



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 13th MEETING

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

CONTENTS

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

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

AGENDA ITEM 108: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 110: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM 111: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 112: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (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.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/43/SR.13
27 October 1988

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to three communications containing requests for hearings relating to the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) (A/C.4/43/9 and Add.1-2). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to grant those requests.

2. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued) (A/43/23 (Parts IV and VI), 226, 671, 680* (reissued); A/C.4/43/L.2, L.6, L.7; A/AC.109/934-936, 937 and Corr.1, 938-941, 942 and Corr.1, 943, 944 and Corr.1, 945 and Add.1-2, 946-950, 952 and Corr.1, 953-957, 959, 963 and 964)

AGENDA ITEM 108: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 a OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/43/23 (Part IV), 219, 226, 658; A/C.4/43/L.7)

AGENDA ITEM 110: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/43/23 (Part IV), 355 and Add. 1-3; A/C.4/43/L.7; A/AC.109/L.1665; E/1988/81)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/43/3 (chaps. I and VI), 226)

AGENDA ITEM 111: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued) (A/43/681; A/C.4/43/L.3 and L.7)

AGENDA ITEM 112: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (continued) (A/43/677; A/C.4/43/L.4 and L.7)

General Debate (continued)

3. Mrs. KING-ROUSSEAU (Trinidad and Tobago) expressed cautious optimism regarding developments in south-western Africa on the threshold of the long-awaited implementation of the plan for the independence of Namibia in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Given the deceptive and obstructionist policies of the Pretoria régime over the years and its brutal treatment of the Namibian people, however, apprehension was justified and no effort should be spared to bring to a close the final chapter of that tragedy in southern Africa.

(Mrs. King-Rousseau, Trinidad
and Tobago)

4. On the question of Western Sahara, her delegation welcomed the agreement by Morocco and the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro (Frente POLISARIO) to a peace plan for the Territory. Their faithful compliance with that agreement and their full co-operation with the Special Representative for Western Sahara were, of course, needed.
5. Given the imminent resolution of the questions of Namibia and Western Sahara, all but two of the remaining dependent Territories would be small island developing countries. That posed a fresh challenge to the Organization, since the new phase of decolonization would call for innovation and flexibility. The small island developing countries were particularly vulnerable to certain threats, such as natural disasters, the deplorable use of those islands, especially in the Caribbean, as dumping grounds for toxic wastes by industrialized States and illicit drug trafficking, which affected particularly Bermuda, the Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands.
6. The small island dependencies in the Caribbean and the Pacific could not afford the luxury of self-delusion. Their limited human, natural and financial resources made dependence on external financial and technical resources inevitable. Proper safeguards, however, must be taken to ensure that the benefits deriving from such unequal relationships were in accordance with the long-term development goals of the colonies.
7. In addition, of course, the small colonies encountered problems that were less related to their small size than to their colonial status. One such example was the inability of the territorial Government of Bermuda to impose stronger sanctions against South Africa than those imposed by the administering Power. Yet another example was the continued sale of the valuable land in the Cayman Islands to foreigners, and the foreign control of property and land development there. When a territorial Government sought control of areas which it believed should be within its jurisdiction, as was the case in the United States Virgin Islands, where control of immigration was being sought, the United Nations should address itself to the issue, taking heed of the concerns of the dependent peoples. The Committee should continue to explore ways to give expression to the principle that territorial size, geographical location, size of population and limited natural resources should in no way delay implementation of the Declaration on decolonization.
8. Mr. TEQ (Singapore) observed that after the Second World War there had been 750 million people living under colonial rule, whereas only 3 million could now rightly be classified as colonial subjects, a testimony to the undoubted success of the United Nations in decolonization. A new wind of détente and dialogue throughout the world had ushered in a new phase of decolonization. There were the recent indications of a genuine movement towards Namibia's independence, as an outcome of the quadripartite talks. In still other instances, such as New Caledonia, negotiations, regional consultations or United Nations mediation seemed to be having results.

(Mr. Teo, Singapore)

9. Perhaps the time had come for the Committee to consider seriously what its role should be in the coming years, once decolonization was completed. It could not be claimed that the United Nations had been extremely successful in decolonization while at the same time preserving unchanged the Committee which dealt with decolonization. One alternative was for the Committee to stop its work altogether when the time came, as the Trusteeship Council had virtually done; or it could carefully review its mandate to see whether it should be concerned with new challenges. Since the colonial domination that was coming to an end was likely to surface again in different forms, Singapore suggested that the Committee could begin its work the following year with a review of the old forms of colonialism and a consideration of new forms of domination that might in fact be colonialism in another guise.

10. Mr. ORTIZ-GANDARILLAS (Bolivia), reiterating his country's support for all peoples struggling for freedom and independence, particularly in southern Africa, noted that positive developments were occurring in certain Territories. Bolivia hoped, for instance, that the parties to the dispute over Western Sahara would, through the good offices of the Secretary-General, rapidly find a just solution.

11. In other areas, however, progress toward decolonization seemed very slow or non-existent. In Namibia, the racist oppression of a valiant people was being escalated, as were the militarization of the Territory and the exploitation of its human and natural resources. Millions were also suffering in South Africa under the decadent Pretoria régime, which was destroying their human dignity and taking their lives. The régime was, moreover, destabilizing and attacking the front-line States. A direct consequence was the enormous refugee problem in southern Africa, as thousands fled the Pretoria régime in search of dignity, peace and freedom, and found themselves living in conditions of barest survival.

12. The United Nations must act urgently to uproot colonialism and apartheid in southern Africa by assisting the front-line States and the national liberation movements, and it must secure South Africa's compliance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and its immediate and unconditional withdrawal from Namibia. The recent talks between Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with United States mediation, might pave the way for a solution.

13. Bolivia endorsed the work 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, and the increasing involvement of the Secretary-General in the search for a peaceful settlement of issues pending before the Committee. It praised the work of the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations and of the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa.

14. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said that decolonization had been one of the major success stories of the past 40 years, and had shaped the modern world. The United Kingdom had played a major role in that process: almost one third of the current membership of the United Nations had at one time been administered by his country.

(Mr. Smith, United Kingdom)

Whereas originally 43 of the Non-Self-Governing Territories - well over half - had been under its administration, it was now responsible for only 10.

15. The wishes of their inhabitants guided his Government's policy. Its aim, which it believed was the underlying aim of decolonization, was to be sure that the people decided for themselves what kind of political future they wanted, whether independence or some other status. Surprisingly, some members of the Committee did not appear to share that aim and, imputing some outmoded colonialist aspiration to his Government, had implied that the process of self-determination could have only one outcome: independence. That was untrue: the peoples of the United Kingdom dependencies had retained their links because it was what they wished. There was no standard blueprint for decolonization in any dependent Territory, and the Committee should not seek to impose one.

16. Some speakers had also implied that the United Kingdom had failed in its Charter obligations to promote the economic, social and educational advancement of its dependent peoples. That too was untrue. His Government took seriously its obligations under Article 73, and had in that connection recently conducted a review of policy towards its five Caribbean dependent Territories and Bermuda, reaching the conclusion that it would not necessarily urge them to move towards independence but remained ready to respond positively where independence was the clearly and constitutionally expressed wish of the people concerned.

17. His Government was implementing a number of administrative measures to ensure their economic and social development, and the reasonable needs of the Territories would be a first charge on United Kingdom aid funds. Since it was also responsible for the external relations, defence and security of the Territories, it had significantly improved the defences of its Caribbean Territories against the serious threat posed by drug trafficking and related problems, in co-operation with the United States Government and other Governments in the region.

18. The peoples of most dependent Territories already enjoyed a measure of self-government that conformed to their wishes. For others, such as the people of Namibia, Western Sahara or New Caledonia, the prospect of a solution appeared to be in sight. Regrettably, the Committee and its subsidiary body, the Special Committee, had failed to keep up with those changing circumstances. Instead of applying a pragmatic and flexible approach to the remaining dependent Territories, they sought to squeeze them into some pre-determined ideological mould. Each year the Special Committee and its Sub-Committees, followed by the Fourth Committee, spent long hours in repetitive and often irrelevant debate that culminated in the same tired and over-long resolutions. The prestige and effectiveness of the United Nations itself were jeopardized in the process.

19. Mr. NUGUEIRA BATISTA (Brazil) said that despite the significant role played by the United Nations in decolonization, colonialism persisted in a small number of Territories, and the United Nations must not relent in its efforts to bring about universal implementation of the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence.

(Mr. Nogueira Batista, Brazil)

20. Brazil attached great importance to the annual examination undertaken by the Special Committee on decolonization of the situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Such monitoring would ensure the necessary pre-conditions for their peoples to express a genuine interest in the pursuance of their national objectives.

21. His delegation noted with satisfaction that, unlike in previous years, the Fourth Committee had been able to keep its deliberations less rhetorical and more objective and efficient.

22. It was to be hoped that the atmosphere of constructive dialogue and the lessening tensions between the super-Powers, as well as the promising prospects for a settlement of a number of regional crises, might help bring to a swift end the last vestiges of colonialism, particularly in Namibia, where ideological differences and strategic interests had long been used as a pretext for not granting independence to that Territory. Brazil had been following with interest the talks between Angola, Cuba, South Africa and the United States aimed at finding a solution to the conflict in south-western Africa and securing implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Brazil had underscored the need for strict respect of Angola's territorial integrity and for an immediate end to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia.

23. His Government welcomed the restoration of a dialogue in New Caledonia and congratulated the Government of France on its success in bringing together the two main parties in that Territory through the agreement of 20 August 1988 and on the measures envisaged for New Caledonia's economic and social development.

24. As a member of the Security Council, Brazil had welcomed the acceptance in principle by the Kingdom of Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO of the peace proposals put forward by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). His Government had voted in favour of Security Council resolution 621 (1988) authorizing the Secretary-General to appoint a special representative for Western Sahara and requesting him to transmit a report on the holding of a referendum. Brazil encouraged the Secretary-General to proceed in his mission of good offices, in co-operation with OAU, to uphold the right to self-determination of the Saharan people in accordance with General Assembly resolution 40/50. It was to be hoped that the belligerent parties would continue to demonstrate the willingness to put aside their differences and achieve a lasting and peaceful solution.

25. Preparing Non-Self-Governing Territories for a viable political and economic existence was the basic responsibility of the administering Powers, but the United Nations and its specialized agencies and Members must share that task by making their own contributions. Brazil intended to maintain and, where possible, increase its contribution, especially in education and training. True to those objectives, his delegation had traditionally sponsored the resolutions on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, which was a meaningful way of preparing the future administrations of an independent Namibia and a pluralist and democratic South Africa, free from racism, and it had supported the resolutions on offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded the general debate on the items.

Rights of reply

27. Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia), speaking as Chairman of the Special Committee on decolonisation in reply to the representative of the United Kingdom, said that the General Assembly had repeatedly stressed the imperative need, firstly, for the administering Powers and the representatives of the peoples of the Territories concerned to participate in the relevant proceedings of the United Nations bodies; secondly, to dispatch United Nations visiting missions to those Territories in order to ascertain first-hand the true aspirations of the inhabitants; and, thirdly, to associate the United Nations in such acts of self-determination as might be conducted in those Territories in relation to their future status. The Assembly had thus called upon the administering Powers concerned to continue to co-operate with the Special Committee on decolonization, and he could only reiterate the repeated appeals addressed to the United Kingdom seriously to reconsider its positions so as to facilitate the task entrusted to the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee.

28. While he noted with satisfaction the United Kingdom's continued readiness faithfully to discharge its obligations under Article 73 of the Charter, it should be borne in mind that the General Assembly had long established the procedure for examining the extent of such compliance. Both the Fourth Committee and the Special Committee must continue to discharge the specific tasks entrusted to them to review such information until the last Territory falling within the purview of Chapter XI of the Charter was no longer of concern to the United Nations. The Organization wanted what was best for the people themselves, as freely determined by the people themselves without interference, coercion or fear of reprisals. To that end, and until the colonial era was in fact over, the Special Committee stood ready to work closely with all administering Powers. Thus, the Special Committee had no "pre-determined ideological mould", other than the goal of self-determination for all peoples, an objective which, it was to be hoped, was shared by the United Kingdom.

29. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) replied that his delegation was encouraged to learn that the Special Committee on decolonization had no pre-determined ideological mould in mind when it considered the Territories on its agenda. The United Kingdom looked forward with interest to see whether that apparent new pragmatic approach would be reflected in the resolutions that the Special Committee on decolonization presented to the Fourth Committee in coming sessions.

Draft resolution in document A/43/23 (Part IV), chap. VII, para. 9 (p. 24), submitted under item 108

30. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, 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 Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

31. The draft resolution was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

32. The CHAIRMAN invited those delegations which so wished to explain their vote after the vote.

33. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said that, as in previous years, his delegation had abstained because the draft resolution implied, in paragraph 2, that it was for the General Assembly to decide when a Non-Self-Governing Territory had attained a measure of self-government sufficient to relieve an administering Power of the obligation to submit information under Article 73 (e) of the Charter. Such decisions should be left to those best equipped to judge, namely, the local Government of the Territory concerned and the administering Power.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded consideration of item 108.

Draft resolution in document A/43/23 (Part IV), chap. VI, para. 17 (p. 11), submitted under item 110

35. The CHAIRMAN said that the delegation of Israel had requested that a separate vote should be taken on the word "Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

36. He invited those delegations which so wished to explain their vote before the vote.

37. Mr. MATNAI (Israel) said that his delegation would vote against the eighth preambular paragraph, because it singled out "Israel" by name, as distinct from its references to "Western Powers" and "other countries", in its concern over so-called economic and military collaboration with Pretoria. That was a ridiculous distortion of the facts.

38. According to statistics of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), Israel's exports to South Africa had amounted to less than one half of 1 per cent of its total exports, and South Africa's imports from Israel had been no more than three quarters of 1 per cent of its total imports. Clearly, Israel's trade with South Africa was negligible compared with that of many other countries. In that context, according to a comprehensive report by the Shipping Research Bureau, based in Rotterdam, the nations of the Gulf had been the main source of South Africa's oil imports. Although they had sold \$US 10 billion worth of oil to South Africa since 1979, the resolution had simply referred to them as "other countries".

39. An increasing number of black African nations had recognized the transparent attempt by some States to use the just struggle against racism and apartheid as a vehicle for an onslaught against Israel. Linking South Africa and Israel in resolutions and speeches trivialized the valiant struggle against apartheid and all other forms of racism. For its part, Israel would continue to host a growing number of black Africans in technical and training programmes, to expand its ties with black Africa and to give increased attention to the representatives of the black South African community. Israel had accommodated hundreds of black South African leaders in a variety of technical and vocational training programmes, and would continue to receive warmly distinguished black leaders from South Africa in the tradition of previous visits.

40. By voting against the inclusion of "Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph, States would be reaffirming their opposition to the practice of selectively singling out States and would be displaying support for a consideration of the real issues before the Fourth Committee.

41. Mr. SIGURDSSON (Iceland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that for years they had actively supported efforts by the specialized agencies to provide assistance within their particular competence to those struggling for freedom and self-determination and to give increased humanitarian, technical and

(Mr. Sigurdsson, Iceland)

educational aid to those peoples that had not yet exercised their right to self-determination. Namibia was a case in point. The Nordic countries were among the largest contributors to United Nations programmes for the Namibian people, especially the United Nations Fund for Namibia. In the revised Programme of Action against Apartheid of 1988, the Nordic countries had committed themselves to increasing their humanitarian aid to refugees, liberation movements, and victims and opponents of apartheid, as well as to assisting the front-line States, both directly and through the specialized agencies and other United Nations bodies.

42. IMF loans to South Africa should be discouraged, with due regard to IMF's Articles of Agreement, as long as the apartheid system persisted.

43. Although some of the assertions in the draft resolution from earlier years had been softened, the Nordic countries deplored the sweeping and inaccurate formulations it contained and would therefore abstain. The Nordic countries were against singling out individual countries or groups of countries as being allegedly responsible for the policy pursued by South Africa and were opposed to the inclusion of irrelevant paragraphs. Furthermore, the statutes of the specialized agencies must be borne in mind, and those bodies should retain their universal character.

44. Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the reference to Israel in the preamble was justified, the economic and military collaboration between Israel and South Africa having encouraged the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist South African régime in violation of the relevant United Nations resolutions. Israel had been singled out because of the unique similarities in the policies of the two régimes. In that context, it was important to note that the Special Committee on Apartheid would be examining collaboration between those two racist régimes.

45. In 1987, the international mass media had reported that trade between Israel and South Africa had amounted to between \$US 500 million and \$US 800 million, a figure not found in the IMF's statistics. In March 1988, a British newspaper had reported that 600 Israeli advisers were helping the racist South African régime in its war in Angola, and had been training UNITA forces since 1976. The non-aligned countries had recently condemned such actions, and for its part, Syria intended to vote to retain the reference to Israel in the eighth preambular paragraph.

46. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution, because it had been drafted in contentious, unhelpful terms irrelevant to the role of the specialized agencies in the development field. It was a classic example of the "tired", overlong resolutions to which his delegation had referred earlier.

47. The specialized agencies had an important and carefully defined role, yet one would not think so from the draft resolution, which had made only passing reference to the fact that their primary function was to assist in the economic and social fields. Instead, it focused on highly political matters, most specifically on South Africa and Namibia, and therefore was fundamentally flawed.

(Mr. Smith, United Kingdom)

48. Moreover, implicit in the draft resolution was the unacceptable assumption that the General Assembly was empowered to give instructions to the specialized agencies and specifically to the international financial institutions, whereas they were autonomous bodies with their own statutes and funding structures. Respect for the autonomy of those organizations was essential if their decisions were to be taken in accordance with the views of their own governing bodies on the basis of programme priorities and the allocation of scarce funds rather than on grounds of political expediency.

49. It was time that the Committee drafted a resolution on the crucial role of the World Bank and the IMF in international development. The draft resolution under consideration simply distracted the specialized agencies from their urgent task and therefore was unlikely to produce beneficial results.

50. Mr. KAGAMI (Japan) said that each specialized agency should be encouraged to take effective and appropriate steps, in keeping with its specific functions, to achieve independence and self-determination and independence for colonial Territories. But each specialized agency should itself decide what measures to take, as each had its own carefully defined area of competence, in which the General Assembly could not intervene. Unfortunately, certain paragraphs in the draft resolution gave specific directives to the specialized agencies and also disregarded the principle of universality of special agency membership.

51. As Japan had made clear in the past, it could not support the singling out of a country or group of countries, and it would therefore abstain in the vote.

52. Mr. van der LUGT (Netherlands) said that his delegation could not support all the provisions of the draft resolution and would therefore abstain. His delegation rejected the attempts in the nineteenth preambular paragraph and in paragraph 8 to politicize IMF and the World Bank and could not accept unjustified criticism of those institutions.

53. Concerning the perceived relations of the World Bank with South Africa, the representative of that body had clearly stated before the Committee that no loans had been granted by the World Bank to South Africa since 1966 and that all loans had been paid back before 1966.

54. His delegation opposed the singling out of an individual country or group of countries in the preamble. Indeed, virtually all Western countries and the country named had taken measures to increase political and economic pressure on South Africa.

55. The Netherlands had consistently supported the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence without further delay or pre-conditions, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and stressed the major role that the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) was playing in Namibia's independence process. However, before free elections were held in Namibia - and the prospects for such elections were somewhat better - no political group or

(Mr. van der Lugt, Netherlands)

organization could claim to be the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

56. His delegation asked the Special Committee on decolonization to consider drafting a more coherent and concise draft resolution on the subject for the next session of the General Assembly. Although three paragraphs had been deleted, there was still much room for improvement.

57. Mr. BARILLARO (Italy) said that his delegation appreciated the contribution to decolonization made by the specialized agencies. However, the draft resolution raised issues and used formulations which were scarcely related to the matter under discussion and seemed to be designed solely to prevent a consensus. Furthermore, it did not take duly into account the functions entrusted to the specialized agencies and did not respect their autonomy. Attempts to reduce their autonomy would undermine the effectiveness of their economic assistance. Lastly, Italy could not accept the singling out of countries or groups of countries to be made responsible for policies pursued by other Governments. For those reasons, Italy would abstain.

58. A recorded vote was taken on the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zaire.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Ecuador, Lesotho, Liberia, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Venezuela.

59. The word "Israel" in the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was retained by 72 votes to 38, with 29 abstentions.

60. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, 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, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

61. The draft resolution, as a whole, was adopted by 118 votes to 3, with 26 abstentions.

62. The CHAIRMAN invited those members who so wished to explain their vote after the vote.

63. Ms. MILLER (Canada) said that her delegation had several basic reservations concerning the references in the draft resolution to international institutions and the specialized agencies. Those references regrettably called into question their independence and their valuable contribution to decolonization. Canada was opposed to name-calling as a matter of principle and questioned the validity of the continued and generalized accusations levelled against Western countries with regard to support for South Africa. Her country, together with virtually all Western nations, had adopted strong measures against the Government of South Africa. Such actions had surely invalidated many of those accusations.

64. Mr. CORR (Ireland) said that his country had always recognized the importance of the specialized agencies in the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization and supported the general thrust of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, Ireland had abstained in the vote because of the criticism of IMF and the World Bank, whose statues the draft resolution failed to take into account.

65. Mr. MENAT (France) said that the draft resolution had unfairly criticized IMF and the World Bank. France was firmly committed to the principle of the universality and independence of the specialized agencies and the need for all States to respect that principle. Furthermore, his delegation had the strongest reservations about the selective criticism of certain countries. Accordingly, he had voted against the inclusion of the word "Israel" in the preamble and had abstained in the vote on the entire text.

66. Mr. CISTERNAS (Chile) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, it had serious reservations about certain paragraphs which it considered inappropriate, particularly those which singled out a group of countries and referred specifically to IMF and the World Bank. The latter were autonomous institutions over which the General Assembly had no authority.

67. Mr. NEZERITIS (Greece) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it felt that the specialized agencies and international institutions could make a significant contribution to decolonization. Nevertheless, Greece felt that it was unfair to single out a particular country and had voted against the inclusion of the word "Israel" in the preamble. However, its vote in no way affected its continued and unreserved support for the struggle of the Namibian people to achieve self-determination and independence.

68. Mr. BOMINA (Zaire) said that, although his delegation generally supported the text of the draft resolution, it had voted against the inclusion of the word "Israel" in the preamble because a particular country should not be singled out in that manner.

69. Mr. SYLVESTER (Belize) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, it had reservations concerning the manner in which Israel had been singled out in the preamble, in contrast to certain Western Powers and other countries.

70. Mr. HILMI (Iraq) said that his delegation had listened with utmost dissatisfaction to the pedantic verbosity in the statement made by the Zionist representative in explanation of vote before the vote.

71. Mr. MATNAI (Israel), speaking on a point of order, said that, although he was proud to be a Zionist, his country, like any other Member State, should be referred to by its proper name.

72. Mr. HILMI (Iraq) said that, although the Zionist representative had referred to a report of the Shipping Research Bureau, he had failed to mention a very important report issued in 1987 by the United States State Department and the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa, which was a United Nations body. He should also have referred to the relevant reports of the Third Committee which clearly indicated that trade between Israel and South Africa had increased in 1987 to 268 million rand.

Draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.3, submitted under item 111

73. The CHAIRMAN said that the Congo, Costa Rica, Mali, the Sudan and the Ukrainian SSR had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

74. Draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.3 was adopted.

75. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of item 111.

Draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.4, submitted under item 112

76. The CHAIRMAN said that the Congo, Costa Rica and Venezuela had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

77. Draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.4 was adopted.

78. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of item 112.

Draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.2, submitted under item 18 on the question of Western Sahara

79. Mrs. RIVES-NIESSEL (Secretary of the Committee) said that paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.2 should be interpreted in the light of Security Council resolution 621 (1988) on the question of Western Sahara. In that connection, the Secretary-General was currently unable to determine the expenditure estimates for future United Nations activities relating to a settlement in Western Sahara. As soon as the plans for those activities had been drawn up, the expenditure estimates would be submitted to the General Assembly and the necessary allocations would be requested in accordance with the established procedure.

80. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Congo and Suriname had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.2.

81. Mr. KABINGA (Zambia), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.2, briefly reviewed the encouraging recent developments concerning Western Sahara and drew attention to specific paragraphs in the draft resolution. The sponsors had concluded that the joint good-offices process had already made appreciable progress and should be completed in accordance with General Assembly resolution 40/50. The progress needed to be further consolidated and it was hoped that the two parties to the conflict would continue to demonstrate the necessary political will to achieve a settlement. The basic goal of the draft resolution was to ensure that the mandate of the Secretary-General in that process was renewed. He hoped that the draft resolution would receive overwhelming support.

82. The CHAIRMAN invited those members who so wished to explain their vote before the vote.

83. Mr. SLAQUI (Morocco) said that the peace proposals put forward by the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU had been accepted by the parties on 30 August 1988. The Security Council had unanimously supported the proposals in its resolution 621 (1988). The peace proposals were interrelated and inseparable. Morocco had unreservedly reaffirmed its commitments and had proposed the adoption of a draft resolution by consensus aimed at concretizing the United Nations peace plan.

84. Draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.2, on the other hand, would upset the overall balance of the peace proposals and call into question the indispensable procedure for ensuring continuation of the peace process. Statements had been made to the effect that a referendum was not peace, which could be ensured only through direct negotiations on the status of the Territory. Those who for years had called for a referendum now wished to divert the good-offices mission for the purpose of a priori legitimization. By means of a procedural manoeuvre, they sought to render the proposed consultation meaningless. There should be no mistake: the direct negotiations, presented as a procedural matter, were in reality a question of substance. The Kingdom of Morocco, which was committed to the good-offices mission and the agreement of 30 August 1988, was unable to participate in the vote on a draft resolution designed to undermine the basis of that mission and the peace proposals.

85. Mr. BOMINA (Zaire) said that the peace proposals put forward by the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU represented a compromise to achieve a just and lasting settlement. Those proposals had been supported unanimously by the Security Council. The peace process was therefore well under way and current conditions favoured the emergence of a climate of trust and understanding. His delegation felt that the tension which had so long divided the States of the Maghreb and OAU was decreasing because of the United Nations peace plan.

86. Draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.2 seemed to call the peace plan into question. The referendum would appear to be subject to the terms of a draft resolution which

(Mr. Bomina, Zaire)

called for direct negotiations. The free and democratic consultation of the populations of Western Sahara should take place strictly in accordance with the peace proposals. Any other approach would disregard the Secretary-General's efforts to achieve a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement and would call into question decisions of the Security Council. Accordingly, Zaire, which felt that it would be dangerous to change or supplement the peace proposals, would abstain in the vote.

87. Mr. PEKURI (Finland) said that in accordance with its commitment to the right of peoples to self-determination, Finland had consistently supported efforts to reach a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Western Sahara and had fully supported the efforts of the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU to bring about a just and definitive solution. It was regrettable that in the light of the ongoing peace process a consensus resolution had not been submitted. Nevertheless, since draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.2 expressed support for the efforts of the current Chairman of OAU and the Secretary-General and appealed to both parties to find a negotiated solution, Finland would vote in favour of it.

88. Mr. ESCUDERO (Ecuador) said that his delegation, which respected the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence in accordance with the principles of the Charter and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.2. The paramount consideration in achieving a lasting settlement was to enable the Saharan people to exercise fully their right to self-determination. The implementation of the peace proposals put forward by the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU should lead to a cease-fire and establish the necessary conditions for holding a referendum.

89. Mr. SAEMALA (Solomon Islands) said that it was the duty of the United Nations, through the Fourth Committee, to promote reconciliation among the countries of the Maghreb on the basis of the experience, practice and relevant resolutions of the Organization. Only through genuine negotiations would it be possible to find a just and lasting solution.

90. Two diametrically opposed objectives were being pursued. For some, the main objective of the peace process was direct negotiations between Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO. For others, the paramount goal was to establish the conditions necessary for a cease-fire and a referendum organized and supervised by the United Nations in co-operation with OAU. Any direct negotiations might suggest that the representational capacity of the parties to the conflict had been settled, which was not the case. Furthermore, indirect negotiations were a normal and internationally accepted procedure provided that they were conducted through an independent and unbiased mediator who enjoyed the support of the parties involved. The talks which had begun in 1985 had proved useful since the parties had accepted the peace proposals.

91. His delegation regarded the peace process begun on the basis of the peace proposals and Security Council resolution 621 (1988) as a step towards a peaceful, just and lasting settlement. Solomon Islands had sponsored previous draft

(Mr. Saemala, Solomon Islands)

resolutions on Western Sahara on the basis of its commitment to the principle of self-determination without entering into the issue of the recognition of any political group in Western Sahara. His Government's policy on the question of recognition was the recognition of States. Accordingly, Solomon Islands would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.2.

92. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon) said that the Committee should not be discouraged in its quest for the peaceful settlement of disputes. However, his delegation was disappointed that the Secretary-General's efforts, backed by the Security Council and the African people, had not been universally welcomed. Time constraints had made it impossible to hold meaningful consultations among all parties to the dispute.

93. He understood the position of those who favoured a consensus text, because harmony was the essence of the United Nations. However, the hopes for a settlement embodied in the draft resolution must not be shattered. Cameroon supported the draft resolution in its current form for want of a better document expressing those hopes.

94. He trusted that efforts would continue to be made on all sides to reach a speedy conclusion to the conflict among African brothers. Despite lingering objections that might prove to be purely procedural, Cameroon was encouraged by the expression of political will on the part of the principal parties regarding questions of substance. It would continue to spare no effort to achieve peace in Africa.

95. Mr. BORG OLIVIER (Malta) said that his Government had consistently supported all constructive efforts and resolutions for a peaceful settlement in Western Sahara, and would continue to do so. Malta regretted that it had been impossible to draft a consensus text which would be acceptable to the parties concerned. Moreover, as the Secretary-General and his Special Representative were initiating a critical phase in the negotiations, the best way to contribute to the current peace efforts was to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

96. Mr. DELLIMORE (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) said that he wished to emphasize the significance of draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.2 and the critical nature of the vote on it. The text encouraged the initiatives taken by the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU, as it noted the progress which they had achieved. However, it also called for direct negotiations, which one of the parties considered to be an unacceptable demand, and thus threatened to derail the Secretary-General's peace efforts. The draft resolution should have provided for a continuation of the peace process successfully undertaken by the Secretary-General. It should not seek to reduce his role to that of a mere go-between whose main goal would be to convince the parties to negotiate face to face, as that was not his mandate. The Secretary-General's role was to enable the people of Western Sahara to exercise their right to self-determination in a free and fair referendum. In view of the advanced stage reached in the implementation of the peace plan devised by the Secretary-General, supporting the draft resolution

(Mr. Dullimore, Saint Vincent
and the Grenadines)

would mean cancelling recent accomplishments and beginning anew. His delegation wondered why the international community should depart from that successful plan, which was a delicate balance of essential elements based on a careful analysis of the positions of the two parties.

97. The draft resolution did not reflect the positive evolution of the situation, and its adoption would be a serious drawback which the international community could ill afford.

98. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution as it was entirely compatible with the Secretary-General's peace plan.

99. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/43/L.2.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bahrain, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

100. The draft resolution was adopted by 87 votes to none, with 53 abstentions.

101. The CHAIRMAN invited those members who so wished to explain their vote.

102. Mr. TROLLE (Sweden) said that the right to self-determination must be the paramount guiding principle in Western Sahara. The recent acceptance in principle of the Secretary-General's peace proposals constituted a significant step towards a peaceful and lasting solution under conditions acceptable to the two parties and to the international community.

103. Sweden had voted in favour of the draft resolution, which referred both to the important guiding principles of the settlement and to the negotiating efforts being made. However, it regretted that the draft resolution did not reflect fully the important progress already achieved, and that the text had not given stronger support to the Secretary-General. Moreover, Sweden would have preferred a consensus text. It shared the hope expressed in the Secretary-General's report that, during the remainder of the peace process, the two parties would continue to demonstrate the political will necessary for its early and successful implementation.

104. Mr. CORR (Ireland) said that, while his delegation favoured a consensus approach to the question of Western Sahara, it had supported the draft resolution, because of Ireland's unreserved support for the right of the people of Western Sahara to self-determination.

105. His Government welcomed the progress achieved in 1988, including the acceptance by both sides of the peace proposals made by the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU. A consensus approach to the question and a consensus text would have been consistent with the acceptance of those proposals and with the task confronting the Secretary-General and his Special Representative. He believed that the process leading to a referendum would be completed in a spirit of co-operation by all the parties concerned.

106. Ms. WICKES (Australia) said that, by voting in favour of the draft resolution, Australia was above all reaffirming its profound commitment to the right of peoples everywhere to self-determination in accordance with United Nations principles and practice. However, her delegation continued to question some aspects of the draft resolution, particularly those which might prejudice the outcome of an act of self-determination.

107. Australia had been encouraged by the progress recently achieved under the auspices of the Secretary-General. She wished to state clearly Australia's confidence in and support for the Secretary-General in the pursuit of a noble task which, by seeking to turn conflict in a colonial Territory into a process of peaceful change, reflected the *raison d'être* of the Organization.

108. Australia called upon all the parties to the conflict to provide the Secretary-General with any assistance which might facilitate his task and, above all, to demonstrate the flexibility and the political will necessary to bring about a rapid, negotiated settlement.

(Ms. Wickes, Australia)

109. She called attention to the provisions in paragraph 4 of the draft relating to direct negotiations and to possible administrative or military constraints during the holding of the referendum. While they were long-standing elements of United Nations resolutions on that issue, Australia wished to make clear that those provisions should not be interpreted at the current delicate stage of negotiations in any way which might create obstacles to the early conclusion of a settlement or would circumscribe the Secretary-General's mandate to pursue that goal.

110. At a time when previously intractable conflicts had been resolved through the good offices of the Secretary-General and when confidence in the ability of the United Nations to fulfil its fundamental peace-keeping task had been renewed, it behoved all who had the true interests of the people of Western Sahara at heart to spare no effort to support the Secretary-General.

111. Mr. AMORIN (Uruguay) said that, when voting on previous resolutions concerning Western Sahara, his delegation had urged that the Committee should recognize the peace efforts made by the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU. The current draft resolution clearly did so. Uruguay trusted that their efforts would continue and that the parties concerned would give their full support to the negotiations.

112. However, he regretted that, despite the progress achieved, it had been impossible to adopt a consensus resolution, which would have more fully reflected the expectations of the international community concerning the process which had begun and its trust that that process would enable the people of Western Sahara to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination.

113. Ms. WILLBERG (New Zealand) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to reaffirm New Zealand's support for the principle of self-determination and its belief that an appropriate act of self-determination under international auspices, without any military or administrative constraints, was the right of the people of Western Sahara. Her delegation's vote was also an expression of support for the role played by the Secretary-General in the peaceful settlement of disputes. However, it was unfortunate that a consensus text had not been adopted.

114. Her delegation strongly welcomed the constructive way in which the Secretary-General had brought his good offices to bear in facilitating progress towards a solution to a problem which had seemed intractable. In particular, New Zealand noted his view that the peace proposals represented a delicate balance of essential elements agreed in principle, about which it would be inadvisable to negotiate further. New Zealand urged continuing flexibility by all parties to the dispute in order to enable the Secretary-General to complete a very complex task.

115. Mr. RIANOM (Indonesia) said that he was heartened by the enhanced prospects for a settlement in Western Sahara on the basis of the peace proposals of the Secretary-General and the Chairman of OAU. He trusted that all parties to the dispute would continue to show the spirit of accommodation and flexibility necessary to achieve the desired goal. Indonesia had abstained in the vote, so as

(Mr. Rianom, Indonesia)

not to do anything that might jeopardize peace prospects. Moreover, the draft resolution contained elements which had yet to be agreed to by the parties directly involved.

116. Mr. ABE (Japan) said that he strongly welcomed the acceptance of the peace proposals by both Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO. Japan hoped that further progress would be made towards a solution, and would make every effort to help to carry out the peace plan. However, under the circumstances, it was inappropriate for the Fourth Committee to adopt a draft resolution which might touch upon the substance of the ongoing negotiations. As those negotiations had just begun, it was necessary to exercise the utmost precaution. Therefore, Japan had abstained in the vote.

117. Mr. AL-SAID (Oman) said that Oman had once again abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on Western Sahara, as the issue involved a brother country. Oman endorsed the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to find a peaceful solution. Its abstention should not be interpreted as a position in favour of either party to the detriment of the other.

118. Mrs. BERTRAND (Austria) said that her delegation would have welcomed a draft resolution which commanded unanimous support. As in previous years, Austria had voted in favour of the draft resolution, because it had consistently welcomed calls for peaceful solutions to conflicts through negotiations between all parties concerned.

119. She regretted that, despite the considerable progress achieved recently, several issues had yet to be resolved. Austria therefore supported the renewed request that the current Chairman of OAU and the Secretary-General should continue to lend their valuable services with a view to facilitating a negotiated and lasting settlement. She welcomed the efforts they had made leading to an agreement in principle. A basis was thereby provided for a peaceful solution in keeping with the principle of self-determination. Austria urged all parties concerned to spare no effort to bring about a fair referendum under United Nations auspices. She hoped that a solution acceptable to all sides would be achieved in the near future.

120. Mr. SAVUT (Turkey) said that Turkey had always favoured the exercise by the people of Western Sahara of its inalienable right to self-determination. The acceptance by Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO of the peace proposals were encouraging developments. Turkey was confident that all parties to the conflict would demonstrate the political will necessary for the success of the Secretary-General's mission. However, it had abstained in the vote because it would have preferred a consensus text, which would have made a genuine contribution to a speedy solution.

121. Ms. MILLER (Canada) said that, in abstaining in the vote, Canada had wished to reiterate its neutrality in regard to the regional conflict in question and to express its desire not to prejudice the solutions being contemplated to resolve it. Her delegation was very pleased with the progress made in the past year towards a peaceful and equitable solution. It congratulated the Secretary-General

(Ms. Miller, Canada)

and the Chairman of OAU on having obtained an agreement in principle. Canada fully supported the ongoing mediation efforts, and subscribed to Security Council resolution 621 (1988). She welcomed the appointment of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, and urged the parties to continue to use the good offices provided to them in finding a speedy, peaceful solution.

122. Mr. BELLINA (Peru) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, because it reiterated the inalienable right to self-determination and independence of the people of Western Sahara. Peru repeated its appeal to the parties to the conflict to spare no effort to implement the peace plan.

123. Ms. BUTON (United States) said that the hope of the United States that the Fourth Committee would be able to produce a consensus resolution on Western Sahara, had once again been disappointed. Moreover, repeated confrontations on the question in the Committee had not brought about a solution to the lingering dispute. The Secretary-General's efforts had led to an agreement in principle on proposals for structuring a referendum. The progress thus achieved had enabled the Security Council to authorize the appointment of a special representative to pursue that process and to seek further agreement among the parties. The United States had voted in favour of the appointment of a special representative. However, the draft resolution appeared to place limits on the Secretary-General's mandate to pursue efforts with a view to structuring a referendum, which was a position contrary to that of the Security Council. While the prospects for a solution were more favourable than ever, the draft resolution did not fully reflect the positive changes which had occurred in 1988. In addition, United Nations resolutions could only be meaningful if they were perceived by all parties as contributing to a solution. However, one party to the Western Sahara conflict viewed the draft resolution as conferring an unfair advantage on the other.

124. The United States had made it clear that a military solution was neither possible nor desirable. It should instead be resolved through dialogue. Her delegation feared lest a contentious resolution should undermine the climate of confidence which was essential to progress on the issue. The active involvement of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative merited a resolution which enhanced the negotiating climate and facilitated the co-operation necessary for the successful settlement of the long-standing conflict. For that reason the United States did not support the draft resolution, and had abstained in the vote. It was important for everyone involved to endeavour to ensure the maximum chance of success for the Secretary-General's efforts. The United States urged restraint and flexibility as his work proceeded.

125. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, because he firmly supported the principle of self-determination. However, it was his understanding that the provisions in paragraph 4 concerning direct negotiations would not become a pre-condition for further progress. Fiji urged the parties concerned to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General and the Special Representative in order to facilitate a speedy settlement without pre-conditions which might detract from the fundamental principle of self-determination.

126. Mr. CHERIF (Tunisia) said that, while he supported the draft resolution, the peace proposals required the support of the countries of the Maghreb region and must reflect their position. The question of Western Sahara would be resolved only if the peace proposals were implemented in full and the parties spared no effort to work constructively, in keeping with the seriousness of the situation, for the principle of self-determination for the people of Western Sahara. Tunisia appealed to all the parties concerned to overcome the obstacles to peace, security and stability for all the peoples of the Maghreb.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.