of the

(Mr. Popal, Afghanistan)

Territory and posed a serious threat to international peace and security. Since the United States had betrayed the confidence of the United Nations with regard to Micronesia and had failed to carry out its responsibilities, the United Nations should take immediate measures to stop that Power from pursuing that policy.

11. The United States policy of annexation had also been evident in the case of Puerto Rico. By using that Territory as a platform for its strategic military goals, the United States Government had spared no effort to thwart the heroic people of the island and had not hesitated to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the independent neighbouring countries.

12. It was deplorable that the people of Western Sahara were still suffering from military occupation, while countries of the same continent were winning their emancipation one after another. His delegation fully supported the heroic people of the Sahraoui Arab Democratic Republic, under the leadership of POLISARIO, in their just struggle against foreign domination and supported the resolutions adopted by the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations calling for negotiations between the Sahraoui Republic and Morocco.

13. His country, as a non-aligned member of the Special Committee of 24 dedicated to the struggle against colonialism in all its forms, believed that all military bases and installations in Non-Self-Governing Territories should be speedily and unconditionally dismantled.

14. While some United Nations specialized agencies were endeavouring to co-operate with the national liberation movements and the developing countries, the International Monetary Fund was doing just the opposite. A loan of over \$1 billion which had been granted by the Fund to the racist South African régime would enable that régime to build up its military arsenal and would encourage its aggression against neighbouring countries. There could be no doubt that that loan had been granted under United States pressure. The maintenance of close ties between the International Monetary Fund and the South African régime was at sharp variance with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions. By refusing to grant loans to countries where the economy was in critical condition and playing such a negative role in South Africa, the Fund was conducting its activities in an increasingly dangerous manner. The delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan would like to stress the urgency of taking measures to prevent the Fund from continuing its illegal activities.

15. Mr. van LIEROP (Vanuatu) said that his country, which had eventually achieved independence with the support of friends throughout the entire world, and in particular of its neighbours in the Pacific, attached special importance to the work of the Fourth Committee. It was out of gratitude for that support and with a desire to exercise its duties and obligations under the Charter, that his delegation was addressing the Committee on the question of East Timor and urging Committee members to adopt draft resolution A/C.4/37/L.8.

(Mr. van Lierop, Vanuatu)

16. The question of East Timor was a stark example of a situation in which a larger and militarily superior country was using force against a smaller and more vulnerable country. That question was admittedly a difficult one. The people of East Timor were neither powerful nor wealthy and were not the object of any super-Power rivalry. Indonesia, on the other hand, was a large and powerful country in its region and had played an important and historic role in the process of decolonization after the Second World War and in the subsequent development of the non-aligned movement.

17. No one appreciated Indonesia's role in contemporary history and its present strength any more than did his country. Although Indonesia and Vanuatu were united by strong ties of friendship, that relationship could not prevent his country from presenting its view of the situation. His country had nothing to gain from its support for the people of East Timor, but it could not, in all conscience, ignore the existing situation, because to do so would, in its opinion, create a dangerous precedent. If no protest was made against Indonesia's actions in East Timor, there could be no moral ground for condemning Israel's annexation of occupied Territories or South Africa's expansionism and aggression. It might also be asked how the process of decolonization could be continued in the face of silence regarding a process in which one colonial Power was replacing another in East Timor.

18. It had been said that the people of East Timor, exercising their right of self-determination, had voluntarily chosen to be integrated into Indonesia. There had never been any evidence of such a decision and no visiting mission had been authorized to go to the Territory, unlike the case of other Territories. How could the international community be expected to accept Indonesia's word without any independent verification?

19. Indonesia's supporters counselled a realistic and practical attitude in face of a situation that could not be changed. That, they said, was the voice of reason. But, for his delegation, it was rather the voice of people who had forgotten their own history. Who among the community of nations had not endured war and subjugation? Who had not enjoyed the satisfaction of regaining their dignity in the face of seemingly insurmountable obstacles? Who spoke of being practical when their own country was attacked or occupied? If the so-called "voice of reason" had been heeded, political independence would have been set back indefinitely for two thirds of the current membership of the United Nations. It was also said, with cynicism, that there was no point in adopting a resolution, because it would not make Indonesia change its policy. Even though some nations chose to ignore United Nations resolutions, that should not deter the Organization from doing its duty. Other supporters of Indonesia had said that it was against Vanuatu's national interests to support the people of East Timor. But Vanuatu could not attempt to build a better life, and strive for justice and equality for its people, while ignoring similar strivings of other peoples. It could not vote against the old colonialism and accept a new one.

20. In that respect, his delegation was pleased to support Portugal's initiative and its desire to complete the process of decolonization. Portugal's action was

(Mr. van Lierop, Vanuatu)

parallel to that of the United Kingdom in respect of Zimbabwe. His Government congratulated Portugal on its courage and candour and trusted that its allies would rally to its support. Some of Indonesia's supporters were trying to make it appear that the draft resolution introduced by Portugal was aimed at recolonizing East Timor. Nothing could be further from the truth. The five Portuguese-speaking African countries and Zimbabwe did not need to prove their anti-colonial attitude, and Vanuatu was proud to stand with those countries as a sponsor of the draft resolution. Vanuatu could not accept the allegation by some of Indonesia's supporters that it was only those African countries that were making an issue of East Timor, nor did it accept the notion that the problems of one region should be a matter of indifference to the countries of another region.

21. The people of East Timor had suffered a series of injustices: invasion, pillage, famine and poverty. In spite of everything, they continued to assert their own national identity by continuing their resistance, which was the only form of self-determination yet available to them. If those brave people did not accept existing conditions, by what right could anyone else accept Indonesia's occupation?

22. Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia) said that, as in previous years, his delegation had voiced its strong objection to discussion of the so-called East Timor question by the General Assembly, since it related to matters which were purely within Indonesia's domestic jurisdiction, East Timor having become a province of Indonesia on 17 July 1976. However, his delegation owed it to the Indonesian people, especially in the province of East Timor, to set the record straight once again. The anti-Indonesian petitioners and speakers had produced no new elements and their statements had contained the same unsubstantiated allegations, the same distorted arguments and wilful misrepresentations and, in some cases, claims so ludicrous that they could be classed only as pure invention.

23. Referring to the Secretariat working paper (A/AC.109/715) and draft resolution A/C.4/37/L.8, he drew attention to document A/C.4/37/6, in which the Indonesian Permanent Representative had communicated his comments on the working paper, a document which was unbalanced and tendentious and went well beyond mere misrepresentation of the facts. His delegation had already explained that the decolonization process had been terminated in East Timor when the Territory had become independent through integration with Indonesia, in accordance with the principles of the Charter and General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV), 1541 (XV) and 2625 (XXV). The people had exercised their right of self-determination; the entire process of decolonization had been witnessed at every stage by scores of foreign diplomats and representatives of the mass media; and the statute of integration had been formally promulgated on 17 July 1976. The argument of the non-involvement of the United Nations could not be used to bring into question the decolonization process which had taken place. It had not been sufficiently stressed that principle IX (b) of General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV) provided that the United Nations could, when it deemed necessary, supervise the processes through which integration was attained. In that respect it should be remembered that the relevant United Nations organs had declined repeated invitations to participate in the decolonization process.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

24. Claims had again been made that the Frente Revolucionária de Timor Leste Independente (FRETILIN) had been the predominant party in East Timor in November 1975, which was quite incorrect. On Portugal's own admission, the Uniao Democrática Timorense (UDT) had clearly been the largest party. In combination with the Associação Popular Democrática de Timor (APODETI), the Klibur Oan Timor Aswain (KOTA) and the Partido Trabalhista, it had represented the overwhelming majority of the people and had been in control of the Territory at the time of the elections in May 1976.

25. One of the most disturbing aspects of the working paper was that it depicted East Timor as famine-stricken and subject to widespread human rights violations. If there had been any truth in those charges, the many reputable organizations operating in East Timor, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the Catholic Relief Service (CRS), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), would have reported such conditions. The findings of those bodies belied such a portrayal, but they were not - or were inadequately - reflected in the working paper.

26. Regarding human rights, virtually all the information was based on Amnesty International reports which in turn relied on unnamed sources. References were made to disappeared persons, repatriation and family reunion. No mention was made, however, of the fact that the Indonesian Government had entrusted ICRC with the task of investigating cases of disappearance. ICRC continued to operate in East Timor and had access to the entire province in discharging its humanitarian task. It was also in charge of enquiries and family reunion and repatriation, in co-operation with the Indonesian Red Cross. The Secretariat should therefore regard ICRC as an authoritative source of information in preparing its papers on the situation in East Timor.

27. In the past two years, a number of journalists, diplomats and other foreign dignitaries had visited East Timor. Their findings concerning the humanitarian aspects in East Timor completely contradicted the accusations referred to in the working paper and the allegations made by some of the speakers before the Committee. CRS, UNHCR and UNICEF had played an active role in East Timor. Some people had tried to discredit CRS but that organization's findings had been corroborated by UNICEF and ICRC. It was evident that some of the petitioners were interested above all in promoting their own ideological and political position and ignored facts which did not suit them.

28. With regard to the food situation, all the charges of famine or widespread malnutrition were based on information provided by Mgr Lopes da Costa. However, the CRS representative in East Timor had found that Mgr Lopes could not provide the names of the sources claiming that there was famine or give the names of the villages affected. The representative had himself ascertained in the many areas which he had visited that food was available and that adequate efforts were being made to meet food requirements. Only one paragraph cited the UNICEF report, which had concluded that East Timor did not appear to be suffering from famine and that there was no reason to think that one would occur. It could thus be concluded that

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

the section of the working paper on the food situation had been compiled with intent to mislead the reader as to the true situation in East Timor and to minimize the achievements of his Government in that field and the important contributions of international organizations such as CRS, ICRC and UNICEF.

29. Another example of the malicious intent of the authors of the working paper was to be found in paragraph 52, where they tried to give the impression that his Government had chosen to discriminate against the Portuguese language and the local lingua franca in the schools of East Timor. In fact, although more than 300 languages and dialects were spoken in Indonesia, the only language of instruction used in schools all over the country was Bahasa Indonesia. However, it should be noted that it was the policy of his Government to preserve and develop the cultural heritage of each ethnic group, including that in East Timor, so as to maintain his country's rich cultural diversity. The Indonesian nation encompassed a mosaic of racial and ethnic groups and it was completely false and ridiculous to suggest that the ethnic origin of the inhabitants of East Timor was different from that of their kin in West Timor and the neighbouring islands of the Indonesian archipelago.

30. As for FRETILIN, it was scarcely a national liberation movement, whatever some people said. FRETILIN had never opposed Portuguese colonialism but had on the contrary been its favourite collaborator. Lacking popular support, it had been encouraged by Portugal to seize power by force and reject democratic procedures. In November 1975, when FRETILIN had unilaterally declared independence, the other four East Timorese political parties in turn had declared independence and simultaneous integration with Indonesia. The provisional Government which they had formed had requested his country to help them restore law and order. Faced with the political vacuum left by Portugal's abandonment of East Timor and the lack of a governmental authority capable of stopping the mass killings and atrocities perpetrated by FRETILIN against the people of the territory, his country had become inexorably involved in the East Timor crisis.

31. Some speakers had not only tried to deny completely Portugal's and FRETILIN's responsibility for the troubles which had accompanied decolonization in 1975 but had also made ridiculous assertions about FRETILIN's strength and exploits. FRETILIN no longer existed except in the minds of a few individuals who had fled East Timor many years earlier but were still desperately trying to convince others that they should reverse the course of history, in violation of the will of the people of East Timor. FRETILIN's forces had become insignificant and whatever disturbances might have occurred in 1981 had been nothing more than a few isolated cases of banditry and robbery. None of the representatives of the many international organizations operating in complete safety in East Timor had indicated having witnessed directly or indirectly the existence of any organized elements of FRETILIN. In May 1982, people throughout the province of East Timor had participated freely in his country's general elections without fear of FRETILIN and without any disruptions or boycotts occurring.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

32. He considered draft resolution A/C.4/37/L.8 unacceptable from both the juridical and the political point of view. It contained no explicit reference to General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV) of 15 December 1960, in particular principles VI, VIII and IX of that resolution, which provided for the right of a people to choose integration with an independent State. Moreover, it was a mistake to consider Portugal as the administering Power in East Timor, since, by its own admission, the Portuguese Government had ceased to carry out its responsibilities in respect to the territory seven years earlier. Furthermore, Portugal had perverted the decolonization process by assisting the seizure of power by FRETILIN, to which it had supplied arms. It was unfortunate that the Portuguese Government had not assumed in 1975 the national and moral duty towards East Timor which it now claimed to have. If it had done so, it would have spared the inhabitants of the territory from the horrors of civil war. Finally, by its open collaboration with FRETILIN in preparing the draft resolution, Portugal had demonstrated clearly its intention to impose FRETILIN on the people of East Timor.

33. It was significant in that regard that the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which related to the statements of petitioners, cited FRETILIN by name as if it enjoyed some special status. The eighth preambular paragraph alluded to East Timor's right to self-determination and independence. His country's position on that question was well known: East Timor had exercised its right to self-determination in conformity with the United Nations Charter and relevant resolutions already quoted. It was strange, to say the least, that FRETILIN was now asking for a referendum to be held in the territory, whereas in November 1975 it had unilaterally declared East Timor independent without the least concern for the right of its people to self-determination. It was encouraging in that respect that his country's position had been recognized and approved by an ever-increasing number of States, as was shown by the trend in the voting records on the issue from year to year.

34. As for the humanitarian situation mentioned in the tenth preambular paragraph, it was hard to see what might have given rise to the concern expressed there. His country had repeatedly presented the true facts about the socio-economic and humanitarian conditions prevailing in East Timor. Those facts had been corroborated by such prestigious international organizations as UNHCR, UNICEF and ICRC, to name but a few.

35. As for paragraph 1, which was being presented as the reasonable element in the draft because it requested the Secretary-General to initiate consultations with all parties directly concerned, its only effect would be to entrust the Secretary-General with a mission doomed in advance to fail, since the constitutional and political status of East Timor had been determined by the people of the territory, who had declared themselves in favour of integration with Indonesia.

36. Lastly, if the sponsors of the draft resolution had taken the trouble to find out, they would have noted that the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system referred to in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution had

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

for long been active in East Timor and that all of them had praised the development efforts under way there. Moreover, those organizations were in East Timor on the basis of agreements with the Indonesian Government, and it was unrealistic to urge them to act in close consultation with Portugal. That provision, apart from being irrelevant, epitomized their cynical hypocrisy.

37. For the past seven years, the Fourth Committee had engaged in a sterile debate on a question which should never have been on its agenda. It was time to put an end to that futile exercise which did nothing for the spiritual and material well-being of the East Timorese people. All those who professed to champion the self-determination and well-being of peoples should abandon the misguided views of only a few and should consider the facts rather than persist in fictions. The people of East Timor had chosen their fate and it was high time for the Committee, by voting against the draft resolution, to strike from its agenda the item on the so-called question of East Timor.

38. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, contrary to the wild charges levelled by certain delegations, his Government had in no way fragmented Micronesia. The status of commonwealth had been conferred on the Northern Mariana Islands in accordance with the wishes repeatedly expressed by the population of that Territory. Similarly, the peoples of Micronesia had been given the possibility of deciding in favour of a unified entity in the 1978 referendum on the Constitution establishing the Federated States of Micronesia. The same applied to the peoples of Palau and the Marshall Islands, who had chosen their political future in a referendum observed by a visiting mission of the Trusteeship Council. The official documents of the Trusteeship Council made it clear that the status of free association had been chosen by the Governments of Micronesia as being the political status which best met the needs of the population. That was undoubtedly what the author of the accusations levelled against the United States found difficult to comprehend, his Government being more accustomed to telling than to asking other peoples what they wanted. The fact was that the Micronesians, exercising their right to self-determination - in other words, their right to decide their political future for themselves - had chosen free association.

39. The United States had been charged with attempting to secure military rights in Micronesia that would extend beyond the trusteeship period. However, no military or security provisions could be included in any future political status arrangement unless they enjoyed the express agreement of the Micronesian Governments and peoples. Another delegation had implied that the United States was conducting nuclear and chemical-weapons testing in the Territory. Kwajalein atoll was a civilian-operated missile test range which constituted no danger to the population; there were such facilities in the United States and other countries. Lastly, he wished to point out that, as stated in a document quoted by one delegation, the trusteeship régime applicable to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands was a distinct régime established pursuant to Articles 82 and 83 of the Charter; that point had been deliberately left out by the delegation concerned when it had quoted that document. The 70 delegations which had voted in the Fourth

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

Committee at the thirty-sixth session to adjourn the discussion on that question, far from seeking a confrontation, had simply wished to have the question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands considered by the Trusteeship Council, as mandated by Article 83. It was purely a question of letting a process of self-determination which was already under way proceed according to the provisions of that fundamental document of the United Nations.

40. Mr. LOULICHKI (Morocco), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out that the representative of Afghanistan, in presenting the question of Western Sahara in inaccurate and provocative terms, had demonstrated his ignorance of the process of decolonization of Western Sahara and of the contents of the decisions adopted by the OAU Implementation Committee. In declaring that the people of Western Sahara had been forcibly prevented from expressing their wishes, the representative of Afghanistan had failed to mention the opinion of the International Court of Justice, which had recognized the legal ties between Western Sahara and Morocco and the Madrid Agreement under which Western Sahara had been returned to Morocco. Confident, therefore, in the legitimacy of its rights, Morocco had agreed to the holding of a referendum under international supervision in order to decide that question once and for all. The Saharan people were represented in the Moroccan Parliament, maintained normal relations with their mother country and managed their local affairs through democratically elected municipal councils. As to the so-called Saharan Arab Democratic Republic with which the representative of Afghanistan requested Morocco to negotiate, the Afghan delegation need only consult document A/37/570/Rev.2 to satisfy itself that the OAU Implementation Committee had never named the parties to the conflict in Western Sahara and that nothing in that document justified such a request.

41. Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out that it was evident from the statement by its representative, that the United States wished to restrict the scope of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by excluding Micronesia. That Declaration unquestionably applied to Micronesia: in that regard, he referred the United States representative to the list of Territories to which General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) applied, a list which appeared in document A/5446, of 1963. Furthermore, it was also clear from the statement by its representative that the United States wished to curtail the right of the General Assembly to consider the question of Micronesia. However, under Article 10 of the Charter, the General Assembly could discuss any questions pending before the United Nations and take a decision on them. The Fourth Committee was therefore competent to consider the question of Micronesia.

42. Furthermore, the United States had tried to mislead delegations on the question of the fragmentation of Micronesian territory. It emerged from statements made at the 1,492nd meeting of the Trusteeship Council that the Administering Authority, far from having favoured the national unity of the Territory pursuant to its obligation under the Trusteeship Agreement, had taken highly regrettable measures aimed at fragmenting that Territory. The United States had encouraged that process by granting unequal economic and financial assistance to the different

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

zones. In addition, according to a letter from a member of Parliament of Palau, the United States was seeking to impose the status of free association on the Micronesian people.

43. No one doubted the right of the Security Council to decide on the strategic status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. That was a legitimate right and was mentioned in the decision of the Special Committee of 24 submitted to the Fourth Committee for adoption. However, the General Assembly was equally entitled to confirm the right of the Micronesian people to attain independence pursuant to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

Question of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands

44. The draft consensus on the question of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands contained in the Special Committee's report (A/37/23 (Part V)/Add.1, chap. XIII) was adopted without objection.

Question of Tokelau

45. The draft consensus relating to Tokelau contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/37/23 (Part V)/Add.1, chap. XIV), was adopted without objection.

Question of Pitcairn

46. The draft consensus relating to Pitcairn contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/37/23 (Part V)/Add.1, chap. XV), was adopted without objection.

Question of St. Helena

47. The draft consensus relating to St. Helena contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/37/23 (Part V)/Add.1, chap. XVI), was adopted without objection.

Question of American Samoa

48. The draft resolution relating to American Samoa contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/37/23 (Part V)/Add.1, chap. XVII), was adopted without objection.

Question of Guam

49. The draft resolution relating to Guam contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/37/23 (Part V)/Add.1, chap. XVIII), was adopted without objection.

Question of Bermuda

50. The draft resolution relating to Bermuda contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/37/23 (Part V)/Add.1, chap. XX), was adopted without objection.

Question of the British Virgin Islands

51. The draft resolution relating to the British Virgin Islands contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/37/23 (Part V)/Add.1, chap. XXI), was adopted without objection.

Question of the Cayman Islands

52. The draft resolution relating to the Cayman Islands contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/37/23 (Part V)/Add.1, chap. XXII), was adopted without objection.

Question of the Turks and Caicos Islands

53. The draft resolution relating to the Turks and Caicos Islands contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/37/23 (Part V)/Add.1, chap. XXIII), was adopted without objection.

Question of the United States Virgin Islands

54. The draft resolution relating to the United States Virgin Islands contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/37/23 (Part V)/Add.1, chap. XXIV), was adopted without objection.

55. Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the draft resolutions and consensuses which had just been adopted, said that his delegation was firmly opposed to the activities and the military bases of colonial Powers in Non-Self-Governing Territories because they were an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In his opinion, that was not made sufficiently clear in the texts in question.

56. Mr. MACLAY (United Kingdom) said that the wording of the draft resolutions which had been adopted on Bermuda and the Turks and Caicos Islands did not fully satisfy his delegation in so far as the reference to certain installations in those Territories was concerned. It was only after lengthy discussion that the Special Committee had arrived at a text which, although not fully satisfactory to any of the parties concerned, had served as a basis for a consensus in which his delegation had happily been able to join. His delegation did not intend to reopen debate on that subject, but since another delegation had seen fit to express reservations, the United Kingdom wished to explain that it, too, did not fully agree with the texts which had been adopted.

57. Mr. KALINA (Czechoslovakia), referring to the draft resolutions which had just been adopted on the Turks and Caicos Islands, Guam and Bermuda, said that his delegation's position was based on General Assembly resolution 35/118. His delegation believed, as that resolution stated, that military bases and installations in Non-Self-Governing Territories constituted an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and that they should therefore be unconditionally withdrawn.

58. Mr. YOSSIPHOV (Bulgaria), endorsed the reservations expressed by the representatives of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia concerning the draft resolutions adopted on the Turks and Caicos Islands, Guam and Bermuda.

59. Mr. HA HUY TAM (Viet Nam) endorsed the reservations which had just been expressed concerning military bases and installations in Non-Self-Governing Territories, since he believed that they obstructed the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Question of Montserrat

60. The draft resolution relating to Montserrat contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/37/23 (Part III)/Add.3, chap. XXVIII), was adopted without objection.

Question of Brunei

61. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Special Committee, in its report to the General Assembly at its current session, had noted that, subject to any directives which the General Assembly might give, it had decided to continue its consideration of that item at its next session, in 1983. Based on consultations held on that subject with the parties concerned, and in the light of the relevant events, he therefore suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should postpone consideration of the question until its thirty-eighth session and should request the Special Committee of 24 to continue to keep the situation in the Territory under review and to report thereon to the Assembly at its thirty-eighth session.

62. It was so decided.

Question of St. Kitts-Nevis

Question of Anguilla

63. Since there were no proposals on those questions, the Chairman suggested that the Committee should recommend to the Assembly that it should postpone consideration of the question until its thirty-eighth session and should request the Special Committee of 24 to continue to keep the situation in the Territory under review and to report thereon to the Assembly.

64. It was so decided.

Draft resolution relating to agenda item 96

65. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution on information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/37/23 (Part III)/Add.1, chap. VII).

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua/Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bénin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

66. The draft resolution contained in chapter VII of document A/37/23 (Part III)/Add.1 was adopted by 144 votes to 0, with five abstentions.

67. Mr. MACLAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution which had just been adopted because, ever since the first list of Non-Self-Governing Territories had been drawn up after the Second World War, the United Kingdom had always complied punctually with its obligations under Article 73 e of the Charter and intended to continue to do so. It could not, however, accept paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which seemed to imply that it

was for the General Assembly to decide when a Non-Self-Governing Territory "had obtained a full measure of self-government in terms of Chapter XI of the Charter".

68. Mr. MIKAYA (Malawi) requested that his country should be added to the list of countries which had voted in favour of the draft resolution that had just been adopted, as he had mistakenly pressed the abstention button.

69. The CHAIRMAN assured the representative of Malawi that the results of the vote would be corrected accordingly.

Draft resolution relating to agenda item 97

70. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the Secretary-General had indicated that he did not foresee any financial implications in the implementation of draft resolution A/C.4/37/L.8 and that, should a change in circumstances make it necessary to incur expenditure, he would, with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, seek the provision of those funds under the resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses.

71. He also informed the Committee that Trinidad and Tobago had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/37/L.8. He then called on delegations that wished to explain their vote before the vote.

72. Mr. SCHAEFER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation would, as in preceding years, abstain from voting on the draft resolution on East Timor. It believed that the principle of self-determination was extremely important, since world peace could not be ensured except through respect for that right, which applied to all peoples irrespective of their status before international law, and not only to those which sought liberation. His delegation had listened carefully to the statements which had been made on the subject of East Timor, particularly those of Indonesia, Portugal and the petitioners. It felt deep sympathy for the people of East Timor because of the suffering which had been inflicted upon them in 1975, and it had consequently studied with the greatest care all the reports on that subject. The reports had convinced it that the living conditions in East Timor had not deteriorated and that, on the contrary, the process of stabilization was continuing. His delegation nevertheless hoped that that process could be further accelerated.

73. The criticisms voiced in the debate on the question might be reduced in future if complete information on the Territory could be obtained and be made freely accessible. His delegation believed that the co-operation of international bodies and the Indonesian Government should be encouraged and that every effort to improve living conditions in the Territory should be made. It was also essential to promote dialogue between the Indonesian Government and the other parties in order to overcome the remaining obstacles. The request, made to the Secretary-General in the draft resolution, to initiate consultations with all parties directly concerned was a positive element.

74. Mr. COSTANZA (Italy) said that, as in preceding years, his delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution on East Timor. It believed that it was preferable not to take a position on the substance of a question which could be more easily resolved through direct dialogue between the parties concerned. His delegation was nevertheless convinced that the good offices of the Secretary-General could be effective when they were requested for the purpose of settling a controversial question. In addition, his country had always supported the efforts of the international community to improve difficult conditions in various areas of the world, and that was its position on East Timor as well.

75. Mr. QUIÑONE (Guatemala) said he recognized that the draft resolution represented a constructive effort, and he particularly endorsed the idea of requesting the Secretary-General to use his good offices. Guatemala had always upheld the principle of territorial integrity, and its intention to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution relating to East Timor did not mean that it had changed its position. Since, however, the members of the Committee had been apprised of new facts the veracity of which could not be ascertained at that stage, his delegation preferred to take a cautious approach and abstain.

76. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/37/L.8.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, Ireland, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Portugal, Rwanda, 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 Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua/Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Canada, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, El Salvador, Gambia, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Maldives, New Zealand, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burma, Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

77. Draft resolution A/C.4/37/L.8 was adopted by 48 votes to 42, with 54 abstentions.

78. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia) said that he had voted against the draft resolution which had just been adopted because his Government was convinced, as it had stated at an earlier meeting, that the Territory had come to be part of Indonesia and that to ignore that fact would be to ignore reality. Those who, like his Government, were truly concerned about the well-being of the population of East Timor would do better, in his opinion, to assist the province by providing the aid which it needed. Australia had contributed to the relief efforts for East Timor and had given over \$6 million since 1975. It had informed the Indonesian Government that it was prepared to continue its assistance, and it had made a significant contribution to the UNICEF programme in the province. The Australian Government also attached great importance to the reunification of families separated by the events and had spared no effort to render aid for that purpose.

79. Mr. MACLAY (United Kingdom) said that although his country had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on East Timor, it recognized that the sponsors had made a substantial effort in the current year to draw up a more constructive text than in previous years. The United Kingdom continued to believe that the people of East Timor had the right to determine their own future in accordance with their political aspirations, unaffected by any external pressure. It sincerely hoped that after the discussion which had just been held on the subject, a more favourable atmosphere could be created for a dialogue between the two countries which alone could settle the problem: Portugal and Indonesia. As a friend of both, his country urged them to negotiate, for it was convinced that a solution which was fair and acceptable to all could be found by diplomatic means. It appealed to them in particular to attempt to find a settlement which would be in accord with the wishes and interests of the people of East Timor.

80. Mr. FLAYEH (Iraq) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it mentioned resolutions which his delegation had not supported.

81. Mr. RUTAYISIRE (Rwanda) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to demonstrate the importance it continued to attach to self-determination and in order to reaffirm its opposition to the policies of fait accompli and might makes right in international relations.

82. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked all those delegations which had expressed their condolences to the Soviet Government and people upon the death of Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.