

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION

*Official Records**



COPY
FOR REFERENCE
ONLY
NOV 21 1983

FOURTH COMMITTEE
19th meeting
held on
Thursday, 17 November 1983
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 19th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 102: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 104: 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 105: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 106: 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.4/38/SR.19
29 November 1983
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/38/23 (Part VI) and Add.1; A/C.4/38/L.10)

Question of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands (A/38/23 (Part VI), chap. XII, para. 10)

1. The draft decision on the Cocos (Keeling) Islands was adopted without objection.

Question of Tokelau (A/38/23 (Part VI), chap. XIII, para. 10)

2. The draft decision on Tokelau was adopted without objection.

Question of Pitcairn (A/38/23 (Part VI), chap. XIV, para. 10)

3. The draft consensus on Pitcairn was adopted without objection.

Question of St. Helena (A/38/23 (Part VI), chap. XV, para. 11)

4. The CHAIRMAN said that the United Kingdom had requested a separate vote on the fifth sentence of the text, which read: "The Assembly notes with concern the presence of a military base on the dependency of Ascension and, in that regard, recalls all the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions concerning military bases and installations in colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories".

5. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said his country felt that the reference to Ascension Island, which some delegations had insisted on including in an otherwise wholly acceptable text concerning St. Helena, was out of place. It would therefore vote against that reference and, if it was not deleted, against the text as a whole. St. Helena and Ascension Island were legally and historically distinct, and were 1,000 miles apart. They were connected only for administrative reasons. Furthermore, the population of Ascension Island was composed of St. Helenians who worked on the communications facilities based on the island. There was not, and had never been, an indigenous population on Ascension Island. The mandate of the Fourth Committee applied to Non-Self-Governing Territories, not to uninhabited ones. There was therefore no reason for it to consider the question of Ascension Island, which fell under neither Article 73 of the Charter nor General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It could hardly be said that the military facilities on Ascension Island constituted an obstacle to the self-determination of a people, since there was no local population on that island, apart from a few migratory birds and a number of turtles.

6. His delegation hoped that the majority of members of the Committee would vote for the deletion of the sentence concerned. In doing so, they would not be voting

/...

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

to support the United Kingdom, but would rather be acknowledging that the decisions of the Fourth Committee on small Territories should be concerned with the protection of the political, economic and social rights of the peoples of those Territories, rather than with scoring points at the expense of the administering Powers.

7. Ms. GJESTLAND (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that those countries considered that Ascension Island - which had never had an indigenous population - was not covered by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), under which the question of St. Helena was being considered, and that they would therefore vote against the draft decision.

8. Miss TRUJILLO (Venezuela), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the fact that Ascension Island did not have an indigenous population did not justify the installation or use of military bases on colonial Territories. According to document A/AC.109/734 prepared by the Secretariat, the Territory of St. Helena included the island of St. Helena and two dependencies, including Ascension Island. Paragraph 107 of that document indicated that, since the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) conflict, Ascension Island had been used as a supply and refuelling centre for the naval and air units going to the South Atlantic. Its airfield had, in April 1982, become one of the busiest in the world. An additional water desalination plant and a five kilometre-long oil pipeline had recently been built. Consequently, Venezuela would vote in favour of retaining the fifth sentence, while regretting that no reference had been made to General Assembly resolution 37/35, to decision 37/420 concerning military activities in colonial Territories, or to resolution 35/118, which contained the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration.

9. Mr. PULZ (Czechoslovakia) said that the fifth sentence of the draft decision did not mention that the military facilities on Ascension Island, which was part of the Non-Self-Governing Territory of St. Helena, had been used by the British invasion forces during the armed conflict in the South Atlantic. As the Special Committee on decolonization had noted, the United Kingdom had used a colonial Territory to restore its rule over another Non-Self-Governing Territory. His delegation also regretted that the Special Committee had not criticized the co-operation between the United Kingdom and the South African racist régime on Gough Island, which was also part of St. Helena. His delegation, which had always respected the spirit of consensus prevailing in the work of the Special Committee, would vote in favour of retaining the fifth sentence and in favour of the draft decision as a whole.

10. Mr. ROWE (Australia) said that, in the Special Committee of 24 his delegation had stated its opposition to the consideration of the question of Ascension Island in the context of the draft decision on St. Helena. Australia considered that St. Helena and Ascension Island were separate entities and that the draft decision on St. Helena should not include any reference to Ascension Island. His delegation regretted that such a controversy should have been introduced into the previously

/...

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

harmonious consideration of the question of St. Helena, and hoped that there would be a return to a positive dialogue. It would vote in favour of deletion of the reference to Ascension Island and, if that sentence was maintained, would abstain in the vote on the draft decision as a whole.

11. A recorded vote was taken on the fifth sentence of the draft decision on St. Helena (A/38/23 (Part VI) chap. XV, para. 11).

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Barbados, Greece, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Nepal, Oman, Philippines, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand.

12. The fifth sentence of the draft decision on St. Helena was retained by 72 votes to 27, with 17 abstentions.

13. A recorded vote was taken on the draft decision on St. Helena as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq,

Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sweden, Turkey.

14. The draft decision on St. Helena was adopted as a whole by 95 votes to 2, with 26 abstentions.

15. Mr. BELLEFLEUR (Canada), explaining his vote after the vote, said he was sorry that it had not been possible to withdraw the controversial phrases. For the same reasons as Norway, he had voted against the retention of those phrases, and abstained on the text as a whole.

16. Mr. SUBBA (Nepal) said he had abstained because the text covered two separate issues, decolonization and the question of military bases. It would have been preferable for the Committee to discuss the question of demilitarization separately.

17. Mrs. BERMUDEZ (Cuba) said she had voted in favour of the draft decision for the same reasons as Venezuela and Czechoslovakia and because, as a member of the Special Committee, she felt that decisions adopted there by consensus should be respected by the Fourth Committee.

Question of American Samoa (A/38/23 (Part VI), chap. XVI, para. 10)

18. The draft resolution on American Samoa (A/38/23 (Part VI), chap. XVI, para. 10) was adopted without objection.

Question of Guam (A/38/23 (Part VI), chap. XVII, para. 9)

19. The draft resolution on Guam was adopted without objection.

Question of Bermuda (A/38/23 (Part VI), chap. XIX, para. 10)

20. The draft resolution on Bermuda was adopted without objection.

/...

Question of the British Virgin Islands (A/38/23 (Part VI), chap. XX, para. 10)

21. The draft resolution on the British Virgin Islands was adopted without objection.

Question of the Cayman Islands (A/38/23 (Part VI), chap. XXI, para. 10)

22. The draft resolution on the Cayman Islands was adopted without objection.

Question of Montserrat (A/38/23 (Part VI), chap. XXII, para. 10)

23. The draft resolution on Montserrat was adopted without objection.

Question of the Turks and Caicos Islands (A/38/23 (Part VI), chap. XXIII, para. 10)

24. The draft resolution on the Turks and Caicos Islands was adopted without objection.

Question of the United States Virgin Islands (A/38/23 (Part VI), chap. XXIV, para. 10)

25. The draft resolution on the United States Virgin Islands was adopted without objection.

Question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands appearing in document A/38/23 (Part VI)/Add.1

26. The CHAIRMAN suggested, in the light of consultations he had had with the Chairman of the Special Committee and a number of delegations, that the Committee should postpone to a later date any decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/38/23 (Part VI)/Add.1.

27. It was so decided.

Question of Gibraltar (A/C.4/38/L.10)

28. The draft consensus on Gibraltar was adopted without objection.

Question of Brunei

29. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that the Territory of Brunei would become independent on 31 December 1983. The Committee could recommend the Assembly to take note with satisfaction of Brunei's imminent independence and convey to the Government and people of Brunei its congratulations and best wishes for peace, happiness and prosperity. As it welcomed the intention of the Government of Brunei to request admission to the United Nations once the Territory gained its independence, the Assembly might perhaps wish to call on the United Nations and other organizations in the system to give the new nation whatever assistance it might need to consolidate its independence.

30. It was so decided.

/...

Question of Anguilla

31. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend the General Assembly to postpone consideration of the question of Anguilla to its thirty-ninth session, and request the Special Committee to keep the situation in the Territory under study.

32. It was so decided.

33. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 18.

AGENDA ITEM 102: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (A/28/23 (Part IV), chap. VII, para. 10)

Information on Non-Self-Governing Territories

34. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution on this subject.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, 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, Romania, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Dominican Republic, France, Lesotho, Paraguay, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

35. The draft resolution was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

/...

36. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom), explaining his vote after the vote, said that his delegation had abstained because it disagreed with paragraph 2 of the resolution, which implied that it was for the General Assembly to decide when a Non-Self-Governing Territory had "obtained a full measure of self-government in terms of Chapter XI of the Charter". His delegation believed that it was up to the Administering Power and the inhabitants of the Territory concerned to decide together when the Territory should be considered as having attained full self-government.

37. Mr. MIKAYA (Malawi) said he had voted for the draft resolution but wished officially to register his disagreement with operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution appearing in chapter VI, paragraph 14 of document A/38/23 (Part IV), and paragraph 10 of the draft decision appearing in paragraph 13 of the same document.

38. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 102.

AGENDA ITEM 104: 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/38/23 (Part IV), chap. VI; A/C.4/38/L.9)

39. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) introduced the amendments proposed by his delegation (A/C.4/38/L.9) to the resolution submitted by the Special Committee in chapter VI of its report. (Paragraph 14).

40. The first amendment was to the sixth preambular paragraph, which spoke of "increased general support rendered to [the South African] régime by certain Western countries, especially the United States of America and Israel". The United States had never made a secret of the fact that it had diplomatic and commercial relations with South Africa; nor did it conceal its abhorrence of South Africa's racist policy or the fact that in its relationships with South Africa it sought to encourage evolution and reform. By singling it out, the resolution was accusing the United States of the sin of candor and openness. A great many countries had diplomatic or commercial relations with South Africa, countries from all continents, and the cause of bringing about change in southern Africa would not be served by picking out one or two from the long list for special condemnation. The Special Committee's decision to single out some countries by name had not been taken by consensus. He therefore proposed deleting words "Western" and "especially the United States of America and Israel", and referring simply to the increased general support rendered to the régime by certain countries.

41. Paragraph 10 commended those non-governmental organizations which were helping to inform and mobilize public opinion in the United States and elsewhere against the assistance rendered by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to South Africa, and called upon all non-governmental organizations to redouble their efforts in that respect. That was a call for interference in the internal affairs of the United States. The paragraph was directed explicitly at "American" public opinion. The wording was incompatible with Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter,

/...

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

which ruled out non-intervention in the internal affairs of Member States. He wondered how many Members of the United Nations would agree to the General Assembly attempting to directly influence public opinion in their country. They would certainly protest in the strongest possible terms. For its part, the United States protested against such action and asked all delegations to vote against the wording. His delegation therefore proposed that the phrase "in the United States of America ... South Africa" should be replaced by the words "on the situation in South Africa". In that way, the United States would cease to be the target of a quite improper and unprecedented propaganda campaign by the General Assembly.

42. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution noted that the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence was in its crucial stage. That paragraph was in line with reality and should be retained. The text condemned nobody and simply stated facts, whereas the United States amendment was aimed at misleading the international community. The United States and Israel were mentioned by name because, in the report of the Special Committee of 24 and other United Nations documents, ample evidence had been provided to support that contention. The United States should fall in line with the opinion of the international community, and he requested the representative of the United States not to insist on his amendment. The Syrian delegation would vote against the United States amendments and requested other delegations to do likewise.

43. Ms. O'FARRELL (Ireland) said that her delegation had always recognized the important role of the specialized agencies in the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and therefore was in agreement with the general thrust of the draft resolution before the Committee. However, her delegation would be obliged to abstain in the vote on the text because of the criticism it contained of IMF and the World Bank and because paragraphs 8 and 9 did not take into account the status of those institutions. It also found unacceptable the singling out for criticism of certain Member States in a rather selective and arbitrary manner.

44. Mr. VANREUSEL (Belgium) said that he appreciated the important role played by specialized agencies on behalf of the peoples of colonial countries and regretted that the draft resolution under consideration contained elements contrary to the status and independence of those agencies. His delegation could accept neither the criticisms of the work and activities of the agencies nor the attempt at politicization which was a feature of the draft. Belgium considered that the universality of the specialized agencies must be maintained and would therefore abstain in the vote.

45. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that one of the fundamental principles of the British Government was the need to respect the independence, autonomy and integrity of specialized agencies, particularly IMF and the World Bank, which had made a substantial contribution to the development of Non-Self-Governing Territories. The United Kingdom was well aware of the link between successful development and the provision of the necessary funds.

/...

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

46. His delegation was therefore disappointed to have to vote, as it had done the previous year against the draft resolution, which took no account of the autonomy of those agencies and attempted to give them instructions on the way to deal with Non-Self-Governing Territories. Nor could it accept the unjustified attacks aimed explicitly against certain Western Member States, which were virtually held responsible for South African policies.

47. It would have been preferable for the draft resolution to have recognized the important role played by those agencies in the development process instead of highlighting their alleged inadequacies. Those agencies were the focal point of policies for the survival, revival and development of the world economy. They had done a remarkable and essential job and had recently assisted many countries to overcome difficult periods. They therefore deserved the support of lenders and borrowers alike. That was why the United Kingdom could not accept proposals aimed at diverting international financial institutions from the urgent task that had been entrusted to them.

48. Mr. SIGMUNDSSON (Iceland), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), said that those countries continued to actively support increased humanitarian, technical and educational assistance to peoples struggling for self-determination and independence. They recognized that the specialized agencies and the institutions associated with the United Nations had an important role to play in that regard within their fields of competence, and regretted that they had to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, since it contained several elements which caused practical and constitutional problems.

49. The Nordic countries deplored the singling out of certain countries to bear responsibility for the policies of the South African Government and wished to reiterate that, as a matter of principle, the statutes of the specialized agencies should be taken into account and the universal character of those agencies should be maintained, something which seemed to have been overlooked in certain paragraphs of the draft resolution.

50. Mr. WARD (New Zealand) fully supported the provisions of the draft resolution requesting the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system to continue assistance to the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories, as such assistance was important both for the general economic development of those Territories and, at the political level, for the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization. His delegation noted that the draft resolution was heavily oriented towards the situation in Namibia; that was a concern shared by New Zealand, in view of its firm opposition to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia as well as that country's policy of apartheid.

51. However his Government felt about South African policies, it was none the less obliged to uphold the independence of the World Bank, IMF and other specialized agencies in their fields of competence. It therefore regretted that some paragraphs of the draft criticized those institutions and attempted to inject political considerations into their decision-making process. Accordingly, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

/...

52. Mr. KURPERSHOEK (Netherlands) said that his delegation fully subscribed to the view that the specialized agencies and the other institutions associated with the United Nations had made important contributions to the implementation of the Declaration, but some paragraphs of the draft resolution under consideration ran counter to principles to which his Government attached great importance. For example, the sixteenth and seventeenth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 8 and 9 were incompatible with the principle of universality and the independence of the specialized agencies and international institutions. His Government rejected the notion that the General Assembly had the right to interfere with the autonomy of the Bretton Woods institutions and feared that attempts to politicize those agencies could only have a negative effect on their vital role in the world economy and their contribution to international economic development.

53. The Netherlands had always emphasized that the people of Namibia must be enabled to exercise their right to self-determination without further delay or preconditions, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). However, it firmly opposed selective and unwarranted criticism levelled at certain Member States. For those reasons, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

54. Mr. WOKALEK (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution contained in the report of the Special Committee of 24 because, while recognizing the importance of the work of the specialized agencies in providing assistance to dependent Territories and peoples, it felt that certain elements in the draft made it impossible for the Federal Republic of Germany to support it. In particular, his delegation was deeply concerned at the questioning of South Africa's membership of the World Bank and the IMF without the least consideration for the statutes of those agencies. He reiterated his delegation's firm support for the principle of universality and its respect for the independence of the specialized agencies and the institutions associated with the United Nations. Those bodies could fulfil their important task only if those principles were respected, and insistence on politicizing the situation could, in the long term, only be detrimental to those peoples who most needed help. His delegation therefore considered the criticism of the work and activities of the World Bank and IMF to be unacceptable and also rejected the unwarranted and arbitrary attacks against certain Member States, especially the United States and Israel, and the attempt to hold them responsible for the policies of South Africa. Such attacks could only damage the constructive work of the United Nations.

55. Mr. TANÇ (Turkey) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution because his Government firmly supported all the efforts that were being made by the international community to eliminate colonialism. Nevertheless, he expressed reservations about the fact that certain regions and countries were mentioned by name in the draft resolution.

56. Mr. RAFINDADI (Nigeria) said that the draft resolution adequately reflected the general opinion of the members of the Committee and their concern about the collaboration of certain Western Powers with South Africa, which ran counter to the aspirations of the South African and Namibian peoples to self-determination and

/...

(Mr. Rafindadi, Nigeria)

independence. It was a secret to no one that the collaboration of Western Powers with South Africa in all fields, and above all in the economic and military fields, had helped the racist régime to defy the international community.

57. His delegation believed that the original text of the draft resolution simply reflected the general view of the Special Committee and the Committee and that it should therefore be maintained as it appeared in chapter VI of document A/38/23 (part IV). Nigeria would therefore vote against the two amendments proposed in document A/C.4/38/L.9.

58. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) said that although it was not advisable in certain cases to mention countries by name, the reference to certain Western countries in the draft resolution, was merely a statement of fact and, as the representative of Syria had noted, the text did not condemn any country. His delegation would therefore vote against the first amendment submitted by the United States.

59. As for paragraph 10, he called upon the United States representative to view it from a different angle: in a sense, the paragraph recognized the open nature of American society and the importance of public opinion in the United States as well as the influence it had on the political decisions of the United States Government. There were several examples of that, and since the paragraph in question commended the non-governmental organizations for the efforts they had made to influence public opinion in the United States, the text was useful, necessary and justified, and his delegation would therefore vote against the amendment to that paragraph.

60. Mr. ROWE (Australia) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in the Special Committee because it could not accept the selective and arbitrary mention of the names of certain States; it would therefore support the United States amendment. Like other delegations which had spoken before it, his delegation had strong reservations about certain paragraphs of the resolution which related to spheres outside the competence of the General Assembly and sought to undermine the independence of the specialized agencies. Once again, as at the time of the vote in the Special Committee, Australia would abstain in the vote.

61. Mr. PEREZ (Chile) said that while his delegation supported the draft resolution and approved its basic elements, it had strong reservations about the paragraphs referring to the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Those were autonomous bodies and neither the Committee nor the General Assembly should interfere with their decision-making processes since they did not fall within their competence. That autonomy, which had been established in the statutes of those two bodies, constituted the best guarantee that the Fund and the Bank would be able to perform the tasks for which they had been established. His delegation also rejected the arbitrary, selective and discriminatory reference to certain countries.

62. Mr. DENICHIN (Bulgaria) said that the draft resolution as a whole constituted a correct assessment of the responsibility and role of the specialized agencies in the implementation of the Declaration. It was impossible to remain silent if

/...

(Mr. Denichin, Bulgaria)

certain agencies were not fulfilling their obligations, as had been demonstrated several times in the course of the debate. Those specialized agencies were bound by the provisions of the Declaration and should scrupulously respect them.

63. Certain delegations had argued that the draft resolution represented an attempt to politicize the IMF. He noted that the IMF was already politicized because it followed a double standard in granting loans: it had recently refused loans to Nicaragua, Grenada, Chile, Viet Nam and Afghanistan although the urgent needs of those countries were obvious and, at the same time, had accorded a huge loan to South Africa for which there was no justification, either economic or political.

64. Moreover, the United States had not denied that it collaborated broadly with South Africa. In that respect, for once, the view of the United States representative and his own view coincided. Where they differed was in the assessment of the effect that collaboration had on apartheid. The United States believed that it had had positive effects, but he seriously doubted whether that could be proved in specific terms. In that respect, he quoted a text of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate indicating that United States investments in South Africa had the effect of strengthening the existing régime. Those adverse effects were too well known to be further commented on.

65. The United States maintained that the crime for which it was being accused was its honesty and frankness. That was not the point. The United States was being condemned because of the prejudicial effect of its collaboration with South Africa. Thus, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and against the United States amendments.

66. Mrs. BERMUDEZ (Cuba) said that her delegation would respond positively to the appeal made by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic by voting against the amendments appearing in document A/C.4/38/L.9. She not only believed, as a member of the Special Committee, that the agreements reached within the Special Committee should be maintained in the Fourth Committee, but also felt that the general support that certain Western countries, and in particular the United States and Israel, were according to South Africa should be condemned. Her delegation was also opposed to the amendment to operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution because it believed that the peoples represented on the Committee had the right to know about the way in which the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank were disregarding United Nations resolutions.

67. Her delegation also found that the explanation provided by the United States representative concerning the relations of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank with the racist South African régime was very unsatisfactory, since the United States itself had admitted to the Committee, in submitting the amendments, that Washington maintained trade and other relations with Pretoria.

68. A recorded vote was taken on the first amendment proposed by the United States of America (A/C.4/38/L.9).

/...

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Comoros, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, ~~Saudi Arabia~~, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Barbados, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Gabon, Gambia, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Lesotho, Nepal, Panama, Philippines, Senegal, Singapore, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Cameroon.

69. The first United States amendment (A/C.4/38/L.9) was rejected by 65 votes to 40, with 19 abstentions.

70. A recorded vote was taken on the second amendment proposed by the United States (A/C.4/38/L.9).

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Comoros, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia,

/...

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Gabon, Gambia, Lesotho, Nepal, Oman, Panama, Singapore, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon.

71. The second United States amendment (A/C.4/38/L.9) was rejected by 63 votes to 39, with 18 abstentions.

72. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution appearing in paragraph 14 of document A/38/23 (Part IV), chapter VI.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden.

/...

73. The draft resolution was adopted by 101 votes to 4, with 28 abstentions.

74. Mr. BELLEFLEUR (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote, said that Canada fully supported all the specialized agencies of the United Nations and all international bodies associated with them, and participated financially in the implementation of their programmes. However, his delegation had not been able to accept operative paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 or the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. It believed that the International Monetary Fund could in no way be considered a political body. It was opposed to the politicization of the decision-making processes of organizations such as the IMF and the World Bank. It was also opposed to operative paragraph 22 because the United Nations should not impose its views on agencies which were, by definition, autonomous.

75. His delegation had on many occasions wholeheartedly condemned the racist policy practiced by the South African republic. However, it could not agree that certain States which maintained economic relations with South Africa should be condemned by name. Moreover, it believed that positive economic exchanges with South Africa could be very effective in the long term in establishing a constructive dialogue which might persuade South Africa to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly. The current resolution aimed instead at completely isolating South Africa, which could only lead to a hardening of its position. His Government had not yet recognized SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, and was therefore opposed to the sixth preambular paragraph.

76. Canada had therefore been obliged to abstain in the vote on that crucial question, although it agreed with the general philosophy of the draft resolution.

77. Mr. CASSIE CHETTY (Sri Lanka) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, since his delegation approved of the underlying idea, but wished to enter reservations concerning the reference to certain countries by name, especially in the sixth preambular paragraph. He also had reservations concerning paragraphs 8, 9 and 10, which contained inappropriate references to the role of certain international organizations.

78. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Special Committee was based on its conviction that the various organizations of the United Nations system had the duty to promote decolonization in their respective fields.

79. His delegation wished, however, to reiterate the reservations which it had expressed in 1982, firstly, regarding the selective nature of certain condemnatory references which did nothing to assist efforts within the United Nations system to ensure the universal implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV); and, secondly, regarding certain references to the action of IMF which, in his delegation's view, were incompatible with the apolitical nature that should characterize the management of the Fund and the implementation of its decisions, in accordance with the principles laid down in its statutes.

/...

(Mr. Lasarte, Uruguay)

80. His delegation also considered that the proper representation of the Namibian people was an integral part of its right to self-determination, the exercise of which could not be indefinitely delayed.

81. Mr. SALAMI (Togo) said that his delegation would have liked to support unreservedly the entire recommendation put forward by the Special Committee under the item. He wished to congratulate the Special Committee once again on its serious attitude and the quality of its work. His delegation regretted, however, that it could not accept certain paragraphs of the draft resolution, since it opposed any selective condemnation. It was in that spirit and because of a question of principle that his delegation had voted in favour of the amendments proposed by the United States. In addition, although it had expressed its full support for the Special Committee's recommendation, taken as a whole, by an affirmative vote, it was because of that same principle that it wished to enter reservations concerning the sixth preambular paragraph and paragraph 10 of the draft resolution adopted.

82. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that he was surprised by the statement by the Egyptian delegation to the effect that, since the United States was an open society in which public opinion played an important role, it was to be expected that the United Nations, as an impartial world organization, should employ that internal democratic process for the pursuit of campaigns, financed mainly by the United States, that were aimed at influencing American public opinion. Obviously, it was necessary to inform and mobilize world public opinion; however, paragraph 10 of the draft resolution adopted was directed exclusively against the United States. Such a problem would, of course, not arise in countries which had no public opinion in the democratic sense of that term. He repeated that such interference in the internal affairs of his country was inadmissible and contradicted the principles of the Charter; the United Nations should therefore not become involved in it. Nevertheless, he knew full well the way in which American public opinion would react: such a procedure, he was convinced, would be totally ineffective.

83. Mrs. ASHTON (Bolivia), referring to document A/38/23 (Part IV), said that her country naturally supported the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO. However, it had reservations concerning certain preambular and operative paragraphs of the draft resolution adopted.

84. Mr. JACOB (Israel) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because of its imbalanced structure and phraseology and because Israel, the United States and "certain Western countries" were singled out for maintaining relations with South Africa. Indeed, most, if not all, of the States represented in the Fourth Committee had ties with South Africa, so that to single out his country constituted a gross distortion - indeed, a mockery - of reality. Obviously, by thus mentioning Israel, the initiators of the draft resolution were concerned less with the issue under discussion than with exploiting the opportunity to attack Israel as part of their campaign of political warfare against his country.

/...

85. Mr. MAHONEY (Gambia) said that he approved of the general idea behind the draft resolution adopted, and had therefore voted in favour of the draft. In his delegation's view, however, selective criticisms should be avoided. It therefore had reservations concerning certain preambular and operative paragraphs, particularly paragraph 9.

86. Mr. RAM (Fiji) said that he had supported the draft resolution recommended by the Special Committee, since the general idea underlying the text was that the specialized agencies and the international organizations associated with the United Nations should pursue their efforts to assist the colonial peoples in achieving independence. However, his delegation had reservations about the sixth preambular paragraph and about paragraph 10, in which certain countries were named. He viewed that procedure as a divisive factor which it could not condone.

87. Mr. MATHIOUDAKIS (Greece) said that he had supported the draft resolution adopted, but considered it was regrettable that certain countries had been mentioned by name. For that reason, his delegation had also voted in favour of the United States amendments.

88. Mr. MOONYANE (Lesotho) said that he had abstained from voting, but emphasized that his abstention did not change the traditional position of his country, which supported the Special Committee's recommendations. His delegation considered, however, that it was impossible to implement certain paragraphs of the draft resolution, particularly those which provided for commercial sanctions against South Africa, and it had therefore abstained.

89. Mr. ZEGERS (International Monetary Fund) said that he wished to clarify a point in response to the assertion made during the debate by the representative of Bulgaria. The latter had criticized IMF for refusing loans to certain countries for political reasons, and he had specifically mentioned Grenada. It should be noted, however, that on 25 August 1983 a loan of \$14.3 million had been granted to Grenada.

90. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of item 104.

AGENDA ITEM 105: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (continued) (A/C.4/38/L.5)

91. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Congo, Guyana, Ireland and Pakistan had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/38/L.5.

AGENDA ITEM 106: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: (continued) (A/C.4/38/L.6)

92. The CHAIRMAN announced that Benin and Pakistan had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/38/L.6.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.