



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 91:	
Question of Namibia (<i>concluded</i>):	
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;	
(b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;	
(c) Report of the Secretary-General	991
(d) Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia	1005

President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEM 91

Question of Namibia (*concluded*):*

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
- (b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: I shall call on representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote on any of the eight draft resolutions before us in documents A/32/L.4-L.8, A/32/L.9/Rev.1 and A/32/L.10 and A/32/L.11 and their respective addenda. Those representatives wishing to explain their vote after the vote will have an opportunity to do so after all the voting has taken place. I should like to remind the Assembly that, under rule 88 of the rules of procedure, the President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment.

2. Mr. BARTON (Canada): On 19 October [*38th meeting*], on behalf of the Governments of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, the United States, as well as Canada, I described to the General Assembly our joint views on the situation in Namibia, and our efforts this year to help bring about the independence of Namibia.

3. In considering the eight draft resolutions that are before us on the question of Namibia, our Governments believe that there are five that bear a relationship to the substance of the discussions now in progress. These are draft resolutions A/32/L.6, entitled "Dissemination of information on Namibia"; A/32/L.7, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa"; A/32/L.9/Rev.1, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia"; A/32/

L.10, entitled "Intensification and co-ordination of United Nations action in support of Namibia"; and A/32/L.11, entitled "Special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia". We do not wish at this point in the discussions to register a specific approach to the substantive matters dealt with therein, and we will therefore abstain in the vote on these five draft resolutions. We wish to emphasize that that abstention should not be taken as an indication of any of our Government's individual positions on the substance of the draft resolutions in question.

4. In pursuing our efforts to remove the remaining obstacles to a Namibian solution consistent with Security Council resolution 385 (1976), we continue to hope that all concerned will endeavour to support that objective.

5. Mr. MORRIS (Australia): In view of the positive features of the draft resolutions on which we are about to vote and because of our continued opposition to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and its consistent violation of human rights in the Territory, Australia will support draft resolutions A/32/L.4 through A/32/L.11, although we have reservations on certain aspects of some of them.

6. In similar circumstances last year, the Australian representative in the Fourth Committee, speaking on the question of Namibia, said that he would have liked to see the draft resolutions on Namibia reflect our point of view and attitudes to a greater degree. I would reiterate this point and extend it a little further. The International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held at Maputo in May, is an impressive example of what can be achieved with consensus as the objective, namely, ideals and end results that are neither diluted nor compromised but are, rather, a collective and impelling appeal for justice by the international community as a totality.

7. From Australia's active participation in the United Nations Council for Namibia and our statements on the question of Namibia in the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, our reservations will be no surprise to delegations. For example, Australia cannot endorse violence in the pursuit of the United Nations objective to end the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. We hope that a peaceful solution can still be achieved. We are encouraged in this view by recent developments in Namibia arising out of the initiatives taken by the five Western members of the Security Council.

8. As the Australian Foreign Minister, Mr. Peacock, said in his statement in the general debate [*11th meeting*], that

* Resumed from the 46th meeting.

initiative draws its strength from the persistence of the international community in its demand that the Territory should achieve independence through free elections under the supervision of the United Nations. We note in particular that South Africa has abandoned its plans to press ahead with the Turnhalle Conference. We have noted also that the provisions of the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Ordinance and the Immorality Proclamation and the Immorality Amendment Ordinance have been repealed and that the pass laws in part of the Territory have been abolished. We hope that these actions, while belated and of as yet little impact, are signs that the South African Government has at last accepted the need for an early transfer to the people of Namibia of control of its own destiny.

9. We hope that consultations between the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO] and the contact group and between South Africa and the contact group will reach a successful conclusion. I recall the comments of the representative of Sri Lanka when he introduced draft resolution A/32/L.11 [45th meeting]. He said that SWAPO wanted to give the Western initiative a chance of success. It could have been more demanding, but SWAPO prudently refrained from such a course of action. Calls for precipitate action, such as immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the South African administration, are less appropriate in view of the ongoing consultations.

10. Similarly, we believe that the question of reparations is best left to the parties themselves. On the general question of a negotiated settlement, while we recognize, of course, the status of SWAPO as a major voice of Namibian aspirations, we cannot endorse any implication that the representatives of indigenous Namibian political forces other than SWAPO should be excluded from deliberations on the constitutional process leading towards a genuinely independent and unified Namibia.

11. In relation to the references to nuclear energy, a more satisfactory formulation was contained in the communiqué of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, held from 8 to 15 June this year. The Heads of Government, including the Australian Prime Minister, expressed concern at the fact that South Africa had the potential for the development of nuclear weapons and might soon become a nuclear-weapon State. In this connexion they urged any Government which was collaborating with South Africa in the development of its nuclear industry to desist from doing so. South Africa should become a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex] and should accept full IAEA safeguards to ensure that nuclear development was for peaceful purposes only.

12. Because of the historical background, the legal aspects of the status of Walvis Bay are complicated and contentious. The legal situation is not as clear as operative paragraphs 6 and 8 of draft resolution A/32/L.7 might seem to suggest. However, my delegation considers that the critical question is not whether South Africa has a legal or historical right to administer Walvis Bay but that, because of moral and pragmatic considerations, Walvis Bay should form an integral part of a united and independent Namibia.

13. In spite of the foregoing reservations, Australia will vote for all the draft resolutions. Our overriding concern is

to see genuine independence for a unified Namibia. Australia will continue to press for an early and peaceful solution in Namibia and will lend its support to constructive proposals to this end.

14. Mr. TLOU (Botswana): We are about to vote on draft resolutions affecting our neighbours, the heroic people of Namibia, whose fight for self-determination and independence has won the admiration of the international community. Botswana's relations with the people of Namibia have deep roots in history. We have stood with them throughout their troubled history. During the German colonial wars Botswana became their home and now, when Namibia is under the occupation of racist, *apartheid* South Africa, Botswana is still their home and will continue to be their home until they have liberated their country and, of their own volition, choose to return.

15. Along with our brothers in Africa and others the world over who have valiantly and consistently supported the cause of liberation in Africa we have unequivocally condemned the illegal occupation of Namibia by *apartheid* South Africa, as we have indeed condemned the whole *apartheid* system in South Africa itself. Our call for the total withdrawal of South African occupying forces from Namibia and for the speedy granting of independence to the people of Namibia as prescribed by the United Nations stands.

16. Botswana can always be counted upon to speak out against oppression in southern Africa. Neither our geographical situation in that troubled part of our continent nor the unfortunate historical development of the region can stop Botswana condemning the racist oppressive régimes in southern Africa or from according asylum to our brothers and sisters who flee from oppression. Thus, in the Independence Day broadcast on 30 September 1977, the President of Botswana, Sir Seretse Khama, asserted in connexion with our rejection of the system of oppression in southern Africa:

“While we realize that good-neighbourliness is in our interest as a poor and weak country, we cannot, however, sacrifice our principles in order that we may be considered a good neighbour.”

Because of our unswerving commitment to the liberation of southern Africa we can take, and have taken, measures within our reach and ability to assist the oppressed of southern Africa.

17. If we were not in the geographical location where fate has placed us we would do much more, and we wish we could do much more. Unfortunately, there are serious constraints beyond our control, constraints which make our economy and indeed our very survival as a nation extremely vulnerable, tied as we are economically to the economy of people whose political system we abhor. These constraints are well known and are understood by our brothers in Africa, especially by the sister African States we work with so closely in the quest for the liberation of southern Africa and by the liberation movements themselves.

18. For this reason we are able at this point to vote in favour of all of the draft resolutions on Namibia—all those of which we are a sponsor—except one, and that is draft resolution A/32/L.7 which regrettably presents us with

some problems. We are compelled by the very serious circumstances beyond our control referred to above to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.7. Although we agree with the substance and intention of that draft resolution and although there is nothing, in fact, that we disagree with in the whole draft resolution, we are forced to abstain because aspects of this draft could adversely affect our economic survival and the welfare of our people.

19. Because Botswana accepts that the international community will take measures against South Africa if agreement on such action is forthcoming, we will never stand in the way of such action. Our brothers in the struggle know, of course, that Botswana's abstention in no way implies that we are relenting in our duty and commitment to assist in the liberation of southern Africa. We will continue vigorously to pursue this noble cause within our means and ability.

20. Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): New Zealand's attitude to the draft resolutions before the Assembly is determined by the fact that we find totally unacceptable South Africa's continued refusal to fulfil the demands of the United Nations in relation to Namibia, and in particular to implement the conditions set out in Security Council resolution 385 (1976). As the New Zealand Minister for Foreign Affairs said in a statement marking Namibia Day this year, the international community cannot afford to relax its efforts to end South Africa's occupation of Namibia and to ensure that the Namibian people are able to determine their own future with the assistance of the United Nations, which is responsible for the Territory.

21. In relation to draft resolution A/32/L.7 on the situation in Namibia, my delegation supports the main thrust and purpose of the draft resolution. There are, however, a number of elements in this very lengthy text on which we feel bound to record reservations. New Zealand has consistently expressed its belief that it should be possible to achieve a satisfactory solution to the question of Namibia through negotiations. Our feeling on this point has not altered. We are therefore unable to agree with operative paragraph 11, which appears to endorse armed struggle as the prime means of bringing about the independence of Namibia. In this connexion the New Zealand delegation welcomes the efforts of the contact group of five Western nations, which has been diligently working for some months now to achieve an agreed solution to the question within the terms of Security Council resolution 385 (1976). We affirm our support of these efforts and our hopes for their success.

22. Secondly, while we recognize that SWAPO is a major political group within Namibia and is the prime leader in the liberation struggle, we feel that for the United Nations to endorse any one organization as the sole representative of the Namibian people may prejudice the wishes of the Namibian people as a whole, and therefore we must reserve our position on operative paragraph 10 in draft resolution A/32/L.7 and supporting references.

23. With regard to the question of Walvis Bay, the New Zealand Minister for Foreign Affairs stated in his intervention in the general debate on 10 October that:

"... any exclusion of Walvis Bay from Namibia would undermine that country's integrity and impede sig-

nificantly its chances of building a viable economy."
[26th meeting, para. 96.]

In our view, therefore, a negotiated solution to the question of Namibia should provide for the inclusion of Walvis Bay in the territory of a free and united Namibia.

24. Finally, in relation to draft resolution A/32/L.7, my delegation, while most concerned that South Africa should not develop a nuclear weapons capability, does not believe that there is a factual basis for the condemnation of certain Western countries in operative paragraph 21 of the draft resolution, or that a resolution on Namibia is the appropriate place for a pronouncement on this question.

25. In connexion with draft resolution A/32/L.10, New Zealand supports the purpose of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia. We do, however, have reservations as to how the Decree is to be implemented and enforced.

26. Despite these substantial reservations, my delegation regards the question of securing the early independence of Namibia as of such overriding importance that it will this year vote for draft resolution A/32/L.7 as a whole, and indeed, for all eight of the draft resolutions before the Assembly.

27. Mr. MÜLLER (Finland): Special ties of sympathy and solidarity have existed for a long period between the Namibian and Finnish peoples. The Government of Finland has actively supported and will support the efforts of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO to achieve genuine self-determination and independence in a united Namibia.

28. My Government has taken several concrete initiatives to help the Namibians in their struggle for independence and we have contributed annually to the United Nations Fund for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia. We are supporting SWAPO morally and materially by extending humanitarian assistance.

29. We fully support the main objectives of the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia and we will, therefore, cast our affirmative vote in favour of all of them. In our view the draft resolutions contain a number of constructive elements and practical recommendations which will contribute to a peaceful resolution of the question of Namibia consistent with United Nations decisions. This is also consonant with the main aim of the work of the Council for Namibia, of which Finland is a member.

30. In the consistent and well-known view of the Government of Finland, the United Nations must do its utmost to seek peaceful solutions to the problems facing the world community. We cannot accept the condoning of armed struggle by the United Nations and we cannot support any references in the draft resolutions to this aim. My delegation, therefore, will take exception to operative paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/32/L.7 should there be a separate vote on it. We also have some reservations on a number of other formulations in that draft resolution.

31. Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden): Sweden's support for the people of Namibia has over the years been demonstrated in many ways and on several occasions. We are in full agreement with the basic elements of the draft resolution A/32/L.7 and we see this draft as an important and accurate statement on the situation in Namibia. The draft resolution addresses itself in a very appropriate way to the necessity of South African withdrawal, the territorial integrity of Namibia, the responsibility of the United Nations, the central role of SWAPO in the process leading to independence and the importance of the negotiating efforts under way leading up to fair and free elections. We welcome the appeal to support and assist SWAPO in its struggle to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, particularly as Sweden has for many years now extended humanitarian and educational assistance to that organization. We recognize that the Namibian people has seen no other way than to resort to armed struggle to free itself from foreign occupation. We know that this struggle is pursued with the goal of creating an independent and united Namibia. That goal has the full support of the Swedish Government.

32. There is, however, a provision in the draft resolution which presents my delegation with very substantial difficulties of a constitutional character. I have in mind the provision containing explicit support for the use of armed force. My country has always firmly upheld that the United Nations is an organization established to provide peaceful solutions to international conflicts. We have consistently refrained from joining in expressions of support for the use of armed force. The only cases in which we would be prepared to support such action are those clearly defined in the Charter. This implies no lack of understanding for the struggle of an oppressed and humiliated people.

33. This draft resolution contains provisions which touch on the division of competence between Security Council and the General Assembly, a division clearly laid down in the Charter. It is the view of my delegation that the situation in Namibia poses a threat to international peace and security. We agree with what is said in this regard in the draft resolution as an assessment of the situation. Such a statement by the Assembly is an expression of opinion. Only a decision by the Security Council to designate the situation as a threat to peace can, in our view, form the basis for our own explicit endorsement of armed action.

34. Sweden is determined to join with the other Members of this Organization to increase international pressure on South Africa until Namibia has gained its freedom and independence. On these basic principles, which are essential to any solution which would do justice to the cause of the Namibian people, there is an identity between the views of my delegation and those expressed in the draft resolution. It is with deep regret, therefore, that for the reasons I have given here Sweden will have to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.7.

35. I should now like to explain our position on the draft resolution concerning the intensification and co-ordination of United Nations action in support of Namibia contained in document A/32/L.10. We shall vote for this draft resolution, but we want to state our reservations on operative paragraph 6. The principle of the division of

competence between the Security Council and the Assembly also has a bearing on the Decree for The Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. There is no doubt as to the importance of these resources not being exploited to the detriment of the people and depleted or exhausted before the Namibians themselves can freely make use of them. My Government has studied the Decree carefully and has also informed various private organizations about its contents. The provisions of the Decree, however, cannot in our view be considered to be legally binding.

36. Mr. MOLAPO (Lesotho): My delegation has asked to be allowed to speak in explanation of its vote before the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.7.

37. Lesotho agrees with the general thrust of the draft resolution. We are, however, forced to abstain in the vote on it because operative paragraph 31 presents my delegation with serious difficulties. Our position on Namibia is a matter of record. We support the independence and self-determination of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO. It is for this reason that we shall be voting in support of all the draft resolutions submitted to this Assembly with the exception of the one I have just referred to. It should be noted that we have sponsored four of these draft resolutions.

38. Mr. KARUHIJE (Rwanda) (*interpretation from French*): Before voting on the draft resolutions before us, I should like to recall briefly the position of my country on the problem of Namibia. This position will justify my vote. The problem of Namibia is a special case where all the purposes and principles defined in the United Nations Charter are systematically flouted. The most negative aspects regarding the dignity of man are all found there: colonialism, racism, *apartheid* and their most adverse consequences. The case of Namibia is a case where a Government, that of South Africa, which still dares to claim respect from other States, systematically violates the international treaties which it has solemnly and freely acceded to. Who can continue to have the least confidence in that Government, which shows such a lack of loyalty vis-à-vis our Organization and the ideals of the Charter? On the other hand, we see here a people, the people of Namibia which, although crucified, will not accept the inevitability of the cruel trial that they are undergoing.

39. How can South Africa still try to justify its presence in Namibia when the General Assembly put an end to its Mandate more than 10 years ago? This is nothing more than colonial aggression, pure and simple, a camouflage—unsuccessful to boot—of a voracious appetite for the wealth of Namibia. And, as its crowning crime, South Africa has taken advantage of the Mandate entrusted to it by the United Nations to apply its detestable racist policy in Namibia. That policy is nothing other than a means to preserve the privileges of a minority. That is why the Government of South Africa has established and maintains a society based on an exclusively white minority in order to exploit the black population and refuses any suggestion of equality between citizens of different races. Using shameless lies and baseless arguments, Vorster and his clique still try to justify their illegal presence in Namibia. They raise, among other things, the spectre of communism. Is it the Communists who have oppressed the Namibian African

people? Communism was not born in Africa, still less in Namibia, and there is no call for these struggles over influence and ideologies between the big Powers of this world to lead to the choosing of Namibia as the place in which to settle their rivalries. While the South Africans know the joys of liberty, in contrast to the *apartheid* régime which they have created, they should understand that a national liberation movement has nothing to do with Communist ideology, above all when that movement was born of reaction to a racial movement of oppression which they have created and imposed on Namibia.

40. Whatever the name that Vorster and his clique wish to give to their illegal occupation of Namibia, it is nothing more than terror deliberately organized against a people that claims the right to decide its own future. But this would not be possible if this minority of "haves" could not bank on foreign protection. If they lost that protection they would be left alone with their arrogance, which would avail them nothing and would soon desert them before an aroused people.

41. My delegation is convinced that any assistance given to South Africa and any continuance of political, economic or other relations with it constitutes a violation of the obligations assumed vis-à-vis our Organization. Our membership in the United Nations imposes on us a collective responsibility in which is implicit the duty for all to find adequate solutions.

42. I would recall here that it is not by deploying military forces that South Africa will suppress the claims of the Namibian people. The recent examples, in Africa and elsewhere, have proved to us that violence against a people cannot quell their feeling of dignity and freedom. All those who wish to perpetuate oppression by arms against the popular forces of liberation have suffered heavy defeats and losses. Domination and oppression cannot be imposed on a people. Our legitimate indignation at the inhuman treatment that the racist minority visits upon the Namibian people must be translated into concrete deeds. The people of Namibia must not feel themselves abandoned in their struggle. For the Namibian people, we cannot do otherwise than demand liberation first, and peace will follow, because no peace is possible so long as the Namibian people are herded into bantustans, while their freedom of movement is not guaranteed, while political prisoners, under the pretext that they cause disorder and chaos, are languishing in Namibia's lock-ups, and while the worthy sons of Namibia, united in SWAPO, are condemned to exile or to clandestine activities in their own country. No peaceful solution is conceivable while South Africa, so as to continue to pillage Namibia and to satisfy its greed for profits, has not renounced its groundless claim to the unilateral annexation of Walvis Bay.

43. The entire international community must loyally work together in the quest for adequate solutions by applying severe sanctions against South Africa. It would be very serious, indeed, for the future of our Organization, were we to accept failure in this matter. We can no longer simply take note of the situation. Action and intervention are necessary so that right shall triumph, since it would be a dereliction of our duty to this people if the international community did not put an end to the illegal colonial

occupation of Namibia by South Africa and guarantee freedom and dignity for the valiant Namibian people. It is in order to contribute to this action that my delegation will support with an unreserved "Yes" all the draft resolutions before us.

44. Mr. THIEMELE (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation, in sponsoring five of the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia, has wished to give expression to its absolute commitment to the people of Namibia and to the independence of this neighbourly, brotherly people, whose country has been occupied for over 60 years by the Republic of South Africa in disregard of all international law and the relevant decisions of the United Nations.

45. The Ivory Coast hopes that our Namibian brothers will continue their struggle against the occupying Power and that everything will be done to secure the withdrawal of South Africa and the proclamation of independence in the context of the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia.

46. The Ivory Coast will continue in its own way to give material and moral support to the freedom-fighters and, in particular, SWAPO, until final victory is achieved.

47. However, and precisely to speed up this victory that we think is near, we consider that the international community should avail itself of every opportunity to liberate Namibia peacefully, because, while armed struggle will inevitably lead to the satisfaction of the aspirations of the people concerned, no one has been able to assess its cost in time, in loss of life and in the destruction of property. Let us not, therefore, react with preconceived ideas and mistaken prejudices. Let us not criticize those who for the first time have solemnly committed themselves to negotiate the independence of Namibia, something that 20 years of resolutions have not been able to achieve. Why not give this venture a chance, even for a few months, to see how far the South African régime is prepared to go in liberating Namibia?

48. We recognize and support the efforts of the SWAPO militants, who are waging a relentless war against the supporters of *apartheid*, but we also feel that our Organization has other means of achieving the same end.

49. It is for this reason that my delegation cannot associate itself with the wording of operative paragraphs 11 and 21 of draft resolution A/32/L.7, which does not take into account present developments in the Namibian question and on which we wish to express our most serious reservations.

50. Mr. ASENSIO-WUNDERLICH (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Guatemala wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolutions relating to Namibia, on which we are about to vote.

51. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/32/L.4, L.5, L.6, L.8 and L.9/Rev.1, but is compelled to abstain in the vote on draft resolutions A/32/L.7 and L.10, in view of the fact that in the preambular paragraphs they include certain views that Guatemala does not share, just as we do not agree with operative paragraph 11 of draft

resolution A/32/L.7. None the less, Guatemala wishes to state that it agrees with the sense and substance of both of these draft resolutions and with most of their provisions.

52. Mr. MAGONGO (Swaziland): The Kingdom of Swaziland, as a former colonial country, has always stood for the freedom and independence of our fellow South Africans, the people of Namibia. We support their inalienable right to self-determination and recognize the formidable obstacles in their way to achieve this God-given right. It has always been the wish of the Government and the people of Swaziland that the transfer of power to the indigenous population should be by peaceful means and in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

53. The world community has on more than one occasion stated that it is about time that the people of Namibia should join the community of nations as a free and independent country. We know that the people of Namibia are a peace-loving people. They, like any other people, aspire to be given an opportunity to control their future.

54. We welcome the commitment by all parties involved to ensure that the situation in Namibia will lead to peaceful elections.

55. As an expression of our support of the noble principles contained in the various draft resolutions, my delegation will cast an affirmative vote on all the draft resolutions except one. We would have wished to express our support on all the draft resolutions, as we did last year, but owing to the new elements as found in paragraphs 31 (e) and 32 of draft resolution A/32/L.7, we regret that the circumstances dictated by our own geographical vulnerability compel us to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.7. It is the earnest hope of my delegation that the international community will understand our difficult position in these trying times.

56. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last delegation which wished to speak in explanation of its vote before the vote. The Assembly will now proceed to take a decision on the various draft resolutions before it. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of these draft resolutions is contained in document A/32/322.

57. We turn first to draft resolution A/32/L.4 and Add.1-3, entitled "Implementation of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia." Last year a similar draft resolution was adopted without vote. May I consider that the General Assembly decides to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 32/9 A).

58. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution A/32/L.5 and Add.1-3, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia". The administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution appear in paragraph 6 of the Fifth Committee's report in document A/32/322. Last year a similar resolution was adopted without vote. May I take it that the General Assembly decides to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 32/9 B).

59. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution A/32/L.6 and Add.1-3 is entitled "Dissemination of information on Namibia". The administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution appear in paragraph 6 of the Fifth Committee's report in document A/32/322. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 135 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 32/9 C).¹

60. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution A/32/L.7 and Add.1-3, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland,

¹ The delegation of the Dominican Republic subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, 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.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Central African Empire, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 117 votes to none, with 24 abstentions (resolution 32/9 D).²

61. The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution A/32/L.8 and Add.1-3, entitled "Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia,

² The delegation of the Dominican Republic subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

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.

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 136 votes to none, with 4 abstentions (resolution 32/9 E).³

62. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution A/32/L.9/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia". The administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution appear in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Fifth Committee's report in document A/32/322. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 136 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 32/9 F).⁴

³ The delegation of the Dominican Republic subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

⁴ The delegation of the Dominican Republic subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

63. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to draft resolution A/32/L.10 and Add.1-3, entitled "Intensification and co-ordination of United Nations action in support of Namibia". The administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution appear in paragraph 6 of the Fifth Committee's report in document A/32/322. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 11 abstentions (resolution 32/9 G).⁵

64. The PRESIDENT: Lastly, we come to draft resolution A/32/L.11 and Add.1-3, entitled "Special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia". The administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution appear in paragraph 8 of the Fifth Committee's report [A/32/322]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Re-

public, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 135 votes to none, with 6 abstentions (resolution 32/9 H).⁶

65. The PRESIDENT: Thus we have concluded the vote on the eight draft resolutions. I shall now call on those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of their vote after the vote.

66. Mr. ECONOMOU (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation voted in favour of the resolutions which we have just adopted on the situation in Namibia, because it approves the way in which they deal with this important question of decolonization.

67. Nevertheless, my delegation maintains its reservations with regard to certain paragraphs of draft resolution A/32/L.7. But, mindful of our desire to support vigorously the application of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, we did not want those reservations to be an obstacle to our positive vote.

Mr. Christophides (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

68. Miss DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): On 20 October [40th meeting], Belgium expressed the point of view of the nine countries of the European Community on this question of Namibia. That position is unequivocal: to our mind, Security Council resolution 385 (1976) is still

⁵ The delegation of the Dominican Republic subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

⁶ The delegation of the Dominican Republic subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

the exact framework prescribed by the international community for putting an end to the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia.

69. Five countries members of the Security Council are now engaged in exploratory efforts, which have shown some progress, towards attaining the aim of the international community, that is, a speedy and peaceful solution to the problem. Their action has our support.

70. Since some of the texts which have been voted upon do not seem to be likely to expedite such a solution, Belgium was, regretfully, unable to vote for all of the draft resolutions concerning the question of Namibia in their entirety.

71. I shall simply mention some of our objections. In draft resolution A/32/L.7, we cannot accept passages such as paragraph 11, which clearly advocates armed struggle. At a time when a number of countries and SWAPO itself recognize the validity of the diplomatic efforts under way to work out a negotiated solution, we do not think that violence can be excused here. Belgium, like its eight partners in the European Community, has always advocated, in accordance with the principles of the Charter, a peaceful solution for as long as such a solution is not impossible. True, the more recent decrees of South Africa hardly augur well for the termination of *apartheid*, and the Security Council has taken a stern stand in connexion with recent developments. We think nevertheless that the peaceful liberation of Namibia remains achievable.

72. We do not doubt the fact that SWAPO is the most visibly active political force in the negotiation process, but the language of operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/32/L.7 does not take account of the fact that SWAPO itself has stated that it would heed a popular verdict which would result from free elections under the aegis of the United Nations. SWAPO recognizes the principle of democratic self-determination stipulated by the international community, but the text of the resolution seems to us to prejudge the result of future elections.

73. Furthermore, as regards the statutory authority of the Council for Namibia at the international level, Belgium has certain misgivings as to the manner in which draft resolutions A/32/L.8 and A/32/L.10 deal with this complex matter. As last year, certain parts of the resolutions adopted by the Assembly do not seem consonant with the respective duties of the Security Council and the General Assembly under the Charter.

74. As to draft resolution A/32/L.11, we question the timeliness of deciding as of now on the resumption of the thirty-second session of the General Assembly in a special session on the question of Namibia, the date of which will be decided only with the agreement of certain Member States.

75. Mr. VERGAU (Federal Republic of Germany): The reasons why my delegation deemed it appropriate to abstain in the vote on five of the eight draft resolutions just adopted by the General Assembly have already been outlined by the Ambassador of Canada in his statement on behalf of the five Western members of the Security Council.

76. The Federal Republic of Germany has joined in the consensus or voted in favour of the other draft resolutions concerning Namibia. As active participants in the current initiative of the five members of the Council, we see this as an expression of our great interest in the advancement of Namibia to an early independence and of our full support for the United Nations in the exercise of its special responsibility in this context. Many of the tasks that arise from this special responsibility have been entrusted to the Council for Namibia. That is why all the draft resolutions to which my delegation has given its approval today deal with this important body.

77. The Federal Republic of Germany has always been prepared to co-operate as closely as possible with the Council for Namibia as well as with the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Ahtisaari. The Council and the Commissioner have acquired great merit in promoting Namibian interests during this difficult period. They have also acquired a knowledge of and experience in Namibian affairs that will yet play an important rôle in the further development of this Territory towards independence.

78. Our respect for the Council of Namibia is in no way impaired by the fact that we do not entirely share the interpretation of its legal status as it appears to be reflected in certain provisions of the resolutions just adopted. Our legal system does not allow us to consider decrees enacted by the Council to be legally binding. This view is based on considerations of international law.

79. My delegation has studied this year's report of the Council for Namibia [A/32/24] with great interest and has found it a very valuable document. Seven of the eight resolutions just adopted are based on recommendations contained in this report.

80. Since my delegation, together with the four other Western members of the Security Council, has decided not to pronounce any judgement on five of these draft resolutions, it also has to reserve its position on the provisions contained in the other draft resolutions relating to the adoption of the report of the Council as a whole.

81. Parallel to our efforts to help to bring about early independence for Namibia, the Federal Republic of Germany is already taking concrete measures with respect to the period following attainment of that independence. It has assisted the United Nations Institute for Namibia in Lusaka, which prepares young Namibians for their future tasks in an independent Namibia, by making important financial and other contributions, and it will continue to do so. We also continue to give financial assistance to the Fund for Namibia.

82. This year, we have made available to UNICEF the amount of \$120,000, which will be used exclusively in a project in favour of Namibian refugees in Angola.

83. Let us hope that the combined efforts of the international community will soon be successful so that, instead of debating this issue here in New York, we can marshal our efforts to co-operate to promote the prosperous development of Namibia as a new, independent country.

84. Mr. PIGNATTI (Italy): Italy has just cast positive votes on seven of the eight resolutions just adopted by the General Assembly, intending to express in this manner its whole-hearted support of the speedy attainment of self-determination and independence for the Namibian people.

85. In this spirit, my delegation would have preferred to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions that were put forward. However, we felt compelled to abstain in the vote on document A/32/L.7, despite our appreciation of the ideas behind it and our agreement with much of its content. The main reason for our abstention was the support for armed struggle expressed in operative paragraph 11. My Government has consistently taken the position that international disputes should be settled within the framework of the principles set out in the Charter of the United Nations. In this particular instance, we believe that the struggle for self-determination should also be carried on—short, however, of violent retaliation in reaction to the oppression of foreign domination.

86. With regard to the other draft resolutions, we have reservations on operative paragraphs 6 and 7 of document A/32/L.10, concerning Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia; operative paragraph 4(c) of document A/32/L.4, concerning the provision for a decree on navigation in Namibian waters; and operative paragraph 2 of document A/32/L.6 concerning the map of Namibia prepared by the United Nations Council for Namibia. Without prejudice to the substantive value of these decrees and documents, we still believe that the legal basis on which the United Nations Council for Namibia is issuing them remains questionable.

87. My delegation would also like to place on record its reservations on operative paragraph 3 of document A/32/L.8. In our opinion, in this respect, by granting full membership to the United Nations Council for Namibia in all specialized agencies and other organizations and conferences of the United Nations, after having already granted observer status to SWAPO we would have been confronted with the paradoxical situation of double representation of the same territorial entity and the same people by two different bodies.

88. As for draft resolution A/32/L.11, Italy has associated itself with the will of the majority of the Assembly, and in particular with the wishes of its African members, to hold a special session on the question of Namibia. We have reservations, however, on the practical usefulness of such a provision as well as with regard to its financial burden. In our opinion, the decision to hold a special session should depend upon the result of negotiations currently under way, namely, those being carried on by the five Western members of the Security Council, to which we take this opportunity to pledge our support.

89. Mr. LIN Chao-nan (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The General Assembly just now adopted eight resolutions on the question of Namibia. The Chinese delegation voted in favour of these resolutions. However, draft resolution A/32/L.5 on the United Nations Fund for Namibia, in its operative paragraph 9 makes reference to the World Bank and the IMF. The Chinese delegation deems it necessary to point out once again with emphasis that these two

organizations have to date refused to implement the General Assembly resolution on the expulsion of the Chiang Kai-shek clique adopted at its twenty-sixth session in 1971 [*resolution 2758 (XXVI)*]. These organizations obstinately pursue the policy of “two Chinas”. This cannot be tolerated.

90. We request that this principled stand of the Chinese delegation be included in the record of the meeting.

91. Mr. PFIRTER (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In keeping with our traditional position on the question of Namibia we supported all the draft resolutions voted on today. Nevertheless, we wish this year to reiterate in connexion with operative paragraphs 10 and 11 of draft resolution A/32/L.7 the reservation formulated by the delegation of Argentina on 10 December 1976 in the Fourth Committee at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly,⁷ when the same question was voted upon.

92. Finally, we wish to add that what we have just stated concerning operative paragraph 10 defines the context within which we interpret operative paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/32/L.7.

93. Mr. LAL (Fiji): My delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia because we unreservedly support the inalienable right of the Namibian people to total freedom and early majority rule. We are totally opposed to racially oppressive practices, such as the repulsive *apartheid* system which has been forcibly extended to Namibia. We firmly believe that the illegal South African régime should withdraw from Namibia, thus facilitating the early transfer of power to Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976) by means of free elections for the whole of Namibia under the auspices of the United Nations. In order to facilitate current initiatives for change, South Africa should abandon the militarization of the Territory and the suspension of human freedoms and should immediately release all political prisoners and detainees. It is within the framework of total freedom that the people of Namibia, guided by SWAPO, can achieve its freedom by peaceful means.

94. It is in the light of this that we have some reservations on paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/32/L.7 and sincerely believe that South Africa should speedily withdraw, thus creating conditions conducive to an early and orderly transfer of power.

95. Mr. ORTNER (Austria): As my delegation has already stressed in its statement in the general debate on this item [*42nd meeting*], we attach the greatest importance to an early and peaceful transition to freedom and independence for a united Namibia. We strongly believe that, at this crucial stage in our common endeavours to achieve this goal, it is essential to send a clear message to the South African Government, to maintain and intensify pressure on that Government and to support the Namibian people in their just struggle and their efforts to prepare for the time when they will finally have gained independence.

⁷ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Fourth Committee*, 45th meeting, para. 8, and *ibid.*, *Fourth Committee, Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

96. We find these basic issues adequately reflected in the draft resolutions on which we have just voted and are pleased to express our fundamental agreement with their thrust and essential content. The Austrian delegation was able, therefore, to support all but one of the drafts.

97. As regards the draft resolution on the situation in Namibia contained in document A/32/L.7, my delegation, much to its regret, had to abstain in the vote because of reservations we hold concerning certain of its provisions. For example, with respect to operative paragraph 11, the Austrian delegation reiterates its basic belief that, however sympathetic we may be as regards the desperation of peoples frustrated in their just struggle for freedom and independence, the United Nations should refrain from advocating the use of force and violence. Concerning operative paragraphs 5 and 20 and some of the subsequent provisions, we feel that such pronouncements and conclusions fall within the competence of another United Nations organ, which is indeed at the present time contemplating such action. Furthermore, crucial as the role of SWAPO must be, other Namibians should not be excluded from participating in shaping the future of that Territory. It is for these and other reasons that we could not support that draft resolution.

98. As far as the other draft resolutions are concerned, for which we cast affirmative votes, we have some misgivings, based on fundamental legal considerations, about the wording and content of a few provisions. These have been explained on earlier occasions and need not be repeated at this point.

99. In conclusion, permit me to stress once more our whole-hearted support for the efforts undertaken by the Namibian people, and endorsed by the international community, to achieve an early settlement of this situation.

100. Mr. MARQUES (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Uruguay voted in favour of the draft resolutions in documents A/32/L.4 to A/32/11 inclusive, with their addenda and revisions.

101. This is only natural given our definite anti-colonialist outlook, which began with the emergence of Spanish American independence and given, moreover, our awareness of the present historic juncture, which calls for strict compliance with binding decisions of the United Nations.

102. Notwithstanding our affirmative vote, we feel compelled to enter the following reservations. First, while supporting the cause of the independence of all peoples and expressing the hope that their aspirations, based on both human and legal considerations, will be fulfilled without delay, we note that operative paragraphs 10 and 12 of draft resolution A/32/L.7 give one organization the status of sole representative of the Namibian people. This implies the institutionalization of the existence of a single party to the exclusion of others.

103. Secondly, we note that paragraph 11 refers to support for armed struggle. In this connexion we feel that the inclusion of such a statement could be construed as a distressing recognition of the weakness of the United Nations, which is something that we cannot accept, since

this paragraph implies that a peaceful settlement in accordance with the Preamble, principles and purposes of the Charter cannot be achieved. Quite the contrary; all peoples must unite their efforts and exhaust every possible means of finding solutions in keeping with those principles.

104. Thirdly, we wish to enter a reservation in respect of operative paragraph 31 (*e*) which requests all States to suspend and prohibit "any supply of oil and petroleum products or any other fuel to South Africa". This implies in fact a serious economic sanction, something which would be more appropriately dealt with in the Security Council. On the other hand, such a far-reaching measure would punish a State and its entire population without distinction as to class or race.

105. Mr. VAN GORKOM (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.7 but supported the other draft resolutions the General Assembly has just adopted. In view of our support for the early self-determination and independence of the people of Namibia, my delegation, of course, would have much preferred to cast a positive vote on all the draft resolutions. To our regret we were not able to do so as draft resolution A/32/L.7 included paragraphs which, in the view of my delegation, do not take into account recent developments with regard to Namibia and, in some cases, are even detrimental to the course of an early peaceful solution.

106. During the debate the representative of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the nine countries of the European Communities, stated that in our view recent developments with regard to Namibia have reached a stage where an early and peaceful transition to self-determination and independence by the people of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976) might well be possible. The representative of Belgium also indicated the support of the nine countries members of the European Community for the efforts of the five Western members of the Security Council to reach such a solution.

107. However, draft resolution A/32/L.7 makes no reference whatsoever to these developments and passes over in silence the efforts of the five Western members of the Security Council.

108. Although we would welcome contacts between SWAPO and the South African Government, we think the decision contained in operative paragraph 12 that independent talks concerning Namibia be confined to these two sides, is inopportune under the present circumstances, pointing as it does to an unrealistic approach.

109. My Government holds the view that it is not for the United Nations to express explicit support for armed struggle, as formulated in operative paragraph 11. In the light of the efforts of the five Western members of the Security Council just mentioned, the Netherlands Government particularly regrets the appeal in operative paragraph 13 to all Member States to support such a struggle.

110. The Netherlands Government recognizes SWAPO as a major political force in Namibia which should be and in fact is directly involved in the negotiations currently in

progress. However, we cannot regard SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people as is stated in operative paragraph 10. There are other political groupings in Namibia which, together with SWAPO, should establish their credentials in free and democratic elections, as provided for in Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

111. With regard to the question of Walvis Bay, we entirely share the view that, for political as well as economic reasons, this territory would be of vital importance to an independent Namibia and, therefore, should become part of it. On historical and legal grounds, however, we regard as incorrect, or at least inaccurate, the wording of operative paragraphs 7 and 8 and, in particular, the expressions "integral part" and "to annex".

112. The Netherlands Government is concerned about the prospect of South Africa acquiring nuclear arms—deeply concerned indeed. It considers it unjustified, however, to level accusations against countries which never intended to provide South Africa with such weapons as is now being alleged in operative paragraphs 10 and 21.

113. Although my delegation supported draft resolution A/32/L.11 the Netherlands is of the opinion that the United Nations already spends a considerable amount of time discussing the problems of Namibia. We sincerely doubt whether a special session of the General Assembly could make an important additional contribution. Indeed it would be regrettable if it became a habit to hold special sessions to consider items that already received adequate attention in the regular sessions of the General Assembly.

114. Although we have been obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/32/L.7 we have readily and wholeheartedly endorsed the other draft resolutions. I should like to emphasize once again the whole-hearted support of the Netherlands for a speedy solution granting the people of Namibia the self-determination and independence they have already been seeking for so long and which is so overdue. To achieve that goal, my Government pledges its full support.

115. Mr. QUARTIN-SANTOS (Portugal): Portugal voted in favour of all the draft resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the question of Namibia, out of consistency with my Government's over-all position on this problem and especially with the support it has always provided to the struggle of the Namibian people for their self-determination, independence, national unity and territorial integrity.

116. However, I should like to point out that the positive votes cast by the Portuguese delegation on all those draft resolutions should not be interpreted as a full endorsement of all the provisions therein, particularly all those contained in draft resolution A/32/L.7.

117. Mr. ZEGERS (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Chile, in keeping with the policy pursued by its Government over the years with respect to the process of decolonization carried out by the United Nations and, in particular, in the case of Namibia, and in accordance, furthermore, with what we stated in our intervention at the 38th plenary meeting of the General Assembly on

agenda item 91, has voted in favour of draft resolution A/32/L.7 entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa", together with all the other draft resolutions relating to this same item.

118. In this way the Chilean delegation has sought to give evidence of its solidarity with the cause of the people of Namibia and this inalienable right to self-determination and political independence, in accordance with the precepts of the United Nations Charter and the principles of resolution 1514 (XV) and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

119. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chilean delegation wishes to place on record its serious reservations concerning some of the paragraphs of document A/32/L.7 which we have just adopted. To begin with, and in connexion with a number of paragraphs in the recently adopted resolution, the Chilean delegation feels that the application of sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter is a task devolving on the Security Council, and this General Assembly does not have competence to impose such sanctions.

120. With reference to operative paragraph 11 of that same draft, the Chilean delegation considers that the settlement of disputes through peaceful negotiated means is one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and that our very presence and participation in this Organization reflects that conviction.

121. For this reason, we believe that every possibility of finding a peaceful solution to the Namibian question should be exhausted.

122. With reference to draft resolution A/32/L.10, which has just been adopted, we wish to formulate a similar reservation in respect of the topics to which I have just referred.

123. Lastly, as stated in the plenary Assembly by the Chilean delegation when this matter was discussed, we wish to place on record our definite and firm support of the rapid independence of Namibia.

124. Mr. ONDA (Japan): My delegation would like to make a few comments on some of the resolutions that have just been adopted.

125. We abstained in the vote on the draft resolution entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa" contained in document A/32/L.7.

126. My delegation has much in common with the views expressed in that draft resolution; however, some of its provisions prevented us from supporting the draft resolution in its entirety, since they are inconsistent with Japan's basic position on the question of Namibia, which has been stated on a number of occasions, including the statement on 27 September by our Foreign Minister, Mr. Hatoyama, during the general debate [*8th meeting*].

127. As regards all the other draft resolutions, my delegation voted in favour of them or joined in the

consensus adoption. However, it wishes to make the following reservations.

128. With regard to the draft resolution entitled "Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia", contained in document A/32/L.8, my delegation reserves its position on operative paragraph 3.

129. With regard to the draft resolution entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia", contained in document A/32/L.9/Rev.1, my delegation's affirmative vote does not mean that it accepts all the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

130. With regard to the draft resolution entitled "Intensification and co-ordination of United Nations action in support of Namibia", contained in document A/32/L.10, my delegation has reservations on operative paragraphs 3, 6 and 7. Japan's current trade with Namibia is very small and in no way constitutes an attempt to help consolidate the continued illegal presence of South Africa in the Territory. It is difficult for my Government under present conditions to implement these provisions fully, but it will continue to do its best to co-operate with international action to ensure the implementation of the resolution as completely as is practical and possible, just as it has done in matters other than trade.

131. Finally, my delegation would like to make an observation on operative paragraph 4 of the resolution entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia", contained in document A/32/L.5. Being fully aware of the importance of the United Nations Fund for Namibia, Japan makes annual contributions of \$60,000 to the Fund. We regret that only a very limited number of States makes voluntary contributions to the Fund, and we hope that a greater number of States will become voluntary contributors to the Fund. My delegation believes that efforts in this regard should be given more emphasis, as compared with the proposal in the paragraph in question.

132. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): The situation in Namibia has this year entered a new and decisive phase. My delegation hopes that the ongoing negotiating efforts in the weeks and months that lie ahead will bring concrete and constructive results, enabling the people of Namibia to gain independence in 1978, in accordance with the principles of Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

133. By voting in favour of all the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia, the Norwegian Government has wanted to express its whole-hearted support for a speedy achievement of independence for the Territory, while taking into account the special responsibility of the United Nations towards Namibia. Consequently, my Government has attached greater importance to the over-all political content and the spirit of the draft resolutions on which we have just voted than to our reservations on certain elements in these texts.

134. None the less, the Norwegian Government wants to reiterate its well-known and long-standing support for political change by peaceful means. My Government has,

therefore, had to reserve its position on operative paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/32/L.7. My delegation wants also to reserve its position on certain other elements of this draft resolution which concern matters falling within the purview of the Security Council.

135. Mr. TÓMASSON (Iceland): Iceland has voted in favour of all the eight draft resolutions adopted by the General Assembly this morning on the question of Namibia. However, I should like to explain that my Government has certain reservations on the wording of some of them. In particular my Government is not able to subscribe to the second part of operative paragraph 2 and the whole of operative paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/32/L.7, where support is expressed for the use of arms in the Namibian people's struggle for national independence.

136. With this reservation in mind and for the record, my delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution also, as Iceland wants to show sympathy and give support to the subjugated people of Namibia in this just struggle for self-determination and national independence.

137. Mr. LOWENSTEIN (United States of America): The representative of Canada has already explained why the United States and some of our colleagues in the Security Council have abstained in the vote on some of the draft resolutions adopted today. I shall now make a few additional comments on some of the other draft resolutions.

138. The first time I ever addressed the United Nations was 18 years ago⁸ when I spoke in the Fourth Committee as a petitioner for the African people of Namibia. The suffering of the people of Namibia seemed very distant from the United Nations in those days, and the Assembly will understand at once how much it means to me personally to share in the sense of great progress towards ending that suffering that has occurred since those difficult times, and the Assembly will understand how happy I am that, acting now on behalf of the United States Government, I could join today in the consensus on the draft resolutions on the Fund for Namibia and on the implementation of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia. Both the Fund for Namibia and the Nationhood Programme provide valuable and needed assistance to the people of Namibia.

139. I must add these observations about those resolutions. First, our participation today in the consensus on draft resolution A/32/L.5 on the Fund for Namibia, does not indicate a change in our view that United Nations voluntary funds should be maintained by voluntary contributions and not by disbursement from the regular United Nations budget.

140. Secondly, we are concerned also that operative paragraph 4(c) of resolution A/32/L.4, which asks IMCO to assist the Council for Namibia in drawing up and enacting a decree on navigation may raise a series of difficult issues in the context of the law of the sea which cannot be resolved in this way at this time. In any event,

⁸ *Ibid.*, Fourteenth Session, Fourth Committee, 907th meeting, paras. 7-22.

progress, visible in this session today, is welcomed by all of us who have been concerned about the problem of Namibia.

141. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland): The situation prevailing in Namibia as a result of its illegal occupation by South Africa is a matter of grave concern to the Irish Government. Eleven years ago we voted in favour of the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, and since that time we have consistently supported the international community's condemnation of the continued illegal occupation and its demands on South Africa to withdraw from the Territory without delay. My Government recognizes that the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, independence, territorial integrity, and in fact their basic political and human rights, have been flagrantly denied.

142. In keeping with these views my delegation was pleased to be able to support seven of the eight draft resolutions adopted today and regrets the fact that, due to a number of reservations, we were unable fully to endorse draft resolution A/32/L.7. Some of these reservations, both on this draft resolution and on those we supported, I should like to mention here.

143. In particular, my Government has some hesitation in endorsing all the references to the status and the role of the Council for Namibia in draft resolutions A/32/L.8, L.9 and L.10. Although recognizing the outstanding achievements of the Council for Namibia in protecting and promoting the interests of the people of Namibia, my Government has some problems in accepting all the implications of these provisions, and we also find the dual representation of Namibia at the international level by both the Council and SWAPO somewhat anomalous.

144. Also, with regard to the problem of Walvis Bay, which is referred to in draft resolutions A/32/L.6 and L.7, my Government hopes that this issue can be settled by peaceful negotiations between the parties concerned.

145. One further point. My Government has problems with the reference to "armed struggle" in resolution A/32/L.7, particularly at a time when serious efforts are at last being made to facilitate a negotiated settlement in Namibia.

146. My Government's commitment to the question of Namibia is well known. Our views on this question were most recently represented in the statement by my colleague, the Permanent Representative of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the nine member States of the European Communities during the general debate on this item, a statement with which we fully associated ourselves. We would like to take this opportunity to place on record our Government's solidarity with the people of Namibia and their political leaders, particularly SWAPO. We also wish to express our support for the work of the Council for Namibia, for the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Ahtisaari, and for all those working to achieve an early and just settlement in Namibia.

147. Mr. CROS (France) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Canada has stated the reasons which prompted my Government to abstain in the vote on five of the draft resolutions we have just adopted. Furthermore,

my delegation is pleased to go along with the consensus on draft resolutions A/32/L.4 and L.5. On the first of these texts, however, some of the wording gives rise to reservations of a legal nature on which my delegation has on several occasions stated its position.

148. Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom): The representative of Canada has already explained why my delegation, in common with its Western colleagues on the Security Council, abstained in the vote on a number of the draft resolutions which the Assembly has just adopted. My delegation was happy to vote in favour of draft resolutions A/32/L.4 and L.5. We contribute to the Fund and to the Institute for Namibia and we welcome the broad objectives of the Nationhood Programme.

149. We should like to record, however, that some paragraphs of draft resolution A/32/L.4 continue to give rise to serious difficulties for my delegation.

150. Finally, I wish to reaffirm my Government's full commitment to early independence for Namibia in accordance with resolution 385 (1976) of the Security Council and its sincere belief that this objective can still be attained peacefully.

151. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran): The Iranian Government has for years supported the just struggle of the oppressed peoples of southern Africa to free themselves from the colonial yoke. It is a strongly held view of my delegation that South Africa should withdraw from Namibia so that the people of the Territory will have an opportunity to decide their future in a fully democratic process under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

152. In accordance with our consistent policy on decolonization and adhering to the views we have expressed on Namibia, the delegation of Iran voted in favour of all the draft resolutions which have just been adopted. Nevertheless, my delegation would like to place on record that it is not in agreement with all the paragraphs of draft resolution A/32/L.7. Furthermore, my delegation wishes to declare that it interprets the provisions of those resolutions in the framework of the United Nations Charter and in the light of the principles established in its independent national foreign policy.

153. Mr. ORTEGA (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Costa Rica voted in favour of all the draft resolutions relating to the question of Namibia which were before the General Assembly.

154. Thus we give further proof of Costa Rica's solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people and place on record once again our repudiation of the behaviour of South Africa, which has consistently refused to comply with the relevant resolutions of this Assembly and the Security Council.

155. In recognizing that the texts strengthen the struggle for a free Namibia at the political, juridical and economic levels, my delegation none the less has reservations on operative paragraphs 10 and 11 of draft resolution A/32/L.7. Although we voted for it, because we agree with its general principles, we wish to state that, notwithstanding the recognition by our delegation of the important role of

SWAPO, we do not agree that we should prejudge the decisions that will in due course be taken by the Namibian people. We are not unaware of the fact that, in the meantime, SWAPO has served as the best vehicle for the protection of the interests of Namibia.

156. On the other hand, my delegation cannot support the reference made in operative paragraph 11 to the use of armed force, because we have always considered that this Assembly should abide by the provisions laid down in the Charter.

157. The PRESIDENT: We have now heard the last speaker in explanation of vote.

158. The representative of SWAPO has asked to be allowed to make a statement, and I call on him.

159. Mr. GURIRAB (South West Africa People's Organization): We have just witnessed a little while ago a clear demonstration of support for our struggle and reassurances of continued moral, political and diplomatic, as well as material, support by the overwhelming majority of States Members of this Organization. We also heard the usual explanations of vote before and after the vote from the same quarters that we regard to be the staunch supporters of the régime which is illegally occupying our country. In addition we heard explanations from some States which would but could not identify themselves with the majority wish of the international community.

160. We heard mention made of the diplomatic efforts being undertaken by certain States and of the fact that those efforts have produced progress internationally, that as a result of those efforts there are positive developments inside Namibia and that, therefore, caution was called for.

161. On 18 October the President of SWAPO addressed this august body [35th meeting]. In that statement, which was a balanced, well-thought-out and carefully presented one, the President of SWAPO sought to impress upon the attention of the international community the activities and policies of the illegal régime in Namibia, which, in defiance of this Organization, is still carrying out policies against the interests of the people of Namibia.

162. Some States mentioned only the so-called diplomatic progress and the so-called positive developments inside Namibia. We would like this Assembly, even at this late hour, to refer to that statement by SWAPO's President to see that, contrary to its promises to the international community, that régime is busy doing everything within its power inside Namibia to entrench its presence—and, for us as a liberation movement, that is very important.

163. The United Nations has assumed a special responsibility for Namibia; therefore, this Organization must think and act in a manner and magnitude commensurate with the policies and actions of the régime in Namibia.

164. The problem is not whether or not SWAPO is the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia. The problem with which this Organization is faced is the question of how committed are the States Members of this Organization collectively, and even individually, to carry out their responsibilities to compel that régime to leave Namibia. SWAPO was born as a result of the colonial

occupation of our country, the continued repression by successive administrations in our country of our people and the exploitation of our resources by that régime and by the multinational corporations which originate in most of the major countries of the Western world. That is the problem with which this Organization is faced, not whether or not SWAPO is the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia.

165. In any case, early last year the Security Council adopted resolution 385 (1976). All States Members of this Organization are therefore in duty bound, individually and collectively, to use their influence to bring pressure to bear on South Africa to comply with and implement the provisions of that resolution. We are now in November 1977, but South Africa has not as yet accepted the provisions of that resolution. When that régime does so all the people of Namibia will have an opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. Until that happens, and so far as we are concerned until and for so long as that régime continues to occupy our country, we are a liberation movement and the struggle will continue for so long.

166. Another element is the question of Walvis Bay. Walvis Bay was, is and will for ever be an integral part of Namibia. Neither now nor in the future shall we accept naked colonial aggression against our country and its people. The armed struggle will continue and be intensified until all the root-causes of our struggle are eliminated in Namibia.

167. We wish to reassure this Assembly and the rest of the international community that SWAPO will be the first to embrace any genuine, meaningful initiative towards a negotiated settlement in our country. But at the same time we cannot close our eyes to what is going on in Namibia as a result of the continued illegal occupation of our country by South Africa and so long as some Powers are using that illegal occupation to exploit the resources of our country.

168. Finally, we should once again like to thank all the countries which have voted in favour of the draft resolutions adopted a few minutes ago. We hope that, should there be time next year for this Assembly to debate the question of Namibia, other countries which abstained will also join in to vote in favour of those resolutions.

(d) Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia

169. The PRESIDENT: I should now like to draw the attention of the Assembly to the note by the Secretary-General in document A/32/321. In his note, the Secretary-General proposes the extension of the appointment of Mr. Ahtisaari as United Nations Commissioner for Namibia for a further one-year term until 31 December 1978. May I consider that the Assembly approves that proposal?

It was so decided (decision 32/307).

170. The PRESIDENT: I take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Ahtisaari and to wish him continued success in his valuable work.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.