



**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 6th MEETING**

**Chairman: Mr. PETERS (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines)**

**CONTENTS**

**REQUESTS FOR HEARING**

**AGENDA ITEM 109: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)**

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2 750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

88-56114 0373S (E)

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.4/43/SR.6  
19 October 1988  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

/...

98

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

REQUESTS FOR HEARING (A/C.4/43/3/Add.1, A/C.4/43/7/Add.2 and 3)

Western Sahara

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it a request for hearing concerning the question of Western Sahara (A/C.4/43/3/Add.1). If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to grant the request.

2. It was so decided.

Namibia

3. The CHAIRMAN said that two requests for hearing concerning the question of Namibia (A/C.4/43/7/Add.2 and 3) had been submitted to the Committee. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to grant the requests.

4. It was so decided.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that a communication containing a request for hearing relating to Namibia, under agenda item 29, had been submitted to the Committee. He suggested that, in accordance with the usual practice, the communication should be circulated as a document of the Committee and considered at a subsequent meeting.

6. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 109: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (A/43/23 (Part III)) (continued)

7. Mr. TAQI (Bahrain) said that the United Nations had played a very important role in decolonization. However, many people remained under the colonial yoke, suffering repression, persecution and exploitation of their natural resources by the administering Powers. The activities of foreign economic interests in the colonial Territories were a flagrant violation of article 16 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 3281 (XXIX), for such activities deprived peoples of their basic right to control their natural resources and constituted an obstacle to their liberation. That applied to Namibia as well, as clearly demonstrated in the report of Standing Committee II on the activities of foreign economic interests operating in Namibia (A/AC.131/286).

8. Despite the adoption of various United Nations resolutions, the pronouncement of the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971 and Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia promulgated by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974, foreign transnational

(Mr. Taqi Bahrain)

corporations, together with South Africa, had continued to plunder the Territory's abundant natural resources. It had been clearly demonstrated in recent years that the profits which those corporations obtained from their exploitation of the resources of the occupied Territories were transferred abroad and made no contribution at all to the economic and social development of the peoples of the colonial Territories.

9. His delegation supported the recommendations of the Special Committee contained in chapters IV and V of its report (A/43/23 (Part III)). It also supported the struggle of all peoples to exercise their rights to freedom, self-determination and independence. It reiterated its support for the Namibian people and all the repressed peoples of southern Africa and welcomed the recent talks between Cuba, Angola, South Africa and the United States designed to find a just solution to the question of Namibia and put an end to that Territory's illegal occupation, so that its people could exercise the right to self-determination under the leadership of its sole legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). Bahrain re-emphasized the need to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only means of securing Namibia's full independence, and it expressed the hope that the resolution would be implemented in the near future.

10. Ms. BUNTON (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, reminded the members of the Committee that under General Assembly resolution 748 (VIII) Puerto Rico had been removed from the United Nations list of Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Office of Legal Affairs had supported that position at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly in its legal opinion that the question of Puerto Rico was not within the jurisdiction of the Committee. In 1982 a vote in the General Assembly had upheld the recommendation of the General Committee that the question of Puerto Rico should not be on the agenda, thereby recognizing the contention of the United States that the subject should not be considered by the United Nations.

11. For those reasons, Puerto Rico was not represented in the United Nations, and therefore not in the Committee either, so that continuing discussion of the question was a refusal to recognize the decision of the General Assembly, the opinion of the Office of Legal Affairs and, most importantly, the freely expressed wishes of the Puerto Rican people itself.

12. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution on foreign economic and other interests and the draft decision on military activities proposed by the Special Committee (A/42/43 (Part III), chap. IV, para. 10 and chap. V, para. 10).

13. Mr. NEZERITIS (Greece), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that he wished to reiterate on behalf of the twelve States members of the European Community their support for all the efforts to eliminate colonialism, the inhuman system of apartheid, and racial discrimination in South Africa. He also reaffirmed the Twelve's unshakeable commitment to the right of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to self-determination in accordance with the Charter

(Mr. Nezeritis, Greece)

of the United Nations and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

14. The Twelve realized that the policy of the Government of South Africa was the reason for the continued oppression, instability and suffering in the region and they condemned once again the activities of foreign economic and other interests which impeded the process of self-determination both in the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia and its adjacent waters and in the other Non-Self-Governing Territories. However, it must be remembered that those activities were often of fundamental importance for the Territories' social and economic development. The draft resolution before the Committee did not recognize that fact, for it made no distinction between the different types of activity in question. He recalled the appeals made by the Committee in various resolutions and decisions for acceleration and expansion of economic development in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

15. The Twelve reiterated the reservations they had made in previous years regarding a number of specific paragraphs in the draft resolution which failed to take into account the provisions of the Charter concerning the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council. They also deplored the fact that individual countries were again singled out, in particular in operative paragraph 17.

16. The Twelve also wished to express their concern at the proposal to vote on the draft decision relating to military activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories, since that was a subject which did not appear on the list of agenda items allocated to the Fourth Committee by the General Assembly.

17. The Twelve were therefore unable to support the draft resolution and draft decision before the Committee.

18. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said that his delegation endorsed fully the statement made by the representative of Greece on behalf of the member States of the European Community. However, he wished to make some additional comments as representative of a State which administered a number of small Territories which were on the Committee's agenda. The draft resolution which the Committee had before it was based once again on the false assumption that the impact of foreign economic activities in so-called Non-Self-Governing Territories was, without exception, detrimental to those Territories and, by definition, prevented their inhabitants from exercising their right of self-determination.

19. The theory of economic imperialism quite simply did not fit the situation in the British dependent Territories. The pace of economic development in those Territories was not controlled by outsiders, but by democratically elected local governments. In a number of Territories, in the Caribbean for example, local and foreign concerns frequently co-operated in such sectors as tourism, banking and real estate, which were the basic motor for economic growth. As a result, jobs were created, government and private revenues were increased and standards of living, health care, education and welfare were improved.

(Mr. Smith, United Kingdom)

20. His Government and the governments of the Territories concerned were well aware of the dangers of concentrating on only one or two economic sectors and were doing what they could to broaden the economic base in those Territories. However, the options open to small island Territories were not limitless and growth in even one sector could lead to growth in others. That was one reason why the dependent Territories continued to welcome and encourage foreign investment.

21. Many of the 44 paragraphs of the draft resolution had stood unchanged for years; despite the repeated calls of his and other delegations, nowhere in them was there any acknowledgement whatsoever of the essential contribution that foreign investment and the activities of foreign interests could and did make to the economic and social advancement of the peoples of dependent Territories. Without an adequate economic base, those peoples could not realistically aspire to independence, but the economic benefits of foreign investment brought closer the day when they could progress towards that goal.

22. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

23. Mr. TAARBORG (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, reaffirmed their support for all realistic measures taken in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in all Territories under colonial domination, including Namibia, and to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa.

24. The Government of South Africa was undoubtedly responsible for the oppression and instability in the region. The Nordic countries condemned the activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the decolonization process in Namibia and other Non-Self-Governing Territories, and were opposed to the exploitation of their natural resources, including the marine resources of the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia.

25. The draft resolution, however, failed to acknowledge that the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the different Territories could be beneficial to their economic and social development; in so doing, the draft resolution strayed from its basic objective. Moreover, the Nordic countries had reservations concerning a number of specific paragraphs which failed to take into account the division of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council.

26. They also had reservations concerning the draft decision on military activities, particularly since it entailed implicit United Nations support for armed struggle, when, in fact, one of the principles of the Charter was to promote peaceful solutions. They also deplored the continued practice of singling out individual countries and groups of countries as supporters of the policies of the Government of South Africa.

27. The Nordic countries would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution and the draft decision.

28. Ms. MILLER (Canada), said that Canada had consistently supported the decolonization process and efforts to achieve a peaceful transition towards independence. Canada shared the hopes expressed by other delegations for the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia. It had provided significant development assistance to the people of Namibia and other colonial Territories, as a means of promoting economic viability and accelerating the process of self-determination.

29. There should be no doubt about Canada's policies with regard to southern Africa or its determination to co-operate with other nations in removing all impediments to self-determination for the peoples of that region. While it accepted much of the content of the material submitted to the Committee under the present item, Canada did not readily accept assumptions such as the blanket condemnation of foreign economic and other interests in colonial Territories and the call for the immediate withdrawal of colonial Powers from all military bases and installations. The reports and draft resolutions before the Committee gave the distinct impression that all foreign economic activities in colonial Territories, particularly those of Western countries and transnational corporations, were inherently evil. That did not square with the facts. Her delegation was therefore unable to support the draft resolution.

30. As in the past, Canada would vote against the draft decision on military activities which, in its view, was unrelated to the item under consideration. Furthermore, the draft decision contained misleading and tendentious language which Canada could not accept.

31. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/43/23 (Part III), chap. IV, para. 10).

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

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

**Abstaining:** Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Guyana, Iceland, Ireland, Norway, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Spain, Sweden.

32. The draft resolution was adopted by 79 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions.

33. A recorded vote was taken on the draft decision contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/43/23 (Part III), chap. V, para. 10).

**In favour:** Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

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

**Abstaining:** Australia, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Guyana, Iceland, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

34. The draft decision was adopted by 76 votes to 11, with 13 abstentions.

35. Ms. WILLBERG (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation's vote in favour of the resolution on the activities of foreign economic and other interests reflected its concern that such interests should not be allowed to impede the progress of Non-Self-Governing Territories towards development and self-determination. Nevertheless, New Zealand did not believe that all foreign economic interests were necessarily detrimental, and considered that, under reasonable controls and guidelines, foreign investment and trade could be a spur to development.

36. While her delegation had reservations about some of the paragraphs concerning Namibia, its vote was confirmation of New Zealand's opposition to the unacceptable exploitation of Namibia's resources and its total opposition to the policies of the Government of South Africa in that Territory. The United Nations had the responsibility to ensure that the natural resources of Namibia, like those of other Non-Self-Governing Territories, were protected for the people of those Territories

(Ms. Willberg, New Zealand)

to use when they came to enjoy independence. In that regard, New Zealand again endorsed the call by the Council for Namibia for the proclamation of an exclusive economic zone off Namibia's coast in order to protect its valuable marine resources.

37. Her Delegation also regretted the tendency to criticize administering Powers, indiscriminately, for, as the reports of the Special Committee confirmed, those criticisms were not applicable in the case of New Zealand's administration of Tokelau.

38. New Zealand continued to have reservations regarding the decision on military activities and had therefore abstained in the vote on that decision.

39. Miss WICKES (Australia) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on foreign economic and other interests in Non-Self-Governing Territories because it believed that such activities must not impede the Territories' progress towards self-government and independence. Australia had consistently condemned apartheid and supported immediate independence for Namibia on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It had also taken concrete action with respect to South Africa and Namibia.

40. Her delegation had reservations regarding certain aspects of the resolution on foreign economic interests, however. In the first place, there was an inherent contradiction between across-the-board condemnation of foreign investment in Non-Self-Governing Territories and the appeals, contained in the draft texts on individual Territories, to speed up their economic development. If properly handled and monitored, foreign investment could make a useful contribution to economic development through the injection of new technology and skills.

41. Secondly, it was regrettable that the draft resolution was largely silent about the activities of those countries from East and West that conducted fishing activities off Namibia's coast. Such activities constituted an obstacle to Namibia's early independence and economic future. Notwithstanding the call by the United Nations Council for Namibia for the proclamation of an exclusive economic zone off the Namibian coast, those fishing activities continued without the Council's endorsement and without any revenue accruing to the Namibian people. It was disturbing that, for narrowly political reasons, such a depletion of Namibia's heritage should be overlooked. Lastly, her delegation's support for the resolution was not to be taken as an indication that it accepted SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

42. Australia had abstained in the vote on the draft decision on military activities, not only because it had substantive problems with the text, but also because the item was not on the Committee's agenda.

43. Mr. AMORIN (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution and the decision because it supported the process of decolonization, which was based on the principle of self-determination and on the need to reaffirm



(Mr. Amorin, Uruguay)

the obligations of administering Powers with regard to the development of Non-Self-Governing Territories and the protection of their natural resources.

44. His delegation had reservations regarding certain aspects of the resolution and decision, however. Firstly, their underlying objectives could be achieved through much more concise texts, with a concomitant increase in their force and political impact. Secondly, condemnation of foreign activities should not be indiscriminate, since activities that might benefit the local populations would thereby be included. Of course, that was not true of Namibia, where the result of any type of economic activity promoted from abroad was to encourage continued occupation of the Territory by South Africa, which had been expressly ruled out by the United Nations in successive resolutions.

45. Lastly, his delegation continued to entertain doubts as to the appropriateness of including the question of military activities under the item on foreign economic interests.

46. Mr. CISTERNAS (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution and the decision because his country fully supported the decolonization process and rejected apartheid and racial discrimination. However, his delegation had certain reservations regarding the failure to draw a distinction between the various types of economic activities carried out in Non-Self-Governing Territories, particularly in the small Territories where some foreign investment was undoubtedly welcome, and necessary for the future of those Territories under independence.

47. His delegation also had reservations regarding the singling out of individual countries and the support expressed for armed struggle in the decision.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 109. In accordance with the usual practice, he proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report on the item directly to the General Assembly.

49. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.20 a.m.