



President: Mr. Imre HOLLAI (Hungary).

AGENDA ITEM 38

Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development

1. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Uganda, Mr. Olara Otunnu, has informed me of the results of the informal consultations I requested him to undertake on this agenda item. I understand that it is the wish of delegations that the item be kept open in order to allow for the continuation of informal consultations, under the chairmanship of Mr. Otunnu, after the suspension of the session. I understand also that delegations wish to pursue these consultations on an urgent basis, in order to make possible an assessment of the situation by the end of January 1983. I therefore propose to the Assembly that agenda item 38 be kept open and that the Assembly reconvene on short notice to consider any decisions or arrangements that might emerge from the consultations.

It was so decided (decision 37/438).

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to express my heartfelt thanks to Mr. Olara Otunnu for his devoted work on this subject. I trust that delegations will continue to support his efforts.

3. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak on this agenda item.

4. Mr. SOBHAN (Bangladesh): I have the honour, on behalf of the Group of 77, to address this plenary meeting on agenda item 38, regarding the launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development.

5. At the outset, I should like to convey to you, Mr. President, the very deep appreciation of the Group of 77 for your commendable efforts and exemplary devotion in the discharge of the onerous responsibility of guiding the work of the Assembly. We are particularly appreciative of your initiative and continued interest in regard to bringing about the launching of global negotiations. We are also very thankful to Mr. Otunnu, of Uganda, a Vice-President of the Assembly, for his perseverance, skill and wisdom in carrying out consultations on this subject on your behalf over the past two months.

6. Three years have gone by since the Assembly, in recognition of the seriousness of the world economic situation, decided to begin negotiations on the launching of global negotiations as a matter of urgency. It is a matter of deep concern indeed that, after three regular sessions and one special session of the General Assembly, we have still not succeeded in launching

those negotiations. Our disappointment and anguish are all the greater since, during the past three years, the state of the world economy has deteriorated to a point at which world economic stability has been seriously threatened. The developing countries have been the hardest hit by this relentless crisis, which has set in motion a downward spiral. Economic development in the South has come to a grinding halt. Indeed, many developing countries are experiencing negative growth rates for the first time. Foreign Ministers from the developed and the developing countries alike have vividly described, in the course of the deliberations in this very Assembly, the precarious nature of the world economy. We had been promised until recently that some kind of recovery was around the corner; yet this recovery has remained elusive. In the meantime, things have got a lot worse. And things will get even worse unless we muster the political will to take concerted action to reverse this trend and take concrete steps collectively in the reactivation of the world economy.

7. We have always emphasized, in all formal and informal consultations and negotiations, our continuing commitment both to global negotiations and to their early launching. On behalf of the Group of 77, I should like to reiterate here our unswerving dedication to the effective launching of global negotiations, by means of a conference, open to all States, which in essence will take an integrated, consistent and co-ordinated approach to problems. The initial stage of the conference would focus on the establishment of the procedures and the agenda and a time-frame for the negotiations.

8. There is today universal recognition of the fact that the present world economic crisis can no longer be resolved through patchwork solutions for selected problems in selected areas. We have all recognized, on the one hand, the clear linkage among the various global economic problems and, on the other, that these problems should be solved collectively, since we are all affected and must consequently work out the answers to these problems together. There now exists nearly unanimous support from our partners in the industrialized world for the launching of global negotiations as a matter of priority. We highly value this positive attitude, for it reflects a growing awareness about the phenomenon of increasing global interdependence and about the ever-important role of the developing countries as partners in development and, above all, a logical acceptance of the need for global solutions to global problems. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Group of 77, in their declaration of 8 October 1982 [A/37/544, annex I], gave a positive evaluation to this development.

9. Throughout the informal consultations which Mr. Otunnu undertook on behalf of the President of the General Assembly, as indeed on earlier occasions,

the Group of 77 has consistently shown a spirit of reasonableness, responsibility and constructive flexibility regarding fruitful negotiations. It is well known that the text of 31 March 1982 did not strictly conform to the position of the Group of 77. In spite of this, the Group of 77, after a positive evaluation of the developments at the Economic Summit of the industrialized countries, held at Versailles from 4 to 6 June 1982, accepted two amendments and offered counter-amendments to the remaining two as a reasonable basis for negotiations. We did so in the sincere hope that the counter-amendments would enable us to reach agreement while meeting the anxieties of some of our partners. To assuage their fears we have repeatedly underscored our commitment to our reaching agreements on the basis of consensus. We are therefore both surprised and disappointed that nearly seven months later we have still received no response to our counter-amendments. We have been told that the Versailles amendments were not presented to the Group of 77 on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. If that be the case, then why can we not sit across the table and negotiate language that would be acceptable to both sides? I emphasize that the two counter-amendments were not presented by the Group of 77 to our partners on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. We are even more disappointed because this session of the Assembly has to conclude on an uncertain note, inasmuch as it has failed to launch the global negotiations. We also feel deeply concerned at the growing tendency towards bilateralism on the part of some of our partners; this undermines the spirit of multilateral co-operation for development. The recent developments in GATT and elsewhere offer us no satisfaction and, more important, bring no relief, even temporarily, to the intensification and multiplication of global economic problems.

10. The Group of 77 firmly believes that the current international economic situation underscores more than ever before the urgent need for the immediate launching of global negotiations—global negotiations that are meaningful, that will provide the international community with the opportunity to tackle the global economic crisis, which is a crisis without parallel, and that will provide us with an opportunity to negotiate solutions to the collective benefit of the entire international community. We therefore endorse the continuing efforts of Mr. Otunnu, on the President's behalf, to break the present impasse. We should like to assure the President that the Group of 77 will continue to extend all possible co-operation to Mr. Otunnu in this difficult task. We believe that both the importance and the urgency of this mission demand a clear demonstration by some of our partners of the political will to negotiate. We should, however, like to stress that the continuation of these consultations should be limited to a short period of time. Neither the Group of 77 nor the international community as a whole can afford to wait indefinitely.

11. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from Russian*): I am authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the delegations of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Ukrainian

Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

12. The position of principle of these socialist countries on the problem of restructuring international economic relations on a just and equitable basis is well known. That position is not subject to any shifts in the situation; it remains fully in force.

13. The socialist countries have taken an active part in the process of the elaboration at the United Nations of new political approaches to the solution of problems of economic relations between States on the basis of the principles of equality and democracy. We have supported the progressive trend in such fundamental documents as the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, regarding them as the basis of all the activity of the United Nations for the establishment of a just and democratic economic order.

14. Such an order is essential from the point of view of the developing countries, and its establishment would also be in the interests of the socialist countries. A logical extension of this position of the socialist countries was their support for General Assembly resolution 34/138, on global negotiations, relating to international economic co-operation for development.

15. The socialist countries supported the Group of 77's broad draft agenda for global negotiations, and they were also prepared to take part in the consensus on the procedure for such negotiations. Unfortunately, since the adoption of resolution 34/138 not only have there been no positive shifts at all on the question of global negotiations but there has indeed been a discernible movement backwards. This situation can be explained primarily by the unwillingness of certain imperialist circles to renounce their positions and by their desire to continue to keep the developing countries in a dependent state and to weaken their unity and also by the attempts of certain Western States to renounce agreements previously arrived at. If that situation continues, one can hardly expect realization of the idea of global negotiations as a contribution to the success of the task of establishing a new international economic order.

16. The socialist countries advocate the prompt launching at the United Nations of global negotiations, in keeping with General Assembly resolution 34/138, which, in particular, emphasizes the need for practical measures to restructure international economic relations on the basis of the principles of justice, equality of rights and mutual benefit in order to promote the common interest of all countries. The practical solution to the problem of world development, including the economic development of the developing countries, is inseparable from the solution to the main global problem, which is the removal of the threat of nuclear war and the achievement of effective measures of real disarmament.

17. The delegations of the socialist countries regret that at the thirty-seventh session it has proved impossible to overcome the deadlock on this question of global negotiations. At the same time, the socialist countries are prepared to continue their co-operation with all countries showing a genuine interest in the

implementation of the General Assembly's decisions on the democratic restructuring of international economic relations and the attainment of progress in the sphere of equitable international economic co-operation in the interests of all countries, including acceleration of the economic and social development of the developing countries.

18. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark): Mr. President, on behalf of the European Community and its member States I should like to thank you very much for the report you have just given on recent developments concerning the launching of global negotiations. In this context, I want through you to pay a special tribute to Mr. Otunnu, of Uganda, for the strenuous efforts he has made during the last month in order to ensure progress on this important question. I share your view that further progress has been made, and the member States of the Community also agree with you that it is important to sustain the political momentum in this issue in order soon to reach a final positive decision on the launching of global negotiations. We would therefore very much welcome it if Mr. Otunnu would agree to continue his efforts to overcome the few remaining problems to secure this goal.

19. The Community and its member States remain of the conviction that the compromise constituted by the proposal from the Group of 77 last spring—the so-called Bedjaoui text—and the Versailles clarifications are indeed still a very good basis for the launching of global negotiations. We are confident that the continued efforts of Mr. Otunnu will make a constructive contribution to efforts to resolve the remaining outstanding issues, and we stand ready to continue our co-operation with him and to give him our full support.

20. Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): Like so many others here today, my delegation regrets that we are about to conclude yet another session of the General Assembly without having reached agreement on the launching of global negotiations. That we have all come a long way from our initial positions is undoubtedly true, but the fact remains, as Mr. Otunnu recently confirmed to us, that there still is a gap to be bridged.

21. The United States still believes that the Versailles text for the launching of global negotiations provides a sound and reasonable basis for proceeding on this endeavour, which is of such interest to so many countries here today. We continue to hope that a way will be found to overcome the remaining obstacles.

22. My delegation takes this opportunity to express our profound thanks and admiration for the remarkably skilled and professional manner in which Mr. Otunnu has conducted his efforts over the past several weeks to bring about a meeting of minds. Our failure to reach agreement is clearly in spite of the imaginative way in which Mr. Otunnu has proceeded.

23. I should like to stress here that the United States will continue to co-operate closely with Mr. Otunnu in any future efforts which deal with the launching of global negotiations.

24. Mr. MI Guojun (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): I listened attentively to the report of the President of the Assembly concerning the informal consultations with regard to global negotiations. The Chinese delegation wishes to express its appreciation

and thanks to Mr. Otunnu for his active efforts in the informal consultations authorized by the President of the Assembly.

25. We are in favour of Mr. Otunnu's continuing his useful work in striving for an early agreement on a text for launching the global negotiations. We wish to express our willingness to support and co-operate in that effort. The development of the situation over the past year has further demonstrated the necessity for global negotiations. The most widespread and persistent economic recession since the war originated in the developed countries. It has, however, brought serious and unprecedented difficulties to everyone, and to the developing countries in particular. The turbulence in the international financial and monetary system has further aggravated the sense of crisis.

26. The old international economic relations could not avert the crisis, nor could they overcome the further development and deepening of the crisis. On the contrary, it is precisely the malfunctioning of and imbalances in existing international relations that constitute important factors in aggravating the economic crisis. As the developing countries have consistently maintained, only a radical reform of international economic relations and the establishment of a new international economic order can create the conditions necessary for the recovery of the world economy and, in particular, for the development of the developing countries. The global negotiations are an important effort aimed at achieving this goal.

27. During the past year, this issue has been addressed in one way or another at a series of important conferences throughout the world. Among those conferences, we have taken particular note of the International Meeting on Co-operation and Development, held at Cancún in October 1981, the Versailles Economic Summit, held in June 1982, and the consultative meetings at New Delhi. The declarations of those conferences indicate that the international community affirms that the launching of global negotiations is a major political objective approved by all.

28. At plenary meetings of the General Assembly and at meetings of the Second Committee held during the current session of the Assembly, the overwhelming majority of representatives have expressed concern with regard to the launching of global negotiations, and it has been widely held that the launching of global negotiations is not only an important historical task of replacing the old with the new in international economic relations but also an urgent need of the present situation. Therefore, we cannot but express our disappointment at the fact that agreement has not been reached on the question of the launching of global negotiations before the adjournment of this session. What has prevented the reaching of agreement on this issue? What is the crux of the matter? We feel that Mr. Otunnu has already pointed that out in his report. The principal divergence of views is in connection with paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. The crux of the matter is whether the coherent and integrated nature of global negotiations can be maintained. This is the fundamental difference between global negotiations and the ongoing sectoral negotiations. If this point were eliminated, then global negotiations would lose their original meaning.

29. It is precisely for that reason that we support the counter-proposal made by the Group of 77 in connection with the Versailles text. Of course, we have noticed that some developed countries have expressed concern with regard to safeguarding the mandate of the specialized agencies. The Group of 77 accepts the formulation in paragraph 4 of the Versailles text. We feel that this point has been met. We do not oppose further efforts at seeking an appropriate wording acceptable to all sides. This, however, must be based on the premise of not harming the fundamental nature of global negotiations.

30. We have made these comments as a matter of reference for the consultations to be held in the next month or two. We hope that all sides, and in particular one major developed country, will display political will and adopt a flexible attitude to participation in further consultations.

31. Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan): First of all, on behalf of my delegation I should like to extend our heartfelt appreciation to you, Mr. President, for your genuine efforts to launch the global negotiations. My appreciation also goes to Mr. Otunnu, of Uganda, the Chairman of the Contact Group, who has worked so hard for the reaching of agreement on the launching of global negotiations.

32. It was truly regrettable for us that we could not reach agreement on this important issue at this session. I believe, however, that we should not be discouraged by the stalemate in our negotiations at this juncture. Rather, I believe that we should renew our genuine and more realistic efforts to launch truly viable and useful global negotiations that would be really conducive to solution of the world economic difficulties from which all of us, particularly developing countries, are seriously suffering. My delegation is ready to work hard towards that end in the coming year as well.

33. Mr. PELLETIER (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): The Canadian delegation wishes to associate itself with the tribute paid to Mr. Otunnu for the work he has undertaken on behalf of the President in seeking a ground for understanding with regard to the global negotiations. We believe that Mr. Otunnu has developed an initiative that is worthy of the esteem of all who have been connected with the global negotiations. We must also say that we deeply regret the delay in carrying out that necessary project.

34. The Canadian delegation believes that the proposal of the end of March put forward by the Group of 77, as subsequently amended following the Versailles Economic Summit of the industrialized countries, constitutes the most interesting basis for the establishment of the global negotiations that we have so far envisaged. We therefore believe that effort to reach an understanding on that basis must be continued, and we assure all those concerned of Canada's constant support in that direction.

35. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The results of the work of the thirty-seventh session have again confirmed that the reason for the persistent deadlock on the question of global negotiations is the stubborn unwillingness of the West genuinely to promote a solution to the economic problems of the developing coun-

tries on the basis of the principles of justice, equality of rights and respect for sovereignty.

36. This session has clearly shown that there are radical differences between the approaches of the West and those of the socialist community to the problem of global negotiations and, generally, to economic relations with developing countries. These differences, of course, also manifest themselves in the approach to the calculation of the economic indicators of the capitalist and socialist countries. Let us take, for example, development assistance. Western statistics make, and can make, no provision for a whole series of forms and types of assistance which are simply not accessible to capitalism and are not inherent in it, because they run counter to its class nature. On the other hand, these forms of genuinely unselfish aid are inherent in socialism. Ignoring such forms of assistance is tantamount to denying the existence of the world system of socialism. Therefore, we shall not start to adapt to Western tastes and customs the factual assessment of our aid, nor shall we repeal—as some would have us do—the State monopoly of foreign trade proclaimed in our Constitution.

37. Appeals for the solidarity of the capitalist and socialist countries in their trade and economic relations with the emancipated former colonial countries are also politically hypocritical. One of the main purposes of the so-called Western assistance is a desire to retain, by neo-colonialist methods, influence in the developing countries in order to guarantee access to sources of raw materials. Imperialism is making extensive use of such assistance to support reactionary, anti-peoples' régimes. Those developing countries which pursue a consistently anti-imperialist policy are frequently the subject of discrimination by the West and are denied Western aid. Imperialism uses a variety of subversive actions against those countries—methods of economic boycott, embargo and other sanctions. Such an approach to economic relations by a number of Western countries directly contradicts the very idea of global negotiations. It has been correctly described in the statements of a number of Group of 77 delegations, and in that Group's documents, as discriminatory selectivism and as a double standard. Therefore, it can hardly be considered unnatural that socialism should come to the aid of precisely the victims of imperialist diktat and assist those that imperialism has been trying to bring to their knees, simply because the people of this or that country chose a path of social and economic development different from the capitalist path.

38. Another important feature of Western aid to the developing countries is the West's use of it as a means for the promotion of the expansion of monopolist capital. At the same time, the West is, increasingly, also trying to use for those same purposes the channels of multilateral assistance through the United Nations. Wherever labour is cheaper, raw materials are abundant and taxes are low, Western monopolies build various enterprises in the developing countries. But are many of those enterprises the full property of the developing countries themselves? Of course, they are not. More often than not they are organically woven into the spider's web of the productive cycle of the transnational corporations, along whose channels enormous amounts of resources are extracted from the developing countries.

39. The Ministers of the member countries of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries have described the expatriation of profits by the transnational corporations as a reverse flow of resources contributing to the decapitalization of the developing countries. I refer to document A/37/333.
40. Unlike that process, the Soviet Union's contribution to industrialization and the development of other sectors of the economy of the young States is fully in keeping with the aims of the global negotiations. All the facilities built by the Soviet Union in the developing countries are the full property of those countries themselves and are strengthening the basis of their autonomous national economies. Soviet experts work on the construction of those facilities, and their services are provided virtually free of charge; the developing countries pay only 15 per cent of the costs of those services. I emphasize "services". It is precisely the volume of services actually delivered that is, in our firm opinion, the ultimate expression of technical assistance. Of course, a single expert can receive the same salary as a film star, but it is unlikely that there will be any real increase in technical assistance to the receiving country as a result.
41. While providing developing countries with comprehensive economic assistance, the Soviet Union duly takes into account the special needs of the least developed countries. As was noted at the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, the volume of the Soviet Union's economic and technical co-operation with the least-developed countries in 1976-1980 grew more than 1.8 times compared with the preceding five-year period, and there is every reason to assume that, in the period 1981-1985, it will increase more than twofold and that it will grow at approximately the same rate until 1990¹.
42. The developing countries are particularly alarmed by the state of affairs in such areas as trade and raw materials, items which could be on the possible agenda of the global negotiations. There has been a great deal of talk at the present session about the financial losses of the developing countries as a result of the heightened protectionism in the trade policy of the Western States and also as a result of the deliberate, not free, market forces brought into play by the Western monopolies in world markets in order artificially to bring down commodity prices. Such methods for the conduct of foreign trade policy are alien to socialism. We build our trade with the developing countries on the basis of the principles of equity and mutual, not unilateral, advantage.
43. A study by the UNCTAD secretariat, dated 26 August 1982,² gives data on the rapid growth of the trade turnover between the Soviet Union and the developing countries for the last decade. It is made clear that the dynamics of the trade turnover is evidence of a clearly higher growth rate of imports into the Soviet Union of goods from the developing countries compared with Soviet exports to them. The UNCTAD document also points out that the concessionary element of long-term Soviet credits to the developing countries runs at an average of 40 to 45 per cent, which is higher than the average rate of the concessionary element of Government commercial credits and private loans provided to developing countries by market-economy countries.
44. The trade practice of the Soviet Union includes discounts in the prices of exports to developing countries and mark-ups on imports of goods from those countries. These discounts and mark-ups should not be confused with the subsidies which Western countries provide within the framework of individual trade agreements with developing countries. Western trade subsidies are combined with a well-developed system of quotas and customs duties and serve primarily to protect the interests of the producers in the developed capitalist countries. The discounts and mark-ups in export and import prices provided by the Soviet Union to the developing countries are a direct deduction from our national income and neither by their nature nor in their scale are they comparable to the subsidies of the Western countries.
45. A very important part of Soviet assistance to developing countries is participation in the training of hundreds of thousands of qualified national cadres for those countries. The Western contribution to the solution of the key problems of these cadres is highly dubious. It is not really a contribution at all; instead, qualified people are drawn out of these countries to the advantage of the Western countries. It is not a coincidence that, at this session, the West concertedly voted against the Group of 77's draft designed to secure practical measures to prevent the brain drain from the developing countries to the Western States.
46. This session, which is about to conclude, has also shown that, at this stage, two problems that have been direct causes of the deadlock in the global negotiations have acquired particular acuteness for the developing countries. One of them is the enormous financial losses of the developing countries and the worsening of their general currency and financial instability as a result of the selfish monetary policies of those forces which control international monetary and financial systems. The second of these problems was the subject of a report by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD on world inflation and the development process [see A/37/518, annex]; it contains eloquent data on the damage done to the developing countries as a result of the policy of the developed market-economy countries.
47. Thus, one of the most important conclusions to be drawn from the discussion of economic questions at this session is the need to take urgent measures to halt the outflow of real resources from the developing countries resulting from the activities of private foreign capital, primarily the transnational corporations, and from the policy of protectionism, the lowering of world commodity prices, the voluntarist financial policy of the leading Western countries, the unjust international monetary system, the export of inflation to the developing countries and the luring of qualified experts from the developing countries into the Western States. That range of problems was the principal subject-matter of the discussion, and the problems must be solved as a matter of priority.
48. An appropriate forum to work out such a solution could be the United Nations conference on global negotiations, the convening of which is envisaged in General Assembly resolution 34/138. The Soviet Union, together with the other socialist countries, consistently supports the Group of 77 in its efforts

to achieve the implementation of that resolution, which was adopted by consensus three years ago.

49. The situation on the question of global negotiations clearly confirms that the responsibility of imperialism for the economic backwardness of developing countries is in no sense confined to its historical aspect. It emanates also from the substance of current Western policies in the sphere of international economic relations. The facts totally refute Western efforts to share this responsibility with others.

50. The Soviet Union, for reasons of principle, refutes and will never accept demands that it should, on an equal footing with the imperialist States, bear responsibility for the current economic plight of the developing countries. We are not going to compete in "geographical arithmetics" with anyone. The real rivalry between the socialist and capitalist systems is taking place in today's world in other spheres. This is shown by the development of the world system of socialism, which is providing an example of genuine equitable and mutually advantageous co-operation with peoples in all fields.

51. At present, the Soviet Union maintains and develops solidarity and co-operation with the countries which have thrown off the colonial yoke and with the peoples struggling for national independence and social progress. Guided by the principles of international solidarity, the Soviet Union, as was stated at this session [13th meeting] by Mr. Gromyko, a member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, provides assistance to the emancipated States in overcoming their economic backwardness, and in that respect is doing not less, but more, than any of the developed capitalist countries. The Soviet Union will continue to provide the developing countries with assistance and support in their struggle for economic autonomy and for the restructuring of international economic relations on a truly equitable and democratic basis, and will persistently strive for the cessation of the arms race, which diverts enormous resources from development purposes.

52. The Soviet side is prepared for open and honest co-operation with all countries on a reciprocal basis. Our activities in this regard should not be impeded by differences in social systems.

AGENDA ITEM 71

Development and international economic co-operation:

- (a) **International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade;**
- (b) **Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States**
- (c) **Trade and development:**
 - (i) **Report of the Trade and Development Board;**
 - (ii) **Report of the Secretary-General;**
 - (iii) **Reports of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development**
- (d) **Industrialization:**
 - (i) **Report of the Industrial Development Board;**
 - (ii) **Report of the Secretary-General**
- (h) **Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system: report of the Secretary-General**

- (i) **Environment:**
 - (i) **Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its session of a special character and on its tenth session;**
 - (ii) **Reports of the Secretary-General**
- (j) **Human settlements:**
 - (i) **Report of the Commission on Human Settlements;**
 - (ii) **Reports of the Secretary-General**
- (o) **Implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries: report of the Secretary-General**
- (p) **New International human order: moral aspects of development**

AGENDA ITEM 72

Operational activities for development:

- (a) **Operational activities for development of the United Nations system: report of the Secretary-General;**
- (b) **United Nations Development Programme: report of the Secretary-General;**
- (c) **United Nations Capital Development Fund;**
- (d) **United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration;**
- (e) **United Nations Fund for Population Activities;**
- (f) **United Nations Volunteers programme;**
- (g) **United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries;**
- (h) **United Nations Children's Fund;**
- (i) **World Food Programme;**
- (j) **Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General**

53. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), Rapporteur of the Second Committee: I have the honour to submit to the General Assembly, under agenda item 71, entitled "Development and international economic co-operation", parts of the report of the Second Committee covering the following sub-items: (a) and (b) [A/37/680/Add.1, part II], (c) [A/37/680/Add.2, part III], (d) [A/37/680/Add.3, part IV], (h) [A/37/680/Add.7, part VIII], (i) [A/37/680/Add.8, part IX], (j) [A/37/680/Add.9, part X], and (o) and (p) [A/37/680/Add.12, part XIII].

54. Draft resolution III, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States" [see A/37/680/Add.1, para. 16], was adopted by the Second Committee by a recorded vote of 127 to 1, with 4 abstentions.

55. Draft resolution III, entitled "Development aspects of the reverse transfer of technology" [see A/37/680/Add.2, para. 35], was adopted by the Committee by a recorded vote of 106 to 21, with 1 abstention.

56. Draft resolution I, entitled "Industrial Development co-operation" [see A/37/680/Add.3, para. 11], was adopted by the Committee by a recorded vote of 101 to 9, with 12 abstentions. I should, however, point out that, in connection with the adoption of this draft resolution, the Committee had taken a separate recorded vote on paragraphs 4 and 7 of section I but, owing to mechanical malfunctions, the votes of delegations were not recorded. However, paragraphs 4 and 7 were retained by 91 votes to 19, with 11 abstentions.

57. Draft resolution I, entitled "Remnants of war" [see A/37/680/Add.8, para. 25], was adopted by the Committee by a recorded vote of 109 to none, with 25 abstentions.

58. Draft resolution II, entitled "Living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories" [see A/37/680/Add.9, para. 20], was adopted by the Committee by a recorded vote of 128 to 2, with 4 abstentions.

59. The remaining draft resolutions recommended for adoption by the General Assembly under the above-mentioned sub-items were adopted without a vote.

60. Turning to agenda item 72, entitled "Operational activities for development", I have the honour to introduce the report of the Second Committee [A/37/774]. In paragraph 36 of that report, the Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of draft resolutions I to VII. Except for draft resolution V, entitled "United Nations Special Fund for Landlocked Developing Countries", which was adopted by the Committee by a recorded vote of 112 to none, with 21 abstentions, the six other draft resolutions were adopted without a vote.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Second Committee.

61. The PRESIDENT: Statements will be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Second Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

62. I should like to remind members that, in paragraph 7 of its decision 34/401, the General Assembly decided that when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee.

63. I now invite members to turn their attention to part I of the report of the Second Committee on agenda item 71 [A/37/680]. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to take note of that report?

It was so decided (decision 37/439).

64. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to part II of the report of the Second Committee [A/37/680/Add.1] on sub-items (a) and (b) of agenda item 71, concerning, respectively, the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. In paragraph 16 of its report, the Committee recommends the adoption of three draft resolutions. Draft resolution I is entitled "Review and appraisal of the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade". The administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/37/762]. The Second Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 37/202).

65. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled "Negative trends in the world economy", was also adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I assume that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 37/203).

66. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "Review of the implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, 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, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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: United States of America.

Abstaining: Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 144 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions (resolution 37/204).

67. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to part III of the report of the Second Committee [A/37/680/Add.2], on sub-item (c) of agenda item 71, concerning trade and development. The Assembly will take a decision on the seven draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 35 of its report.

68. Draft resolution I, entitled "Particular problems facing Zaire with regard to transport, transit and access to foreign markets", was adopted without a vote by the Committee. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 37/205).

69. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled "Action programme in favour of island developing countries", was also adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 37/206).

70. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution III, entitled "Development aspects of the reverse transfer of technology". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, 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 Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Greece.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 127 votes to 21, with 1 abstention (resolution 37/207).

71. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV, entitled "Sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development", was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 37/208).

72. The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution V, entitled "United Nations Conference on Conditions for Registration of Ships". The administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/37/779]. The Second Committee adopted this draft

resolution without a vote. May I assume that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 37/209).

73. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution VI, entitled "United Nations Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology". This draft resolution was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 37/210).

74. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution VII, entitled "Signature and ratification of the Agreement Establishing the Common Fund for Commodities". It was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly also adopts it without a vote?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 37/211).

75. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn to the draft decisions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 36 of its report [A/37/680/Add.2]. The Committee adopted draft decision I, entitled "Specific action related to the particular needs and problems of land-locked developing countries", without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft decision I was adopted (decision 37/440).

76. The PRESIDENT: Draft decision II, entitled "Protectionism and structural adjustment", was also adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly also adopts it without a vote?

Draft decision II was adopted (decision 37/441).

77. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Panama in explanation of vote.

78. Mr. KAM (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The draft resolution entitled "United Nations Conference on Conditions for Registration of Ships", which we have just adopted, was the result of a painstaking process of consultations and negotiations inspired by a genuine spirit of compromise, which is reflected in the very careful balance struck in the text. My delegation is pleased that the Second Committee, as well as the Assembly, adopted this draft resolution by general agreement. We supported the adoption of this draft resolution because we consider that it contains provisions which, if correctly carried out, will make possible a wide-ranging and constructive process of preparation for the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Conditions for Registration of Ships.

79. My delegation attaches fundamental importance to the provision in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution that, in the preparation and recommendation of a draft international agreement on the conditions of registration of ships, the Preparatory Committee should take fully into account the views of all interested parties. We believe that this clearly points to the concept of consensus, which, in our view, is essential in developing principles enshrined in international law and recognized by the international community as coming within the sovereign decision of States.

80. We feel that the Preparatory Committee, as well as the proposed Conference, can have positive results only if the classical concept of minority and majority gives way to general consensus, which, in our view, must prevail in respect of maritime issues, especially with regard to the right of each State to establish its own social development model and to determine its own economic policy.

81. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to part IV of the report of the Second Committee [A/37/680/Add.3] on sub-item (d) of agenda item 71, concerning industrialization. The Assembly will take decisions on the two draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 11 of its report.

82. Draft resolution I is entitled "Industrial development co-operation". The administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/37/780].

83. I call on the representative of Denmark on a point of order.

84. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark): As mentioned by the Rapporteur of the Second Committee, there were some difficulties when we took a separate vote on paragraphs 4 and 7 in the Committee. We should therefore like to have a separate recorded vote on those paragraphs here in order that we may have a clear picture of what we are doing. In order to facilitate the Assembly's voting, we can accept a recorded vote on both paragraphs at the same time.

85. The PRESIDENT: As I hear no objection to the proposal of the representative of Denmark for a separate recorded vote on paragraphs 4 and 7 of draft resolution I, I take it that the Assembly is in agreement, and I now put those paragraphs to the vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

Paragraphs 4 and 7 of draft resolution I were adopted by 118 votes to 20, with 11 abstentions.

86. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution I as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution I, as a whole, was adopted by 129 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions (resolution 37/212).

87. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Conversion of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization into a specialized agency". The administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/37/780]. The Second Committee

adopted this draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 37/213).

88. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to part VIII of the report of the Second Committee [A/37/680/Add.7], on sub-item (h) of agenda item 71, concerning the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 14 of its report, entitled "Economic Commission for Africa: regional programming operations, restructuring and decentralization issues". The draft resolution was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 37/214).

89. The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 15 of its report, the Second Committee recommends the adoption of a draft decision entitled "Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system", which it adopted without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly also adopts that draft decision without a vote?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 37/442).

90. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to part IX of the report of the Second Committee [A/37/680/Add.8], on sub-item (i) of agenda item 71, concerning the environment. The Assembly will take a decision on the six draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 25 of its report.

91. Draft resolution I is entitled "Remnants of war". The administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/37/740]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, 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 Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 25 abstentions (resolution 37/215).

92. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled "Implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification", was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 37/216).

93. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III, entitled "International co-operation in the field of the environment", was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 37/217).

94. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV, entitled "Implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification", was also adopted without a vote by the Second Committee. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 37/218).

95. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution V, entitled "Session of a special character of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme", was also adopted without a vote by the Second Committee. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution V without a vote?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 37/219).

96. The PRESIDENT: Finally, we come to draft resolution VI, entitled "Study on financing the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification". The Second Committee adopted draft resolution VI without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 37/220).

97. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

98. Mr. HOHWÜ-CHRISTENSEN (Sweden): The Swedish Government has for many years taken an interest in the problem of remnants of war. This matter was touched upon in one of the three Protocols annexed to the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects [resolution

35/153], and it has been discussed in various United Nations forums. No concrete action has, however, been taken by the international community in this field of international law or international co-operation. We feel that something should be done and as soon as possible.

99. However, as on earlier occasions in the Assembly, the Swedish delegation has found it necessary to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution. It is our firm view that the possibility of achieving practical results in this field would be furthered by leaving aside the controversial question of international responsibility and the related demands for compensation. Instead of looking back and focusing on guilt and responsibility, we should look ahead.

100. We have stated before that the solution to the problem of remnants of war can be found only on the basis of analysing comprehensive and factual information on the various aspects of the matter. We therefore support the idea of a United Nations study, as proposed in the resolution. We have voiced this idea ourselves—*inter alia*, in response to the letter of UNEP dated 19 March 1982. There is a need to examine options of international co-operation for solving the problem, looking to the possible role of the United Nations in this regard, and to analyse the legal setting of this basically humanitarian problem.

101. We do not think, however, that the study on remnants of war should concentrate on specific demands of certain States and the issue of compensation. We are faced with a practical problem of international co-operation. Let us tackle that problem in a practical way and in a manner that is uncontroversial and stands a chance of obtaining the consensus of the international community.

102. Mr. JAYANAMA (Thailand): I am not speaking in explanation of vote. I only wish to make the following brief statement. We had intended in the Second Committee to co-sponsor the draft resolution entitled "Session of a special character of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme", which appeared in document A/C.2/37/L.49. We would appreciate it if the Secretariat would record that fact.

103. The PRESIDENT: That will be recorded. The General Assembly will now consider part X of the report of the Second Committee [A/37/680/Add.9], on sub-item (j) of agenda item 71, concerning human settlements. The Assembly will take decisions on the three draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 20 of its report.

104. Draft resolution I is entitled "International Year of Shelter for the Homeless". It was adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 37/221).

105. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories". The administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/37/683]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Burma, Canada.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 145 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions (resolution 37/222).

106. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolutions III A, B and C, under the general title of "Human settlements", are entitled, respectively, "Report of the Commission on Human Settlements", "Mobilization of financial resources for the development and improvement of human settlements" and "Co-ordination of human settlements programmes within the United Nations system". The Second Committee adopted draft resolutions III A, B and C without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to follow suit?

Draft resolutions III A, B and C were adopted (resolutions 37/223 A, B and C).

107. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to part XIII of the report of the Second Committee [A/37/680/Add.12], on sub-items (o) and (p) of agenda item 71, concerning, respectively, implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries and the new international human order: moral aspects of development. In paragraph 10 of its report, the Second Committee recommends the adoption of two draft resolutions.

108. Draft resolution I, entitled "Implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the

1980s for the Least Developed Countries”, was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 37/224).

109. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled “New international human order: moral aspects of development”. The Second Committee also adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 37/225).

110. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Second Committee [A/37/774] on agenda item 72, concerning operational activities for development. The Assembly will take decisions on the seven draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 36 of its report.

111. Draft resolution I, entitled “Operational activities for development of the United Nations system”, was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 37/226).

112. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled “Critical situation of financial resources of the United Nations Development Programme”, was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 37/227).

113. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III, entitled “Role of qualified national personnel in social and economic development of developing countries”, was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 37/228).

114. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV, entitled “United Nations Volunteers programme”, was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 37/229).

115. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution V is entitled “United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, 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 Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic

Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 21 abstentions (resolution 37/230).

116. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VI is entitled “United Nations Children’s Fund”. The Second Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 37/231).

117. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution VII, entitled “United Nations technical co-operation activities”, which was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to adopt this draft resolution without a vote?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 37/232).

118. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Belgium, who wishes to speak in explanation of her delegation’s position.

119. Mrs. LOECKX (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): The draft resolution concerning operational activities for development of the United Nations system, which has just been adopted, sets guidelines for an overall examination to be undertaken by the General Assembly in 1983 on the basis of a study by the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation. We hope that this examination will be a fruitful one and that it will include an objective consideration of the suitability of setting targets, as provided for in paragraphs 4 and 6 of the resolution. We do not feel that the setting of unrealistic targets has made a positive contribution to the mobilization of resources or to the programming of operational activities.

AGENDA ITEM 16

Elections to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other elections (concluded):*

(e) **Election of the members of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries**

120. The PRESIDENT: Since no candidates have been put forward, I suggest that the General Assembly decide to defer until its thirty-eighth session the election of the members of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that is the wish of the General Assembly.

It was so decided (decision 37/320).

AGENDA ITEM 17

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (continued):**

(i) **Confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization;**

(j) **Confirmation of the appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development;**

(l) **Confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries**

121. The PRESIDENT: I invite members to turn their attention first to a note by the Secretary-General concerning sub-item (i) of agenda item 17 [A/37/770]. In that note, the Secretary-General proposes to reappoint Mr. Abd-El Rahman Khane as Executive Director of UNIDO for a further period of two years, ending on 31 December 1984, or until UNIDO becomes a specialized agency, whichever date comes first. May I take it that the General Assembly decides to confirm that appointment?

It was so decided (decision 37/321).

122. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to the note by the Secretary-General concerning sub-item (j) of agenda item 17, on the confirmation of the appointment of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD [A/37/771]. In his note, the Secretary-General proposes that the appointment of Mr. Gamani Corea be extended for a further period of one year and nine months, beginning on 1 April 1983 and ending on 31 December 1984. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to confirm the extension of the appointment of Mr. Corea?

It was so decided (decision 37/322).

123. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn its attention to sub-item (l) of agenda item 17. In his note concerning confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries [A/37/773], the Secretary-General states that he is not submitting an appointment for confirmation by the General

Assembly. May I take it that the Assembly takes note of that document?

It was so decided (decision 37/323).

AGENDA ITEM 32

Question of Namibia (concluded):*

(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 United Nations Council for Namibia;**

(c) **Reports of the Secretary-General**

124. The PRESIDENT: Members will recall that the Assembly concluded its debate on this item at the 106th meeting, held on Wednesday, 15 December. I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to introduce draft resolutions A to E, contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/37/24, para. 786].

125. I call first on the representative of Guyana, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa".

126. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): It is 16 years since the General Assembly took the momentous decision to terminate the Mandate which the League of Nations had entrusted in 1920 to South Africa and which South Africa proceeded so shamefully to betray. I refer to the Mandate in respect of the Territory then known as South West Africa and now known as Namibia.

127. It is 11 years since the International Court of Justice, in its historic advisory opinion of 21 June 1971,³ declared that the General Assembly had legally terminated South Africa's Mandate, that South Africa was in illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia and that South Africa was duty-bound to withdraw forthwith.

128. It is more than four years since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), endorsing the United Nations plan for Namibia, a plan which had been agreed to by the two parties to the conflict, namely, South Africa, the illegal occupier, and the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people. And yet, at the end of 1982, Namibia is still occupied and resolution 435 (1978) is still unimplemented.

129. We have seen new initiatives by members of the Western contact group, initiatives which, despite even further concessions from SWAPO, have failed to produce any positive results. The plan known as the United Nations plan for Namibia endorsed in resolution 435 (1978) was authored and fathered by this very Western contact group.

130. One of the reasons why SWAPO, with the support of the front-line States and the rest of Africa, agreed to make major concessions involving that plan was the assurance that, should South Africa renege on its promises, the Western members of the Security

* Resumed from the 111th meeting.

** Resumed from the 109th meeting.

* Resumed from the 106th meeting.

Council would no longer use their veto power to prevent the imposition of sanctions against Pretoria. Yet when, in April 1981, a request was finally made in the Security Council for the imposition of sanctions against South Africa, a country which has violated every norm of civilized behaviour, which has imposed upon its people the notorious system of *apartheid*, which has maintained its illegal presence in Namibia since 1966 and which has not hesitated to launch an increasing number of attacks against neighbouring African countries—when that request was finally made, the three Western permanent members of the Security Council did not hesitate to use their vetoes to shield South Africa from the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. The argument was made then that sanctions could not work, that they were the wrong weapon, that they were a useless weapon. Yet the same weapon which was thought unsuitable in respect of South Africa was unhesitatingly recommended and even applied in other cases.

131. In the meantime, South Africa has become increasingly emboldened in its defiance of the international community, as we have seen this year in its acts of aggression against Angola, including the continuing occupation of parts of that territory, in its support for rebel movements in Angola and Mozambique, in its efforts to subvert the Government of Zimbabwe, in the mercenary invasion of the Seychelles and, only recently, in the armed attack against the capital of the Kingdom of Lesotho. Not content with that, the Foreign Minister of the Pretoria régime has proudly proclaimed a so-called new Monroe Doctrine for southern Africa, which he asserts has the support of the United States and which will have the effect of proclaiming the paramountcy of the *apartheid* régime over the whole of southern Africa.

132. It is against that background of obstinacy and contempt on the part of South Africa, of aggression that seems to have no limits, of frustrated hopes and of bad faith, that draft resolution A, which my delegation has the honour to introduce, is to be seen. This draft resolution is recommended to the Assembly by the United Nations Council for Namibia and endorsed by the contact group acting on behalf of the entire Group of African States. I should like to outline the most important elements of this draft resolution. Although its title is identical to that of last year's resolution 36/121 A, it also includes the substantive portions of resolution 36/121 B, entitled "Action by Member States in support of Namibia". In an effort to achieve conciseness and brevity, however, the first two resolutions of last year have been merged into one.

133. The draft resolution, in its operative part, begins by reaffirming yet again the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia and reiterates the direct responsibility of the United Nations Council for Namibia, while reaffirming the mandate given to the Council as the legal Administering Authority for that Territory until independence. It further reaffirms that the only two parties to the conflict in Namibia are, on the one hand, South Africa, as the illegal occupier, and, on the other, the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

134. After laying down these basic principles, the draft resolution condemns South Africa for its illegal

occupation of Namibia and declares that such occupation constitutes an act of aggression against the Namibian people in terms of the definition of aggression adopted by the General Assembly in 1974, thus entitling the Namibian people to avail themselves of all means at their disposal, including armed struggle, to obtain their freedom and independence, which is theirs by right.

135. The draft resolution reaffirms the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands; it reaffirms the central role of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and firmly rejects the manoeuvres by one member of the contact group aimed at undermining the international consensus embodied in that resolution.

136. In view of recent South African threats to proceed with a so-called internal settlement in Namibia, the draft resolution denounces any such schemes and calls on the international community not to recognize any authority or settlement imposed upon the Namibian people in disregard of the present draft resolution as well as of relevant resolutions of the Security Council.

137. Everyone is aware that in the past year there has been a marked increase in the level of assistance provided to South Africa by certain Western countries. The United States press, among other sources, gives ample testimony to this. Who can deny that the links between the régimes in Tel Aviv and Pretoria are growing even stronger, as manifested by the visit of General Sharon to the Namibian battlefield in December of last year and the assistance rendered by Israel to South Africa in circumventing the arms embargo? Nor could the Assembly pass over in silence the \$1.2 billion loan recently granted by IMF to South Africa, in disregard of a resolution overwhelmingly approved by the Assembly on 21 October 1982.

138. The draft resolution also condemns South Africa's military buildup in Namibia and its use of Namibian territory to launch military attacks against independent African States, in particular the People's Republic of Angola, and calls upon the international community to extend full support and assistance to the front-line States in the face of repeated acts of aggression by South Africa.

139. The draft resolution also addresses itself to the persistent acts of repression and State terrorism perpetrated by the illegal régime against Namibian patriots, and once more demands the immediate release of all Namibian political prisoners.

140. The plunder of Namibia's natural resources by transnational corporations continues unabated. Hence, the draft resolution declares that the activities of foreign economic and other interests operating in Namibia constitute a major obstacle to its independence. And here I should point out that this particular paragraph is in keeping with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice,³ which states that States Members of the United Nations are under an obligation to desist from entering into economic and other forms of relationship with South Africa on behalf of or concerning Namibia which might trench its authority over the Territory.

141. Paragraphs 32 to 35 reiterate the request to all Member States to impose a comprehensive boycott on South Africa and the request to the United Nations Council for Namibia to monitor it in keeping with resolution ES-8/2, adopted by the Assembly at its eighth emergency special session, in September 1981, and reiterated in more detail in resolution 36/121 B.
142. Finally, the draft resolution declares that South Africa's defiance of the United Nations, its illegal occupation of Namibia, its persistent acts of aggression against independent African States, its policies of *apartheid* and its development of nuclear weapons constitute a serious threat to international peace and security and, in that light, strongly urges the Security Council to listen to the call of the overwhelming majority of the Assembly for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.
143. The draft resolution that I am submitting for the consideration and approval of the Assembly is an accurate reflection of the situation in and relating to Namibia. It is motivated by nothing but a concern for the people of Namibia, a concern for what they are being made to suffer by the régime that still illegally occupies their territory, a concern that they be allowed to live as free men and women, free from South African occupation and aggression. I appeal to delegations to give the broadest possible support to this draft resolution.
144. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Nigeria, who wishes to introduce draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)".
145. Mr. ESEN (Nigeria): My delegation has the honour to introduce draft resolution B, which relates to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In the four and a half years that have gone by since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) endorsing the United Nations plan for Namibia, South Africa has raised one excuse after another in an effort to avoid implementation of the plan, to which it had given its assent.
146. Last year—and I regret having to state this from the rostrum of this Assembly—South Africa was handed another useful weapon by the new Administration in Washington through the latter's insistence on establishing a linkage between South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia, which it has been illegally occupying for the past 16 years, and the departure of Cuban troops from Angola, troops which are there at the invitation of the Government of an independent sovereign State.
147. Need I remind the members of the Assembly of the circumstances in which those Cuban troops arrived in Angola? They arrived in the autumn of 1976, at the time when South African forces were at the doors of Luanda and threatening to put in power a puppet régime subservient to South African interests. Need I further remind the Assembly that in the past six years the acts of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola have not abated and that therefore the People's Republic of Angola, in common with all other States Members of the United Nations, has the sovereign right, in pursuance of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, to act in self-defence and to call for the assistance of any country willing to lend its support? Need I repeat the obvious before the members of the Assembly and state that Angola is not the only State of the Organization to have foreign forces stationed on its soil in the exercise of its collective right to self-defence? Need I emphasize that at a time when the Western contact group was negotiating the plan, which subsequently became known as the United Nations plan for Namibia, neither any member of the contact group nor South Africa thought of raising the question of Cuban forces in Angola, not only because they were two entirely different issues but also because it was understood that the Cuban presence in Angola was related to the threat posed to that country by the régime of Pretoria as well as being a matter that fell within the domestic jurisdiction of a sovereign State?
148. What had been a non-issue for four years suddenly became an issue as a result of the obsessive foreign-policy concerns of one country. Not even the united opposition of the whole of Africa has brought about a change in attitude on the part of the United States Administration, as manifested by the recent declaration of Vice-President Bush at the conclusion of his African tour.
149. Draft resolution B, which my delegation has the honour to introduce to the Assembly, is short and to the point. After reaffirming the need to proceed without any further delay with the United Nations plan for Namibia and after taking note of the consultations which have been held with a view to achieving its early implementation, it reaffirms the direct responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia, pending its independence, and reiterates that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. In paragraph 3, it firmly rejects the persistent attempts by the United States and South Africa to establish any linkage or parallelism between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, while emphasizing that such attempts are only retarding the long-overdue independence of Namibia. The draft resolution is restrained in language in an effort to command the broadest possible support. I appeal to every member of the Assembly that is opposed to any linkage issue and that supports the speedy achievement of independence by Namibia to lend support to this draft resolution, which has been recommended to the Assembly by the United Nations Council for Namibia and which has been endorsed by the contact group of the Group of African States at the United Nations.
150. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of India, who will introduce draft resolution C, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia".
151. Mr. BANERJI (India): My delegation has the honour to introduce draft resolution C, which relates to the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia. The draft resolution enjoys the consensus support of the members of the Council itself and the endorsement of the contact group of African States, acting on behalf of the Group of African States.

152. The United Nations Council for Namibia, established by General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V), of 19 May 1967, is the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until it achieves independence. For the 15 years during which it has been in existence, the Council has striven to safeguard and promote the rights of the Namibian people, to mobilize worldwide support for the Namibian cause and to train and equip Namibians to shoulder the responsibilities concomitant with independent nationhood. In addition, the Council has represented Namibia in various world organizations and at international conferences. The Council is therefore, in a sense, the interim Government of Namibia at the United Nations, which administers the Territory as a direct trust.

153. In spite of all efforts, South Africa continues to defy the decisions of the United Nations and the will of the international community by persisting in its illegal occupation of Namibia. It also seeks to promote the puppet political institutions that it has installed in the Territory in an attempt to create the impression—a false impression—that Namibia has its own Government in Windhoek. Until this state of affairs is brought to an end, until South Africa is made to withdraw from Namibia and until Namibia emerges into independence, the United Nations must, we believe, retain direct responsibility for the Territory, and the Council must continue to discharge its responsibilities.

154. Draft resolution C seeks to authorize the United Nations Council for Namibia, which works closely with SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, to continue its work in the fulfilment of its mandate. It spells out the activities which the Council should undertake in that context and seeks the co-operation of all States Members of the United Nations with the Council, co-operation which we hope will be forthcoming. The draft resolution also calls for the convening in Paris in 1983 of an International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence. The Secretary-General has already undertaken some preparatory work for this venture, in co-operation with the United Nations Council for Namibia. We believe that at the present critical juncture, when the situation on the horizon looks far from promising and when new impediments are being put in the way of the achievement of early independence for Namibia, this international conference will be timely and appropriate. It will serve to focus world attention on the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, the continuing agony of the brave Namibian people and the need to bring them to liberation without further delay. We commend this draft resolution to all members of the Assembly. We are confident that it will have their overwhelming support.

155. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Bulgaria to introduce draft resolution D, entitled "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of Namibia".

156. Mr. DENICHIN (Bulgaria): Since its inception, the United Nations Council for Namibia, mindful of its solemn commitment to the people of Namibia expressed in General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), of 27 October 1966, has stressed the important and urgent need to arouse world public opinion on a

continuous basis with a view to assisting effectively the people of Namibia to achieve self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namibia and, in particular, to intensify the widespread and continuous dissemination of information on the struggle for liberation being waged by the people of Namibia, guided by their liberation movement, SWAPO.

157. The thrust of the draft resolution is embodied in its preamble, which stresses the urgent need to intensify efforts to mobilize international public opinion on a continuous basis with a view to assisting effectively the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, in their legitimate struggle for self-determination, freedom and independence. The United Nations Council for Namibia reiterates the importance of publicity as an instrument for furthering the mandate given by the Assembly to the Council, and, in pursuance of that goal, the Council is requested to consider ways and means of increasing dissemination of information.

158. The draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to direct the Department of Public Information, in addition to its responsibilities relating to southern Africa, to assist, as a matter of priority, the United Nations Council for Namibia in the implementation of its programme of dissemination of information. The draft resolution contains a decision to intensify the international campaign in support of Namibia, and to this end the Council is requested to include the following in its programme of activities on dissemination of information: publications, production and dissemination of radio programmes, the production of material for publicity through radio and television broadcasts, the placement of advertisements in newspapers and magazines, and a number of other activities designed to promote the independence of Namibia. In addition, the draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to give the widest possible publicity to the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, and further requests the Council to organize, in co-operation with the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, an international seminar of media leaders, with a view to alerting the mass media to the need to increase publicity on the question of Namibia.

159. The non-governmental organizations and support groups actively engaged in supporting the struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, are requested to intensify, in co-operation with the United Nations Council for Namibia, international action in support of the liberation struggle.

160. Member States are requested to broadcast programmes on their national radio and television networks and to publish material in their official news media informing their populations about the situation in Namibia and about the obligation of Governments and peoples to assist in the struggle of Namibians for independence.

161. The dissemination of information on Namibia represents an important aspect of the overall efforts of the United Nations to achieve freedom and independence for the Territory. In spite of the long years of illegal occupation of Namibia, the public

in some countries is still not sufficiently aware of the true nature of the problem and the extent of the suffering of the Namibian people, as well as of the people of those front-line States that are the constant victims of acts of aggression by the racist régime of South Africa. Either the media of certain Western countries do not publish sufficient information on the problem of Namibia or the published information is biased in accordance with the political interests of the ruling circles in those countries which are rendering all-round assistance to Pretoria, thus enabling the racists to continue the illegal occupation of the Territory. It is therefore very important for the United Nations to maintain a constant flow of information, particularly to the public in those States, on all aspects of the question of Namibia.

162. Draft resolution D has been the subject of consultation and approval by the contact group of the Group of African States at the United Nations. I therefore have the honour to recommend it for adoption by the General Assembly.

163. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Venezuela, who will introduce draft resolution E, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia".

164. Mrs. CORONEL DE RODRÍGUEZ (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have the honour and privilege of introducing draft resolution E, on the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

165. If we examine the activities of the Fund from its establishment in 1971 to the present we will see that they have increased considerably. Today they cover the broad spectrum of assistance programmes for Namibians, including the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia, which fulfil the solemn commitment undertaken by the United Nations to assist the people of the Territory and prepare them for independence. The Fund has been operational since 1972, and the assistance programmes that it covers have been steadily expanded by the General Assembly.

166. For Venezuela, a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, this situation is a source of genuine satisfaction.

167. With the expansion of its activities, the Fund has had to channel its resources through three accounts: the General Account, which covers the Fund's activities of a general nature; the Trust Fund for the Nationhood Programme for Namibia; and the Trust Fund for the United Nations Institute for Namibia. The Fund's major source of financing is the voluntary contributions of Governments, organizations and institutions. Since the Fund was established, the General Assembly has every year authorized, as an interim measure, an appropriation from the regular budget of the United Nations to assist in the implementation of the Fund's programmes. Thus, for example, in resolution 36/121 F, of 10 December 1981, the General Assembly decided to allocate to the Fund the sum of \$1 million, as a temporary measure. The same allocation is provided for in the present draft resolution, which also appeals to all States, to the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, to governmental and non-governmental organizations and to individuals to increase their aid to Namibians through the United

Nations Fund for Namibia, the United Nations Institute for Namibia and the Nationhood Programme for Namibia. The draft resolution also highlights the need for contributions to be made to increase the number of scholarships awarded to Namibians under the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

168. The draft resolution takes note of the relevant sections of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/37/24, paras. 643-712 and 718-729] and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained in it. Also, it expresses appreciation for the efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in providing assistance to Namibian refugees and requests him to expand those efforts in view of the substantial increase in the number of Namibian refugees. The draft resolution requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to complete and publish a reference book on Namibia, which is now in an advanced stage of preparation, and to carry out a demographic study of the Namibian population. It also asks the United Nations Institute for Namibia to prepare, in co-operation with SWAPO, the Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and UNDP, a document on all aspects of economic planning in an independent Namibia.

169. I am particularly pleased to point out that this draft resolution has been the subject of consultations and has been approved by the contact group of the Group of African States at the United Nations. In conclusion, I appeal to all the members of the Assembly to support this draft resolution, which endeavours to ensure that Namibians will receive the assistance they need during their difficult and protracted struggle for the liberation of their homeland.

170. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting on any or all of the five draft resolutions that have just been introduced. Representatives will also have an opportunity, as usual, to explain their vote after the voting on all the draft resolutions.

171. Mr. GUERREIRO (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil will vote in favour of the five draft resolutions contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia. We shall do so because we fully support all efforts made by the United Nations to bring about the cessation of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and to promote the Territory's accession to internationally recognized independence without delay. However, with regard to draft resolution A, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa", my delegation has certain reservations on the wording of some of its paragraphs, both preambular and operative, which do not seem to contribute to the achievement of the objectives which the draft seeks to promote.

172. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): Although the question of Namibia has been considered by the United Nations for many years now, this does not in any way diminish its importance.

173. The independence of Namibia is an objective to which Australia is fully committed. We see the full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as providing the means for achieving that independence. Australia very much regrets that the

implementation of that resolution has been delayed for so long, since it contains the essential elements of an acceptable settlement within the framework of the United Nations. The repeated raising of new obstacles by the South African Government has been the main impediment to its implementation. We look to South Africa to take steps to create the necessary climate of confidence without which implementation of the resolution cannot proceed smoothly. In this regard, South Africa's aggression against its neighbours, most recently demonstrated by its hostilities against Lesotho, can only serve to undermine this climate.

174. Given the difficult situations it has sometimes faced, we can only commend the continuing and patient efforts of the contact group, and we are confident in its ability to bring about the independence of Namibia. We also wish to express our support for the front-line States, which, in the face of South Africa's intransigence, have demonstrated prudence and restraint.

175. Australia, for its part, has tried to contribute to the creation of a favourable climate within which resolution 435 (1978) can be implemented. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, we have always sought to play a constructive role in the work of the Council. But we would be less than frank if we were to deny that at times we have raised objections to the activities of the Council. One such instance has been in regard to the drafting process by which the Council agreed on the draft resolutions to be submitted to the General Assembly this year. The original draft resolutions were, in general, reasonably worded and, with one exception, refrained from name-calling and tendentious language. Unfortunately, certain countries insisted on, in our view, extravagant formulations. This has meant that Australia could not associate itself with the draft resolutions forwarded to the Assembly by the Council. In fact, on four of them we shall have no alternative but to abstain; we shall support the fifth draft resolution.

Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Vice-President, took the Chair.

176. We would much prefer that it were otherwise, since Australia, for the most part, has been a supporter of the efforts of the Council in facilitating the independence of Namibia.

177. I should like to conclude by reiterating that our commitment to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is a genuine commitment. Our hope is that the conditions which will enable the settlement to proceed with the support of all relevant parties can be achieved without any further delay.

178. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and Norway, in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions concerning the question of Namibia.

179. The Nordic countries remain firmly convinced that the people of Namibia must be permitted as soon as possible to determine their own future through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This has been clearly stated in individual statements of our delegations.

180. The Nordic countries regret that some of the draft resolutions before us do not lend themselves to an affirmative vote. This is all the more regrettable since we so strongly support the overall objective of the draft resolutions, namely, freedom and independence for Namibia. The draft resolutions contain a number of elements which cause us difficulties of principle. I shall now outline these difficulties in general terms.

181. First, as we have stated on a number of occasions, the Nordic countries cannot accept endorsement by the United Nations of the use of armed struggle. One of the basic principles of the Organization is the promotion of peaceful solutions to international problems. For the same reason, we cannot support calls for military assistance. Secondly, owing to the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account that only the Security Council can adopt decisions binding on Member States. Thirdly, the Nordic countries deplore the inappropriate and arbitrary singling out of individual countries and groups of countries. We believe this procedure is both unfair and unwise. It makes it more difficult than before to maintain the international consensus on the question of Namibia. Fourthly, all political parties enjoying popular support in Namibia must be allowed to participate in a political process through free and fair elections. SWAPO is such a party and must be part of any solution in Namibia. However, we have reservations concerning formulations which prejudice the outcome of free elections. Fifthly, we have hesitations concerning some paragraphs with sweeping financial implications. As relevant documentation has been made available only at the eleventh hour of the session, a thorough review of those implications has been made virtually impossible.

182. Mr. RAM (Fiji): As in previous years, my delegation will once again vote in favour of all the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia. We shall do so because we remain convinced that the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence should be exercised in accordance with the appropriate United Nations resolutions, including, in particular, Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

183. My delegation deplores South Africa's militarization of Namibia and South Africa's military aggression against neighbouring States, because such aggression constitutes a serious obstacle to an internationally acceptable solution to the question of Namibia. For the same reason we have reservations regarding reference to armed struggle, as contained, for instance, in paragraph 7 of draft resolution A. We also have reservations regarding the selective singling out of countries, because my delegation is of the view that this does not facilitate the independence of Namibia.

184. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria): In the course of the general debate on this question, Austria had the opportunity to reaffirm its position of principle with regard to Namibia's independence and the endeavours of the United Nations to achieve it [102nd meeting]. We have constantly stated our firm belief that the transition of

Namibia to full independence will have to be achieved by peaceful means only and as the result of negotiations. Although we can understand the impatience and disappointment of the Namibian people in view of the protracted negotiating process, its long-term benefits should be taken into account in comparison with the suffering and sacrifices which armed struggle inevitably demands. Austria is convinced that, in the light of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, armed struggle should not be endorsed or supported by General Assembly resolutions, nor should military support for any armed struggle be encouraged. Austria has, furthermore, strong reservations about the attempt to prejudge and to influence the independent work of the Security Council, an attempt which stands in contradiction to the relevant provisions of the Charter.

185. Austria is fully aware of the significant and important role which SWAPO has assumed in the fight of the Namibian people for their independence, as well as in the negotiating process, a role which undoubtedly will continue in the political future of the Territory. The final endorsement of that role, however, will be given by the Namibian people themselves in free and fair elections. The General Assembly should not prejudge this free and democratic expression of political will by the population of Namibia.

186. Austria also believes that the arbitrary singling out of certain States for condemnation is not justified and in no way advances the legitimate interests of the Namibian people. We are also concerned about the considerable financial implications of some of the proposals contained in the draft resolutions, which require a very substantive and hardly justifiable increase in the budgetary allocations. We regret that for those reasons Austria will have to abstain on draft resolutions A and D. We wish to reiterate, however, that this in no way affects Austria's firm commitment to a peaceful and negotiated transition of Namibia to independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

187. Mr. PÉREZ (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Chile will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions pertaining to the question of Namibia with the exception of draft resolution A, which we cannot support because it contains certain paragraphs which in both form and substance depart, in our judgement, from the line of moderation and conciliation that should characterize the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

188. My delegation, during the work of the Council for Namibia, has already expressed its opinion and its reservations with respect to certain paragraphs of draft resolution A. As we pointed out in our statement in the general debate here on this item [*104th meeting*], the cause of Namibia is one which all of us in the Organization support and with respect to which all of us bear responsibility. We therefore oppose the reference to and condemnation of specific countries, as we feel that to be most unwise if we wish to achieve the climate of co-operation and understanding that is essential to the attainment of a negotiated solution to the question of Namibia. That is why we also express reservations with respect to paragraph 3 of draft resolution B.

189. Mr. BARBOSA DE MEDINA (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): The exercise of the right to self-determination by the Namibian people, in keeping with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), is the subject of an unquestionable consensus on the part of the international community.

190. My Government, therefore, has followed with interest the activities of the United Nations, in particular the Secretary-General and the United Nations Council for Namibia, and of the front-line States and the contact group countries. My delegation welcomes the encouraging results which have already been achieved, while emphasizing the importance of the acceptance of the principles on which the constituent assembly and the constitution of an independent Namibia will be based: The Portuguese Government whole-heartedly supports the application of the principles of self-determination and independence to Namibia. It repeats its firm opposition to any act which might delay the process that will assure the Namibian people of their right to determine their own future. My Government has also expressly condemned the acts of aggression perpetrated by the South African authorities against neighbouring countries, in particular its military incursion into and illegal occupation of the territory of Angola. It is our conviction that the road leading to a negotiated, peaceful and internationally acceptable solution to the Namibian problem has already been laid down, and that we must encourage any active form of dialogue and joint effort which would lead to the achievement of the goals advocated by the United Nations.

191. In this context, my delegation is not able to give its support to draft resolutions which, because of their language, because of discriminatory references to certain countries or because of their less realistic appreciation of the evolution of the problem, do not constitute a positive contribution to starting the implementation of the independence plan for Namibia. That is why Portugal will abstain on draft resolutions A and B, in particular paragraphs 10, 17, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 34 and 37 of draft resolution A and paragraph 3 of draft resolution B, in spite of the support that Portugal has given to the essential goals which these draft resolutions pursue. Moreover, for this very reason of our fundamental agreement with the goals, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions C, D and E, in spite of our reservations about the financial implications of the initiatives which draft resolutions C and D advocate, as well as about the contents of paragraphs 5 and 13 of draft resolution D.

192. Mr. ULRICH (Denmark): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community.

193. In their statement in the debate [*102nd meeting*], the Ten underlined their conviction that the people of Namibia must be permitted, without further delay, to determine their own future through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Ten reaffirmed their support for all parties which have striven over the last year to bring about the achievement of independence, peace and prosperity for Namibia. The Ten regret that, in certain respects, the draft resolutions before

the Assembly do not take into consideration the efforts being made to seek a speedy solution in accordance with resolution 435 (1978) and the substantial progress which has been achieved following the resumption of the negotiating process initiated by the five Western countries of the contact group.

194. The attitude of the 10 member States of the European Community to endorsement of armed struggle in resolutions of the General Assembly is well known and has frequently been expressed in the Assembly. The Ten are conscious that the continued illegal South African occupation of Namibia suggests to many that it will be ended only through armed struggle. However, the Ten believe that the United Nations has, above all, the obligation to encourage peaceful solutions. The Ten's commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and its division of competences remains unchanged. The people of Namibia have the right to choose their own government through free and fair elections. In the view of the Ten, none of the participants in those elections should therefore be designated in advance as the sole and authentic representative of the people. The Ten reject all arbitrary and unjustified attacks on individual Member States.

195. The Ten urge all parties concerned to facilitate the conclusion of the negotiations without further delay and to refrain from actions which could endanger agreements reached.

196. Mr. TANÇ (Turkey): My Government strongly supports the ever-increasing efforts being made in order to ensure the accession of Namibia to full independence without further delay, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. The views of my Government in this regard have been set forth in detail in our address before the Assembly on 14 December 1982 [103rd meeting]. Accordingly, my delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia. However, my delegation wishes to place on record that it does not agree with the references made to one or several Western countries or to the Western region in general in the sixteenth, nineteenth and twenty-second preambular paragraphs and in paragraphs 10, 17 and 26 of draft resolution A, in paragraph 3 of draft resolution B and in paragraph 5 of draft resolution D.

197. Mr. MEESMAN (Netherlands): Sixteen years ago, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), thereby putting an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia because of its non-compliance with the obligations ensuing from the Mandate agreement and because of its refusal to carry out the previous resolutions of the General Assembly on this subject. However, South Africa has ignored resolution 2145 (XXI) and all subsequent resolutions on this issue adopted by the Assembly and has continued its illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of world opinion. Only implementation without delay of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and the United Nations plan for free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control, as approved by Security Council resolution 435 (1978), can lead to a solution to this problem. Therefore, my Government strongly supports the efforts made by all parties which have endeavoured to achieve an early and peaceful transition to self-determination and independence by the

people of Namibia, in accordance with these resolutions.

198. In view of the fact that Namibia is a particular responsibility and concern of the United Nations, the Netherlands Government believes that it is the duty of this world body to encourage these ongoing efforts. To our deep regret, however, my delegation will be unable to vote for all the draft resolutions before us because they once more contain a number of controversial and divisive elements. I shall enumerate briefly some of our principal reservations.

199. The Netherlands wishes to dissociate itself from any explicit or implicit endorsement of armed struggle. An organization which under its Charter is committed to the search for peaceful solutions cannot possibly encourage the use of violence. Nor can we agree to measures aiming at the total isolation of South Africa, for such measures would only inflict added suffering and hardship on the people of South Africa and neighbouring countries. The Netherlands therefore entered a reservation concerning the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa⁴.

200. SWAPO is undoubtedly a major political force in Namibia and as such has been directly involved in the current negotiations. However, the Netherlands feels that the recognition of SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people would prejudice the outcome of the free and democratic elections provided for in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

201. Furthermore, the objections of the Netherlands to attempts to politicize the specialized agencies or to tamper with the division of competences as laid down in the Charter are well known.

202. My Government rejects all arbitrary and unjustified attacks on individual Member States. The repeated singling out of one of the members of the contact group of five Western States, which were the authors of the plan approved in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), raises doubts about the real motive of those who insisted on the inclusion of these unfounded accusations in the draft resolutions.

203. My delegation particularly objects to paragraph 10 of draft resolution A and to the third preambular paragraph and paragraph 3 of draft resolution B. For the reasons just mentioned, the Netherlands will have to abstain on those draft resolutions.

204. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution C. However, for the reason that I have just set forth, we object to subparagraph *e* of paragraph 4.

205. We also have reservations about efforts to confer upon the United Nations Council for Namibia the same rights and privileges in international organizations as those reserved for States. The Netherlands Government considers that a continuation of the efforts of the Western contact group seems to hold out the best prospects for early, internationally recognized independence for Namibia. We therefore doubt that the proposed international conference on Namibia, to be held in Paris, will serve a useful purpose.

206. Finally, we wish to express our strong reservations about paragraph 5 of draft resolution D. We fear that the decision to entrust a sub-organ of the United Nations with tasks inimical to a group of

Member States will, if carried out, detract from the Organization's ability to seek a speedy solution to the Namibian problem.

207. Mr. GHIKAS (Greece): The delegation of Greece will vote in favour of draft resolutions A to E, in keeping with its consistent policy of support for the implementation of the declaration of the independence of Namibia as well as the struggle of the Namibian people for the attainment of their independence. However, if separate votes were to be taken, Greece would abstain on the sixteenth, nineteenth and twenty-second preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 10, 17 and 26 of draft resolution A, on paragraph 3 of draft resolution B and on paragraph 5 of draft resolution D, because of their wording and some of the elements they contain.

208. Mr. DORR (Ireland): Ireland is fully committed to the attainment of independence by Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and at the earliest possible date. That remains our position. We support the efforts of the United Nations, of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], of the front-line States and of the Western five-member contact group to achieve that goal. The United Nations plan endorsed by resolution 435 (1978) does not contain a detailed blueprint for the future relations of the States of southern Africa and clearly it will not resolve all the issues in the region; but its implementation will be an important step in that direction.

209. Ireland has always accepted that it might be necessary for the international community to bring increased pressure to bear on South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia through a series of graduated and carefully chosen measures adopted in due form by the Security Council. That is the general approach that has guided our attitude to the draft resolutions before us. I shall take each of the draft resolutions in order and refer to each.

210. My delegation can support many of the provisions contained in draft resolution A, the omnibus political draft resolution on the situation in Namibia. It is with regret, therefore, that we shall abstain on this text, as we were obliged to do on similar drafts in the past. We feel obliged to abstain as the draft resolution includes several formulations that we cannot accept. In particular, it condemns the collusion by certain Governments with South Africa, including one Government which, as a member of the Western contact group, has been engaged in a major negotiating effort this year which we hope will bring Namibia to independence in accordance with resolution 435 (1978). We find this condemnation unwarranted and divisive at a time when we believe the international community should strive to present a united front against South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. The tenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 2 of this draft resolution give explicit support to armed struggle. We know well that Namibians have so far been denied their rights and we understand the frustration that drives them to take up arms to secure independence. However, as we have made clear in the past, we do not want to see the Assembly endorse violence, especially at a time when the international community is anxiously awaiting a successful conclusion of the negotiations aimed at bringing Namibia to independence through peaceful means.

211. As regards the references to SWAPO in this and other draft resolutions, I wish to reaffirm once again that Ireland recognizes and appreciates SWAPO's widespread support and the leading role it has played in seeking independence for Namibia. We note, of course, that when free and fair elections are held under United Nations auspices and supervision—a proposal which SWAPO has accepted and which Ireland strongly supports—the people of Namibia themselves will then have the opportunity to choose their representatives freely and through a democratic process.

212. We have decided our position on draft resolution B in the light of our strong support for the United Nations plan endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We do not think that its implementation on its own merits should be further delayed. At the same time, we recognize that those who have been trying to negotiate implementation of resolution 435 (1978) must be given a certain latitude in regard to it—which may include separate efforts to resolve other issues, but without, of course, changing the terms of the plan itself. For that reason, we should not wish our vote in favour of this draft resolution to be read as endorsing the excessively categorical statement about delaying the decolonization process or as specific criticism of the efforts of the United States to secure implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Nevertheless, because of our strong feelings about Namibian independence and our strong support for the other paragraphs of draft resolution B, we have decided to vote in favour of the draft as a whole, despite our misgivings on certain aspects.

213. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution C. We shall do so because we generally support the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia and many of its recommendations. However, as our voting on some of these draft resolutions on Namibia will indicate, we do have difficulties about certain recommendations of the Council and, as we have previously indicated, we also have some reservations about the powers of the Council in regard to certain issues.

214. My delegation continues to believe that it is important that the Council should consider further ways and means of increasing the dissemination of information relating to Namibia so as to mobilize public opinion in support of the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence. We should have therefore liked to be able to vote in favour of draft resolution D, which deals with this subject. We note, however, that the divisive element which brought us to abstain on a similar draft resolution at the last session occurs again in the present draft. We cannot accept the decision in paragraph 5 whereby an international campaign to expose and denounce the collusion of certain Western countries with South Africa is to be intensified by the Assembly. We continue to feel—as we did last year when the Assembly first decided to launch the campaign—that this course of action will be harmful rather than helpful to the objectives which we all share in practice. Accordingly, and to our regret, we are obliged to abstain on a draft resolution which we could otherwise have supported.

215. Finally, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution E. As we have demonstrated by our annual contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, we feel that it performs a valuable function in providing assistance to Namibians, who have suffered so much as the result of the continued illegal occupation of their land by South Africa.

216. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): The position of my country on the question of Namibia is sufficiently well known to the Assembly. My country, a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, had the honour, as the Assembly knows, of proposing the commemoration of the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and their Liberation Movement, SWAPO. Moreover, in various international forums, my country has consistently supported and will continue to support the just and legitimate cause of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative.

217. My delegation feels that the settlement of the question of Namibia is a pre-condition for the restoration of peace and stability to that region of Africa and that the elements of such a settlement are for the most part contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978); in my delegation's opinion, the Western contact group countries have an important role to play in the scrupulous application of the entirety of that resolution. Thus, my country, while encouraging the contact group countries in their initiatives, calls on them at the same time to show greater firmness in regard to South Africa, which should comply with the international consensus on the question of Namibia without further delay.

218. In view of the commitment of my country and the positive steps taken by certain delegations, my delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions, which reflect the consensus on the question of Namibia. We are of the view, however, that the wording and formulation of certain operative paragraphs should have been improved, in the best interests of the Namibian people and all the States that are exerting efforts for the scrupulous application of resolution 435 (1978). Thus, while expressing some reservations on the wording of some parts, my delegation—I repeat—will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions proposed for our approval.

219. These remarks in no way detract from my country's commitment to the cause of the Namibian people. Quite recently, the Head of State of Senegal, in his capacity as General Secretary of the Senegalese Socialist Party, renewed his unconditional and unreserved support for the Namibian cause by having that Party adopt a motion of active solidarity with our Namibian brothers.

220. Mr. Van LIEROP (Vanuatu): On instructions from the Government of Vanuatu, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolutions contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Some delegations have already expressed reservations concerning some of the language in the draft resolutions; others will undoubtedly agree.

221. We must ask, however, is it the drafters of those draft resolutions who have gone too far, or is it the architects of South Africa's intransigence who

have gone too far? Is the language of the draft resolutions illegal and unpromising of any possible avenue of compromise, or is South Africa—whose actions are patently illegal and which arrogantly refuses any possible compromise, short of one which would lead Namibia and neighbouring African States into a permanent state of bondage and subservience—unreasonable? Have SWAPO or neighbouring African States attacked and occupied South Africa? Have SWAPO and neighbouring African States looted South Africa of its natural resources and destroyed schools, hospitals and other institutions of South Africa's national infrastructure? Now, then, can words of a resolution be equated with the violent and provocative actions of South Africa? How can we close our eyes, our ears and, indeed, our minds to all that has and has not transpired over the past 16 years?

222. Milder resolutions have been adopted in the past, but to no avail. South Africa not only has continued in its errant ways but has in fact misinterpreted patience and moderation as weakness and acquiescence.

223. Those who have the power to bring South Africa to its senses through non-violent means have chosen not to use that power. As a result, the people of Namibia have been left with no alternative but to confront the State that occupies their land. Certainly, it is not resolutions—any resolutions—that will change the situation in Namibia and free the people of that country. We are confident that the Namibian people will themselves do that, and we are mindful that actions do in fact speak louder than words.

224. We do feel, however, that it is important for every member of the international community to stand on the side of justice and equality rather than on the side of *apartheid*, or on the sidelines. We recall the fight against fascism which led to the formation of the United Nations. We recall, as well, the dignified legal manner in which the people of Namibia petitioned for a redress of their grievances, and we recall the words of others uttered here in these chambers on behalf of causes far less clear-cut than is the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

225. We reiterate here today our abhorrence of violence—all violence. We do, however, understand and recognize that the people of Namibia have been compelled by South Africa to wage armed struggle. South Africa made the decision that armed struggle would be the vehicle for its withdrawal from Namibia, and South Africa still has it in its power to choose a different path. The question is, does South Africa have the will to choose a different path? Is that State, as at present constituted, capable of choosing a different path?

226. We are voting today against South Africa and for Namibia—nothing more and nothing less.

227. Mr. ASSADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): We are profoundly pleased to vote in favour of Namibia in relation to the draft resolutions before the General Assembly. On the basis of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, we support all liberation movements and anti-imperialist struggles, as well as all the oppressed peoples of the world.

Mr. Hollai (Hungary) resumed the Chair.

228. It should, however, be added that, according to a multitude of well-authenticated documents, the *apartheid* régime of South Africa is a Zionist régime. As a matter of fact, this racist and inhuman régime is no different from the Zionist entity: both of them are manifestations of world Zionist colonialism. In this regard, we regret that the Zionist nature of the *apartheid* régime has not been clearly recognized and so defined. We are of the belief that, as long as this fact remains unrecognized, proper justice will not be done to the Namibian cause. Taking note of this fact is particularly significant in the light of the recent targeting of Latin America by world Zionist imperialism.

229. It is our firm view, therefore, that the United Nations should, in a serious, all-out and unambiguous manner, move against the ever-expanding, treacherous encroachment of the Zionist cancer.

230. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take decisions on draft resolutions A to E contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/37/24, para. 786]. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of these draft resolutions is to be found in document A/37/782.

231. The General Assembly will first take a decision on draft resolution A, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan,

Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 23 abstentions (resolution 37/233 A).⁵

232. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, 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 Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 17 abstentions (resolution 37/233 B).⁵

233. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution C, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colom-

bia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 8 abstentions (resolution 37/233 C).⁵

234. The PRESIDENT: We now come to draft resolution D, entitled "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, 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 Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 127 votes to none, with 20 abstentions (resolution 37/233 D).⁵

235. The PRESIDENT: We come now to the final draft resolution presented under this item, draft resolution E, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, 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 Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 141 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 37/233 E).⁵

236. The PRESIDENT: I call now on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

237. Mr. ODANO (Japan): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolutions A, B and D mainly for the following reasons.

238. Japan has consistently supported efforts to achieve the early independence of Namibia through peaceful means. But, as my delegation has made clear on many occasions, we do not support armed struggle. We will not support it even in the search for a settlement of the vexing question of Namibia. Further, while Japan recognizes the significant role being played by SWAPO in the movement for Namibian independence, it maintains the position that representation of the Namibian people should ultimately be determined by the Namibian people themselves, through free and fair elections.

239. Moreover, these draft resolutions contain some paragraphs which refer to and criticize by name particular Member States. My delegation does not believe that this name-calling will contribute to a solution of the problem. Further, under the present circumstances my delegation doubts whether comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa would in fact be the most effective and expeditious means of achieving the desired end.

240. In addition, while my delegation attaches importance to the dissemination of information on Namibia, we believe that the information must be accurate, fair and balanced. It is also important that close co-operation and co-ordination be maintained between the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Department of Public Information to ensure that the facilities of that Department will be utilized effectively and that information will be disseminated in a co-ordinated manner. It is essential that limited financial and human resources be utilized in an effective way.

241. My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions C and E. However, our affirmative vote should not be construed as support for all the paragraphs of the draft resolutions. My delegation's position, which it has made clear on various occasions, has not changed.

242. For reasons we have explained with regard to draft resolutions A, B and D, my delegation has reservations on some parts of the report and programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia. In addition, my delegation is obliged to point out that the report is inaccurate in its reference to my country in connection with the so-called Namibian uranium question. There is no recorded fact of the importation of uranium from Namibia into my country. In response to the steps taken by my Government, a contract for the purchase of Namibian uranium by a private company was recently cancelled. It is hoped that this situation will be accurately reflected in any future report.

243. Although we recognize and appreciate the important role the United Nations Fund for Namibia is playing, we have reservations regarding paragraph 3 of draft resolution E, which allocates \$1 million from the regular budget of the United Nations. The Fund, it should be recalled, was established as a voluntary fund.

244. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The Albanian delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia

which have just been adopted by the General Assembly. By those votes, Albania has once again shown the firm and determined support of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania for the just cause and struggle of the people of Namibia for freedom and national independence.

245. We voted in favour of, *inter alia*, draft resolution B, which in its third preambular paragraph and in paragraph 3 condemns and rejects the manoeuvres and attempts of the United States and the racist South African régime to justify their consistent actions to prevent a solution to the Namibian problem by seeking to link the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. Our delegation condemns that type of manoeuvre by American imperialism and the South African racists, the purpose of which is to delay, complicate and undermine a solution to the problem of Namibia. But my delegation also wishes to emphasize that its condemnation of these manoeuvres by the American imperialists and the South African racists does not in any way mean that Albania regards as just or approves the continued presence of foreign military troops on Angolan territory. From the outset we have disapproved of such acts, and we maintain that stand, which is based on our position of principle and our view that the sending and stationing of foreign military forces in the territory of another country is inadmissible and unjustifiable.

246. Mr. GOONETILLEKE (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka voted in favour of all the draft resolutions contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia. We did so out of full sympathy with the objectives and the general thrust of those draft resolutions.

247. However, in keeping with the foreign policy of Sri Lanka, my delegation wishes to reiterate and reaffirm its view, which has been expressed in the Assembly on numerous occasions, that it would prefer that there be no specific condemnation by name of individual countries and institutions in these draft resolutions. In this connection, my delegation wishes to make special reference to the nineteenth preambular paragraph and to paragraphs 26 and 31 of draft resolution A.

248. Mr. PAVANARIT (Thailand): My delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions under agenda item 32, in conformity with my Government's position on this issue, which is consistent and has often been repeated. It fully supports the right to self-determination of the Namibian people in a united Namibia, strongly condemns the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and endorses the call for that illegal presence to be withdrawn immediately from the Territory of Namibia to enable the Namibian people to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence.

249. The illegal occupation of Namibia by South African armed forces and their repressive measures against the local population, in defiance of the United Nations Charter and the just demand of the international community, has made it necessary for the Namibian people to engage in an intensified armed struggle under the leadership of their representative, SWAPO. On this occasion, my delegation wishes to reaffirm once again its unconditional support for the

legitimate cause and struggle of the Namibian people to attain sovereignty over their own territory and resources.

250. At the same time, South Africa should be put under sustained pressure to halt its oppressive acts towards the Namibian people, as well as the front-line States. Its recent aggression against Lesotho was rightly condemned by the world. In compliance with the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions calling for mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime, Thailand has withheld all dealings with South Africa and has for several years been applying a voluntary trade embargo against that country.

251. Although my delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions, we have reservations on parts of certain of them, particularly the nineteenth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 26 and 30 of draft resolution A and paragraph 3 of draft resolution B, which make specific references to some countries with which my country enjoys diplomatic relations. My delegation sincerely believes that the General Assembly should present a collective stand in dealing with this issue. Had countries not been named on such a selective basis, the draft resolutions would have enjoyed the broadest consensus, which they fully deserved.

252. Mr. LESETEDI (Botswana): Although Botswana voted in favour of all the draft resolutions, we reserve our position on paragraphs 31, 34 and 37 of draft resolution A.

253. Mrs. MAUALA (Samoa): Samoa has supported all the draft resolutions, in line with our strong support for the speedy attainment of independence by Namibia.

254. On draft resolution A, however, we have reservations regarding the texts of several paragraphs, and especially where there is a selective singling out of countries for condemnation.

255. Mr. VANREUSEL (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution B. Belgium duly appreciates the efforts undertaken by the United States Government to reach a positive solution to the Namibian problem. However, Belgium has already expressly rejected the establishment of a linkage between the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola and the achievement of Namibian independence. Indeed, we find it unwise to set any pre-conditions for the implementation of the plan that has already been approved by the Security Council. I would add that where this question is concerned Belgium sees no alternative to a negotiated solution.

256. Mr. HLAING (Burma): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A to E.

257. Over the many years that the question of Namibia has figured as a perennial item on the agenda of the Organization, Burma has consistently advocated and striven for the speedy emergence of an independent and sovereign State of Namibia. To allow it to continue to remain in its present anomalous status of dependence, tutelage and illegal occupation will not only make a mockery of the principles enshrined in

the Charter but will also be a great disservice to the cause of international peace and security.

258. The draft resolutions that the Assembly in its wisdom has just adopted certainly contain many elements which, if faithfully implemented by all concerned, cannot fail to show us the way towards the peaceful transition of Namibia to independence and nationhood. With this in mind, we voted in favour of the draft resolutions, even though we would not claim them to be entirely flawless and the best that was possible. My delegation, however, would like to register its reservations on the formulation and wording of certain paragraphs, namely, the sixteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 26 of draft resolution A.

259. Mr. BAYONA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions with regard to the question of Namibia, consistent with its position in favour of putting an end to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and of enabling the Namibian people to accede to independence. We should like, however, to point out the importance of giving priority to the use of peaceful means in the solution of international conflicts, in keeping with the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. Similarly, my delegation wishes to express its reservations with respect to references to certain countries by name. Singling out those countries for condemnation can give the text a biased and, therefore, discriminatory meaning.

260. Mr. ESSY (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): The cause of Namibia is, above all, an African cause and thus it is an Ivory Coast cause. The Ivory Coast, which is a founding member of the OAU, will spare no sacrifice to make its modest contribution to the solution of that problem, a fact that will one day be recognized by the various protagonists that are struggling on every front to hasten the dawn of Namibian independence, which is the true wish of the entire community. My delegation, however, abstained in the vote on draft resolution A, since we feel that some of its wording is inappropriate and untimely and contributes little to progress towards the common goal we seek.

261. Mr. ADDABASHI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Now that the General Assembly has adopted the draft resolutions concerning the question of Namibia, it gives me pleasure to express my delegation's satisfaction with the results of that voting, which show that the struggle of the Namibian people enjoys increasing support from the international community. This can only bolster the will of that valiant people and their resolve to attain their right to self-determination and independence.

262. My delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions, and we wish to commend the United Nations Council for Namibia for the meritorious efforts it made in preparing them.

263. Certain countries, however, did not support the draft resolutions and explicitly stated that they opposed reference to the fact that SWAPO is the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Thus, they have attempted to support the racist South African régime in order that it can carry out its schemes in the Territory and attempt to set up certain puppet

parties through which it can deceive international public opinion.

264. The position of SWAPO among the Namibian people and SWAPO's efforts for the Territory's independence are undeniable. Those who oppose the Namibian people's recourse to armed struggle are virtually telling them that they must acquiesce in persecution, oppression and murder, and this is something that neither the Namibian people nor other peace-loving peoples can accept.

265. One delegation, which expressed its point of view with regard to SWAPO and the armed struggle, attacked my delegation last week in the Security Council, accusing us of not contributing to solving the problem of southern Africa. At the same time, that delegation expressed his country's commitment to the search for a solution to the problem of southern Africa, although we note today that delegation's opposition to the draft resolutions. That is not unusual for that country, whose history is replete with tragedies it has inflicted on the peoples it colonized during its long colonial past. With regard to the problem of the Middle East, it handed over Palestine to the Zionists; and with regard to the problem of southern Africa, it has enabled the racists to entrench themselves in Namibia. In addition, there are other problems in the world, including that of the Malvinas Islands, which result from the policy of that country. One statesman has said that without that State the United Nations would not have come into existence—in other words, there would have been no problems requiring the setting up of the Organization.

266. The affirmative votes by my country and other peace-loving countries on the draft resolutions flow from a firm belief in the justice of the cause of the Namibian people. These draft resolutions support the Namibian people's struggle. A vote against them contributes nothing to a solution to the problem and is tantamount to support for the racist régime in its occupation of Namibia.

267. We hope that the draft resolutions the Assembly has just adopted will contribute to awakening the conscience of the imperialist countries and will influence them to change their position and join the international support for boycotting the South African *apartheid* régime and putting pressure on it to withdraw from the Territory of Namibia.

268. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Uruguay voted in favour of the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia. In the annual consideration of this item, we increasingly observe a simplification of positions, with less attention being paid to the many aspects involved, so much so that the vote, rather than being an expression of position on the text, takes on the character of a political statement on the substance of the Namibian question. It is in this context that the vote of my delegation should be interpreted, a vote which has been cast to show clearly our position with respect to the substance of the question a position that has been explained on a number of occasions—namely, the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, freedom and independence, preserving its territorial integrity; the responsibility of the United Nations in the administration

and in the process of independence; compliance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) as the indispensable basis of that process; and the illegality of South Africa's occupation and the internal measures that have been adopted.

269. However, my delegation wishes at the same time to place on record its strong reservations about various aspects of the text. For example, armed struggle cannot be institutionalized as a normal remedy; the representation of the Namibian people should be decided upon by that people itself, in the exercise of its self-determination; relations between States are conducted in a sovereign manner by those States, and the limitation or restriction of that right is exclusively within the competence of the Security Council; and international economic and financial bodies are governed by their respective statutes and should not be politicized. Similarly, my delegation dissociates itself from the specific references to Member States. In particular, we place on record our reservation concerning paragraph 3 of draft resolution B.

270. Finally, my delegation would have liked the draft resolutions to contain reference to the progress made through the negotiations conducted to date with the participation of the front-line countries, the Western contact group and SWAPO. It is to be hoped that the way of peace and law will be the outcome of the attempt to attain the aims of the United Nations.

271. Mr. BLAIN (Gambia): In keeping with our strong position over the years on the question of Namibia, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A to E. However, I wish to state categorically that had we voted separately on the nineteenth preambular paragraph and on paragraphs 26 and 30 of draft resolution A, my delegation would have abstained, because each of those paragraphs single out certain Member States. The paragraphs are counter-productive and certainly do not contribute positively to an early solution of the Namibian problem.

272. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/152, of 20 December 1976, I call on the Observer of the South West Africa People's Organization, who wishes to make a statement.

273. Mr. MUESHIHANGE (South West Africa People's Organization): I am grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the members of the Assembly for once again allowing a representative of our movement to make a statement to the Assembly.

274. In the debate on the question of Namibia, concluded last week, no fewer than 86 delegations participated, and the international community resolutely reaffirmed its unswerving solidarity with, and support for, the heroic struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. Virtually all the speakers commended the Namibian patriots for the sacrifices they are making in their struggle for the right to self-determination, freedom and genuine independence. At the same time, most of the representatives condemned the racist, illegal régime of *apartheid* South Africa for its State terrorism, aggression and generalized repression against the Namibian people, in total disregard of the numerous resolutions of the United Nations, which demand the immediate and uncondi-

tional withdrawal of the racists and their occupation forces from our country.

275. In this connection, our delegation was pleased to note the strong condemnation and rejection of the ever-increasing collaboration by the major North Atlantic Treaty Organization Powers and their transnational corporations with the illegal régime in Namibia in the plunder of Namibia's natural resources and the ruthless and criminal exploitation of the people, in the interests of super-profits which are wholly taken out of the country by the inimical foreign interests.

276. We welcome and appreciate this continued close association of progressive and justice-upholding mankind with the sacred cause of Namibia, a Territory which is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until its independence.

277. The moment of truth has finally arrived. The Assembly has just taken a series of decisions on the draft resolutions introduced so brilliantly by the representatives of Bulgaria, Guyana, India, Nigeria and Venezuela on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia. We are grateful to them, and wish to express our gratitude to the Council for the splendid work done to produce these drafts.

278. As in previous years, a clear and convincing majority has emerged, unreservedly supporting the Namibian people and SWAPO in the patriotic struggle to regain their freedom and national independence. The vote clearly underscores this fact.

279. A group of delegations pressed the ambivalent yellow button, which is a polite way of saying "no". This group consists of two types. On the one hand, there are those countries that are among our friends, providing invaluable humanitarian and financial assistance, thus enabling SWAPO to cater to the needs of the Namibian refugees residing primarily in Angola and Zambia. These countries have customarily expressed difficulties that they have encountered in some of the draft resolutions, owing, they say, to certain internal constitutional and legal constraints. It is our sincere hope that they will in the near future rise above those temporary impediments and show the courage of their convictions, which they otherwise so ably and repeatedly articulate, by voting in favour of draft resolutions on Namibia. Promises and kind words are heartening, but actions are most imperative to us at this critical stage in our struggle against fascist domination and foreign exploitation.

280. On the other hand, there are the members of the contact group, who conveniently use the pretext of being the "political brokers" in the Namibia talks and who therefore cannot, supposedly, join the overwhelming majority by voting affirmatively. This position has never been convincing to us. In our view, what hamstringing them are their widespread relations of collaboration with the *apartheid* régime and their preoccupation with strategic interests and other global considerations, which have always proved to be obstacles to Namibia's freedom. These are people who, in strong words, condemn and reject *apartheid* and illegality from one side of their mouths but, at the same time, whisper encouraging words from the other side of their mouths to the racists as friends and allies, and continue business as usual

with them. Ironically, the very authors of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) are today busy diluting the spirit and the letter of that resolution.

281. We listened just now to the same broken records signifying nothing—except to cover up manoeuvres and machinations, while the Namibians continue to suffer as hostages in their own fatherland.

282. I must make reference to a strange but predictable thing that happened during the first few days of the Assembly's debate on Namibia. On the very day that the debate started, misleading articles were planted in major Western newspapers, especially *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, in a sinister attempt to upstage the debate and to create the impression that serious efforts were afoot which would produce Namibia's independence in the near future. Of course, that was not true. But that kind of cheap antics underlines more clearly the cozy relations that exist between the politicians, opinion-makers and the mass media in the West, with their interlocking interests. Needless to say, our support in this regard is for the establishment of a new world information order.

283. In conclusion, I wish to thank all those delegations—the majority—which voted in our favour. I reassure them that, with their support and the cooperation of numerous other forces the world over, we are waging an international struggle against imperialism, colonialism, racism, *apartheid*, Zionism and hegemonism. The struggle will and must continue until that certain final victory.

284. In particular, we appreciate the categorical rejection of the linkage issue—which is a false and extraneous issue—to the settlement of the Namibian problem.

285. SWAPO reiterates its readiness to work with the United Nations Council for Namibia, as in the past, in the common struggle leading to the decolonization of Namibia without further delay. In this context, we wish to congratulate Mr. Mishra upon the recommendation for his reappointment as United Nations Commissioner for Namibia. We trust that the Assembly will endorse him unanimously.

286. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Zambia, in his capacity as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, wishes to make a statement, and I now call on him.

287. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I should like to thank all those Member States which participated in the debate on the question of Namibia.

288. The draft resolutions which the United Nations Council for Namibia recommended to the thirty-seventh session—and which were endorsed by the contact group of African States acting on behalf of the Group of African States at the United Nations—have been adopted by large majorities. We thank those who voted for the draft resolutions, thus making it clear to South Africa that the international community stands solidly behind the Namibian people in their struggle for justice, liberty, freedom and independence.

289. Two thirds of the entire United Nations membership participated in the debate on this question, condemning the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa in defiance of the numerous United Nations resolutions and the decisions of the International Court of Justice. Many representatives have reiterated their support for United Nations-supervised elections that would lead to full Namibian independence. Many representatives have also expressed their disappointment at the introduction of irrelevant issues in the negotiations for the settlement of the Namibian problem. They have rejected any linkage between the settlement of the Namibian problem and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

290. We were dismayed by the statement made in the Assembly on 15 December [105th meeting] on behalf of the Western five. Only in one sentence and in the context of criticizing the draft resolutions presented to the Assembly did the statement refer to Namibian independence. The statement of the Western five seemed to equate the aggressor, which is the racist Pretoria régime, with the victim, which is the Namibian people. It departed from earlier perceptions, as we understood and continue to understand them, as it shifted responsibility for achieving a settlement to what it called "the sovereign States of southern Africa". Where, I ask, are the Namibian people in this new equation? To what role have the Western five relegated them? Even some of Pretoria's propaganda has started to hint at the possibility of a SWAPO-led victory in the elections. Are the Western five becoming more royal than the king? And when the Western five said in their statement that they "denounce violence from whatever source", were they calling on the Namibian freedom fighters to lay down their arms? Is that neutrality? No, in our view that is bias against what the majority of the Assembly stands for.

291. Both the statements by Member States and the resolutions just adopted make it quite clear that South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its aggression against independent African States in the region have created a situation that is a threat to international peace and security. The General Assembly, by these resolutions, gives a mandate to the United Nations Council for Namibia to establish a worthy and extensive programme of work; it calls for appropriate action by Member States; it provides for increased action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations; it establishes a wide-ranging programme of dissemination of information and a programme of assistance to Namibians through the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

292. A number of Member States abstained in the voting on the draft resolutions. The United Nations Council for Namibia would like to believe that those Member States still support the spirit of the resolutions adopted. I am confident that they too share with us the deep desire to see the people of Namibia attain their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

293. In the opening speech which I had the honour to deliver at the 101st meeting, on 13 December, I spoke of the euphoria which had dissipated with regard to an early breakthrough in the implementation

of the United Nations plan for a Namibian settlement. A press release issued by the Mission of the racist régime of South Africa on 15 December 1982 gives the most up-to-date picture of the imperial mentality of the Pretoria régime. In that press release, they characterize the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia in mobilizing public opinion as a "cynical propaganda campaign". They talk of the Council's membership in these words: "Of the 31 members of the Council less than half are regarded as being more free than Namibia". There was not one single word in that press release which did not drip venom and hatred of Africa in regard to Namibia's independence. That press release was in reality Pretoria's answer to the Assembly's work, at the thirty-seventh session, connected with Namibia's liberation. The racists of Pretoria must be made to come to their senses. For who but Pretoria can equate sovereignty in all African States with the denial of freedom in Namibia? Who but Pretoria and the participants in the Berlin Conference of 1885, which ushered in the scramble for the colonization of Africa, could justify an illegal occupation on the basis of the so-called material benefits which the racist occupiers are boasting about bringing to Namibia? Who but Pretoria, which is dreaming of an empire, could still claim that many black men and women are better off in servitude than in freedom?

294. Questions have been raised here today about the nature of the United Nations Council for Namibia and its status. These same questions were raised on 18 December 1982 by some members in the Fifth Committee. These, of course, were relevant questions, as they related to the need for the Council's entire membership to attend meetings away from Headquarters.

295. The United Nations Council for Namibia, by General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V), is the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence. It is, in effect, the *de jure* Government, which is prevented from exercising its duties in pre-independent Namibia by South Africa's illegal occupation. Several procedures flow from the Council's status. The 31 representatives on the Council have, in effect, a dual capacity. As members of their permanent missions to the United Nations they are national representatives; but as members of the Council they, collectively, are the representatives of Namibia. This is the essence of Namibia being the responsibility of this world Organization until independence. This explains the special procedures which relate to the annual elections of the President, Vice-Presidents and Committee Chairmen, as well as to the designation of the Council's delegations and missions to Governments, institutions and meetings of members of the United Nations family of organizations, and so on. This also explains the procedure for collective travel by the Council for plenary meetings away from Headquarters. It also explains the procedure for designation of an Acting President of the Council, usually from among the Vice-Presidents of the Council, whenever the President is away from Headquarters.

296. Therefore, if there are countries—and I now know that there are—that are still in doubt about the legality of the Council being the legal Administering

Authority for Namibia until independence, we can propose only one practical way to resolve their doubts, and that is the following: help Namibia secure its genuine independence and freedom now and we, as the legal Government of Namibia, will be the happiest Government on earth to leave office.

297. The United Nations Council for Namibia, in conformity with its mandate as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, will continue its efforts to mobilize world opinion in support of the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, for self-determination, freedom and national independence. It is with this objective in mind that the General Assembly has called upon the Secretary-General, in consultation with the United Nations Council for Namibia and with the OAU, to organize at UNESCO House, in Paris, in 1983, an International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence. We regard that Conference, as it was regarded by 31 Heads of African States and Governments that met at Tripoli in November 1982, as a major event which the entire world community should fully support.

298. Before concluding, I should like to gaze for a few seconds across the far horizons, all the way to Namibia. On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I should like to tell the Namibians the following: the world community is with you; the United Nations Charter is with you; international legality is with you; all freedom-loving people everywhere are with you; our hearts and prayers for the speedy end of your ordeal and the dawn of your victory are with you.

AGENDA ITEM 17

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (continued): **(k) Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia**

299. The PRESIDENT: In his note in document A/37/772, the Secretary-General proposes the exten-

sion of the appointment of Mr. Brajesh Chandra Mishra as United Nations Commissioner for Namibia for a one-year term beginning on 1 January 1983. May I take it that the General Assembly approves this proposal?

It was so decided (decision 37/324).

300. The PRESIDENT: I congratulate Mr. Mishra on the extension of his appointment.

AGENDA ITEM 142

Observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Simón Bolívar, the Liberator

301. The PRESIDENT: I have been informed by the Chairman of the Latin American Group that the Group has decided to take measures to commemorate in an appropriate manner the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Simón Bolívar. May I assume that the General Assembly takes note of that decision of the Latin American Group?

It was so decided (decision 37/443).

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.

NOTES

¹ See *Report of the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, Paris, 1-14 September 1981* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.I.8), part two, para. 88.

² TD/B/918.

³ *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

⁴ *Report of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, Paris, 20-27 May 1981 (A/CONF.107/8), sect. X.*

⁵ The delegations of Lesotho and Swaziland subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.