



President: Mr. Imre HOLLAI (Hungary).

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

AGENDA ITEM 18

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (continued):

(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 Secretary-General

1. Mrs. JONES (Liberia): I want first to congratulate Mr. Hollai on the dedication, patience and understanding with which he has conducted the affairs of the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly thus far. The qualities he has exhibited are indeed those which the States Members of the United Nations need to resolve the chronic problems inherited by the Organization.

2. Old habits are difficult to uproot. Throughout human history, man has, for one reason or another, colonized or dominated and justified his action in his own eyes. This is a chronic habit of man. Another chronic habit is man's tendency to make war. These habits have been exhibited for more than 6,000 years. Thirty-seven years ago—the life span of the United Nations so far—we gave ourselves under the Charter the colossal task of uprooting these habits. Indeed, it has become the duty of the United Nations to ensure that all colonial peoples are free, in accordance with the rule of law. The rule of law guarantees that the exercise of this duty by the United Nations must be undertaken with a supreme sense of responsibility.

3. The scientific age in which we live has led to the hardening of positions and views concerning colonial rule in one form or another. Domination by colonial rule is not quite the same in every age; it is sometimes overt, sometimes covert; it may be visible or invisible. The justification common to all of these colonial manifestations and for what prevails today is, as always in colonial territories, expediency supported and reinforced by domination. Moreover, it is the exercise of the power to demonstrate that one nation is superior in the possession and use of technology, possessing technology superior to that of the lands that are colonized.

4. Speaking about colonial rule today may be like talking about the cave men and dinosaurs to some;

yet it cannot be overlooked that, in any age, people and nations will strive to dominate others because they are superior in the tools of domination. Domination will be interpreted in ways expedient to them, and this expediency must be cloaked with the respectability of the rule of law over a period of time. The fact remains that man has proved himself to be a better slave, so to speak, when he is free, and an inefficient slave when he is in bondage. The same principle holds true in fostering good relations among States.

5. The world has undergone various stages of decolonization. Many of the lands colonized on the continents are now free. Now, it is the islands which, for strategic reasons believed by some, are now in trouble. Small or large, the world is not free if one inch of territory remains under colonial rule. Man's rebellious spirit has been exhibited in the fight for freedom more than in any other arena. One day in the future it will be said, as Alexander the Great said, that there are no more lands to be conquered. One day there will be no more colonial territories left in the world. This achievement would have as great an impact as civilizing and educating man against warfare.

6. The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples must therefore be commended for its dedicated work for freedom, justice and peace. The world is a better place because of its efforts.

7. My Government will continue to support all efforts of the United Nations to bring freedom and justice to oppressed peoples. Indeed, it will join its efforts with those that labour tirelessly for the day when colonialists themselves will become weary of the self-imposed burden of colonial rule, a burden of wasteful and wasted energies, time and resources that could have been spent and used more productively.

8. It is paradoxical that the architects of the Charter of the United Nations are among those that are lukewarm about its full implementation. We must remind ourselves on occasion, when we tend to feel weary and frustrated about fighting for freedom for oppressed peoples, that nearly every State Member of the United Nations has had colonial experience. The fight to throw off the colonial yoke has been unrelenting. We know how it feels to be colonized, and we know how it feels not to be colonized. It is the latter feeling of achievement we should maintain and strive for, for those aspiring to achieve what we have achieved.

9. Mr. SAIGNAVONGS (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Today, 22 years after the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 1514 (XV), the political map of the world has been changed considerably by the accession of more than 50 countries and territories to self-determination and independence.

10. During the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, there were events that augured well for the history of the peoples of Vanuatu, Belize, and Antigua and Barbuda, which after years of struggle finally acceded to political independence and became full Members of the United Nations. These achievements highlight the historic significance of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union, and constitute an important landmark in the struggle of peoples for national liberation against colonialist, neo-colonialist and imperialist domination.

11. However, in spite of the considerable progress made in the process of decolonization, close to 4 million people in Asia, Africa and the Caribbean continue to suffer from oppression and colonialist domination, not to mention the newly independent States which are also enduring neo-colonialist domination and exploitation.

12. The vestiges of colonialism, even in its classical form of exploitation and oppression, have not totally disappeared from the face of the earth. The United Nations has made considerable efforts to eliminate these vestiges of the colonial past, but it has come up against numerous external factors which are serious obstacles to the application of resolutions on decolonization. This has happened, in particular, in the case of South Africa, Namibia, Puerto Rico, the Malvinas, and other Non-Self-Governing Territories.

13. In defiance of the numerous decisions of the United Nations and of the demands of the international community, the South African minority racists persist in their criminal policy of *apartheid* in an effort to maintain the indigenous majority population under their yoke by cruel and brutal repression. Similarly, they continue their illegal occupation of Namibia, a Territory for which the United Nations has assumed special responsibility, and engage in acts of aggression against independent neighbouring countries. The delaying tactics of the South African racists with respect to Namibia, with the complicity of their Western protectors, are designed to undermine the efforts of the United Nations to find a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem, and also to install and strengthen a neo-colonialist puppet régime in the Territory.

14. If the racist South African régime has had the audacity for a number of years to flaunt its defiance of the international community by sabotaging the Organization's decisions on Namibia, it is because it has been encouraged by the economic, financial, military and diplomatic aid which certain Western Powers members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], their transnational corporations and certain international financial institutions have continued to provide.

15. The attempts made by the United States to link the negotiations on the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist forces from Angola and its veto in the Security Council on sanctions against South Africa, as well as the recent decision of IMF to lend \$1.1 billion to Pretoria, are evidence of this.

16. In this respect, my delegation firmly denounces the manoeuvre to connect the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban forces, which is contrary to the letter and the spirit of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The granting of independence to Namibia has nothing whatsoever to do with the presence of Cuban internationalist forces in Angola. In our opinion, any negotiations on the settlement of the Namibian problem must be based upon resolution 435 (1978).

17. At the present time, although the attention of the international community is centred particularly upon the question of Namibia, we must not overlook the fate of the other Non-Self-Governing Territories, in particular the smallest of these. The goals and objectives of the Declaration on decolonization have not yet been achieved with respect to the small Territories situated in the Pacific, the Indian Ocean, the Atlantic and the Antilles. The continued colonial exploitation of these small Territories by imperialist monopolies and their use by the administering authorities as military bases are a serious obstacle to the exercise of self-determination and the achievement of independence by the peoples of these Territories and therefore an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration.

18. Under the Trusteeship Agreement, the Administering Authorities are committed to promoting the economic, political and social development of these small Territories until they achieve full independence. United Nations resolutions have frequently emphasized that size, geographic situation, population and limited natural resources should not delay self-determination by the Territories thus administered.

19. In spite of that, according to the report of the Special Committee [A/37/23/Rev.1], it appears that in certain of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, in particular the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, including Micronesia, the administering Power has not supplied sufficient economic assistance to the Territory to enable its populations to achieve the greatest possible degree of economic independence and to reduce the structural imbalances in their economies. More serious still is the policy of fragmentation carried out by the administering Power in this Territory, which delays the rapid access to independence and self-determination of these peoples.

20. In numerous resolutions, and in particular in paragraph 2 of resolution 35/119, the General Assembly has reaffirmed once again that:

“the continuation of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations—including racism, *apartheid*, the exploitation by foreign and other interests of economic and human resources, and the waging of colonial wars to suppress national liberation movements—is incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and poses a serious threat to international peace and security.”

21. In this spirit, and in conformity with the resolutions recently adopted by the Fourth Committee on the activities of foreign economic interests and foreign military activities which impede the implementation

of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, my delegation considers that it is imperative to put an end to the illegal occupation, annexation and use of Non-Self-Governing Territories for military purposes if we wish to create favourable conditions which will permit the indigenous populations to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. In this connection, it is imperative that enforcement measures be adopted, under Chapter VII of the Charter, against South Africa, which is the principal bastion of colonialism, racism and aggression and is an instrument of imperialist policy.

22. My delegation is in favour of the unconditional elimination of all military bases and installations in Non-Self-Governing Territories and is against any military activities on the part of the administering Powers in the colonial countries, including activities of mercenaries.

23. The Lao People's Democratic Republic wishes to reaffirm its unwavering support for the national liberation movements of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America fighting for the elimination of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations and for the rapid implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

24. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to pay tribute to the Special Committee for the efforts it has made in the fulfilment of its noble task, in spite of the numerous and varied obstacles it has met. Considering the historic responsibility of the United Nations concerning the liberation of colonial peoples, my delegation believes that we must co-ordinate our efforts and do everything possible to ensure that colonialism is finally removed from the face of the earth. My delegation is ready to support any proposals aimed at the achievement of that noble purpose.

25. Mr. SAHNOUN (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): A little over 22 years ago, the General Assembly adopted resolution 1514 (XV), which contains the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. With that historic resolution, the United Nations was responding to the express desire of peoples to recover their inalienable and absolute right to self-determination and independence. Resolution 1514 (XV) will be seen to have represented a special moment in the history of the movement towards the emancipation of peoples and in the decline of the colonial era.

26. By placing its action in the context of the phenomenon of decolonization and by assuming the solemn commitment to contribute to the advent of a new era purged of every concept of colonial and racial domination, the United Nations was being faithful to the ideals which prevailed at its own creation, thus giving them a new dimension.

27. The two decades that have just ended have been marked, from that standpoint, by a considerable contraction of the area of colonial domination in the world. Since the historic date of 14 December 1960, no less than 57 new States have been able to join the great United Nations family, and several tens of millions of people have regained freedom. Those results honour the United Nations, which realized that at the root of

peace lie freedom and the aspiration of each country to a freely determined national existence.

28. For Algeria, the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is not simply a major achievement of the United Nations to which it will never cease to pay tribute. Our unwavering loyalty to the Declaration is also and above all the expression of our allegiance to our own national liberation struggle, as well as testimony to our determination to strive unremittingly for the liberation of peoples still held under the colonial and racial yoke.

29. On this twentieth anniversary of Algeria's independence and admission to the United Nations, my delegation's contribution to this debate should be seen as an expression of our active solidarity with all peoples whose aspirations to self-determination, freedom and independence are reflected in the report of the Special Committee. Our contribution also bears witness to our conviction that a people determined to live in freedom is invincible, regardless of the price it must pay to win that freedom. Lastly, our contribution echoes the appeal of those peoples, which reminds us that the universality of the United Nations will be truly achieved only when all those peoples are occupying the places in this Hall which the Charter provides for them as sovereign and independent States.

30. While it is encouraging to note the irresistible progress of the peoples' liberation movement, and while the United Nations may take a certain legitimate pride in the important part played by the Special Committee in accelerating the decolonization process, that makes it even more frustrating that, here and there, vestiges of colonialism persist. Thus, in Africa and in the Atlantic, the Pacific and the Indian Oceans the colonial phenomenon continues.

31. The question of Namibia, to which my delegation will return in detail during its consideration by the General Assembly, remains particularly acute. The situation prevailing in that Territory, which has been declared the sole responsibility of the United Nations, is extremely tragic. Namibia is subjugated, its people oppressed, its natural resources plundered and its territory used for massive acts of aggression against a neighbouring State, the People's Republic of Angola.

32. For several decades now, South Africa has been enjoined in vain by the international community to respect its international obligations towards Namibia. But, still today, the South African *apartheid* régime persists in its defiance. It does so thanks to the direct or indirect support it receives from its allies, which are precisely those that, on pretexts which have nothing to do with the question of Namibia, are trying to block the process of the decolonization of that Territory. This means that the responsibility of the United Nations to lead that Territory to genuine independence remains unfulfilled. We call on the Assembly to shoulder its responsibility fully and to demand the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

33. The gains and achievements of the peoples' liberation movement also owe much to the Special Committee, to which we pay tribute for the historic role it has played. We reiterate our confidence in

that Committee. In addition to its unceasing work for the immediate and full implementation of resolution 1514 (XV), the Special Committee, thanks to the valuable assistance of the Department of Public Information, plays a decisive role in mobilizing international public opinion in favour of the struggle of peoples under colonial domination for the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. The Special Committee also consistently makes an outstanding and effective contribution to the debates in the General Assembly and the Security Council by submitting specific proposals to speed up the decolonization of all colonial Territories, including the small Territories of the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian Oceans.

34. In this connection, the Algerian delegation unreservedly supports all the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee to the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, as well as draft resolutions A/37/L.32 and Add.1 and A/37/L.33 and Add.1, of which, furthermore, it is a sponsor.

35. It is impossible to praise the historic actions of the Special Committee in favour of the emancipation of colonial peoples without mentioning the name of Mr. Frank Abdulah, of Trinidad and Tobago. Chairman of the Special Committee since 1979, Mr. Abdulah has left his mark on that body, both by his diligent mastery of the problems of decolonization and by his combative zeal. Thanks to his qualities as a wise diplomat and to the esteem he enjoys, he has made a valuable contribution to the cause of decolonization. I thank him for his tireless and unceasing efforts for the effective achievement of the goals of the Special Committee and for the promotion of the purposes and principles of the United Nations. At the same time, I wish him great success in his future tasks as his country's representative to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

36. I should not like to conclude before paying a particular tribute to Mr. I. Djermakoye, the Under-Secretary-General, who is leaving the Organization after having devoted to it more than 16 years of his life. I thank him for the work he has done in the service of the cause of the liberation of peoples.

37. Mr. HYERA (United Republic of Tanzania): Twenty-two years have elapsed since the Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Over this period, there has been substantial progress in the application of the principles of the Declaration, as many countries, including my own, have emerged from colonial bondage. Yet, as is amply shown by the present report of the Special Committee, the scourge of colonialism has not been completely eradicated. The people of Namibia, whose Territory is under the illegal occupation of the oppressive and obnoxious *apartheid* régime of South Africa, are still not free. Neither are the populations of island Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Caribbean and the Pacific. For these and other peoples, the success so far scored in decolonization only provides hope that they too will soon exercise self-determination. They are not free. They are still suffering. My delegation endorses the call of the Special Committee to the international community to continue to render unflinching support

for and solidarity with all peoples still under colonial domination in their struggle to achieve their independence and freedom.

38. The stage we have reached in the history of the struggle against colonialism and *apartheid* in South Africa calls for enhanced international dedication, perhaps more than ever before. For, as speakers rightly warned in the recent debate in the Assembly on the policies of *apartheid* of the white minority racist régime of South Africa, the fact that the questions of South Africa and Namibia have been on the General Assembly agenda for three decades poses a danger that our sensitivity to these issues might be blunted by repetition. Is it not ironical that, of the Territories on the initial list of those under colonial rule, the only Territory that for a long time now has been under the direct administration of the United Nations itself should be one of the last to be free, and that nazism, in whatever manifestation, should, almost 40 years after it was condemned as a crime against humanity, still be tolerated and, indeed, given comfort? It is therefore necessary for the international community not only to remain steadfast in support for the aspirations of the oppressed people of South Africa and Namibia but also to ensure that these evils, these blemishes, are immediately done away with. In this regard, my delegation fully supports the recommendations contained in the draft resolution on the dissemination of information on decolonization [A/37/L.33 and Add.1]. We believe that publicizing the liberation struggle is a key factor in furthering the purposes of the Declaration.

39. The problem of the independence settlement for Namibia is still unsolved. Negotiations to bring about a peaceful settlement on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have stalled. South Africa is still stubbornly defying the decision of this body which terminated that country's mandate over Namibia 18 years ago. In total disregard of the Charter of the United Nations, it still ignores and blocks all efforts aimed at a peaceful solution to the question. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country said the following in the general debate of this session, on 12 October:

“While we have been engaged in the negotiations aimed at securing a peaceful settlement to the Namibian question, we have maintained that: first, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the basis for achieving independence for Namibia and thus there is a need to have it implemented without delay; secondly, the Western contact group, at whose diplomatic initiative the plan for the independence of Namibia was originally conceived and which possesses considerable leverage over South Africa, has a duty to see to it that the plan is implemented; and thirdly, the central role of the Organization in working for the independence of the Territory must be underlined.

“Over the last few months the front-line States, SWAPO and Nigeria have been engaged in constructive consultations with the Western contact group regarding the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We regret that, although some progress has been made, some issues remain outstanding. But the main obstacle remains the intransigence of the South African régime and this defiance by the

South African authorities is regrettably assisted by the introduction into the negotiating process of an extraneous issue.

“It is thus a matter of deep regret that a non-issue should be made to pose as a difficulty. The attempt to link the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola poses a serious danger of derailing the entire exercise. ... We have made it clear that this issue is against the letter and the spirit of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and constitutes interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State.” [28th meeting, paras. 48-50.]

There has been no positive development on the question of Namibia since then.

40. We endorse the report of the Special Committee concerning the activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa. It is irrefutable that foreign economic and financial interests in Namibia and South Africa are a major obstacle to political independence and racial equality as well as to the enjoyment of the natural resources of these territories by their peoples.

41. A certain wise man is quoted as having said that in order to understand another person you should imagine yourself in his shoes. Who, in the shoes of the peoples under colonial and racist oppression, would buy, particularly at this late stage, the arguments advanced by self-confessed partners of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa—indeed, beneficiaries of *apartheid*—in favour of collaboration with that régime?

42. The intransigence of South Africa over Namibia can equally be explained by its desire to continue to plunder and exploit the natural resources of that Territory. My delegation joins others which condemn the policies of those Governments which continue to support those foreign economic and other interests engaged in exploiting the natural and human resources of the oppressed peoples of South Africa and of Namibia and other Non-Self-Governing Territories. In this regard we note with satisfaction that some enlightened ordinary shareholders of some of the multinational corporations have begun to question their association with the racist *apartheid* régime of South Africa in the illegal exploitation of uranium and other minerals in Namibia. The big demonstrations in May this year which greeted the annual meeting of the Rio Tinto Zinc Corporation in London and the questioning of the management of that corporation by some shareholders over the company's activities, particularly its private army in Namibia, are welcome developments and need to be encouraged. The keeping of private armies by some transnational corporations operating in Namibia is consistent only with the illegal nature of South Africa's occupation of that Territory and must be denounced.

43. The *apartheid* régime continues to use Namibia as a springboard for constant armed aggression against the neighbouring front-line States of Zambia and Angola. Even as we sit here today, South African troops still occupy southern Angola. South Africa has

also perpetrated and continues to perpetrate acts of aggression against Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana and Lesotho. South Africa's involvement with mercenaries who attempted to overthrow the legitimate Government of Seychelles last November is well known to all of us here.

44. South Africa's military adventurism and general military buildup have, unfortunately, been interpreted by some Governments represented here in terms of strategic considerations of the overall super-Power rivalry. To do so is callously to ignore the inalienable rights of the people of South Africa and Namibia, who are struggling against *apartheid* and colonialism. The struggle of the people of South Africa is nationalistic, and to continue to introduce East-West rivalry into that region is to deny the people of southern Africa their inherent right to freedom, liberty and justice and to do violence to the principles and ideals of the Charter of the United Nations.

45. We join other representatives in condemning the collusion by the Governments of certain Western and other States with the *apartheid* régime of South Africa in the nuclear field. We endorse also the recommendation of the Special Committee that Governments should refrain from supplying the racist minority régime of South Africa, directly or indirectly, with facilities which might enable it to produce uranium, plutonium and other nuclear materials or military equipment.

46. The Government of South Africa is an enemy of the citizens it ruthlessly oppresses. As it denies its citizens the enjoyment of fundamental human rights and spurns international opinion, that régime is also an enemy of humanity. Therefore, South Africa has to be treated as an enemy, not as a partner. Urgent and effective measures to terminate all collaboration with the *apartheid* régime in the political, diplomatic, economic and military fields are warranted. The recent action by IMF in granting a loan of \$1.1 billion to the Government of South Africa is, in this connection, to be regretted and condemned.

47. My delegation wishes to record its tribute to and its appreciation of the Special Committee's Chairman, Mr. Abdulah, of Trinidad and Tobago, who will soon be relinquishing that office on his transfer to another station in the service of his country. As its Chairman, Mr. Abdulah has served the Special Committee for three years, but his service to that Committee is even longer. During this period, he has worked tirelessly to shed light on the problems of decolonization, as well as to enlist international support for the struggle of peoples under colonial domination to achieve their independence. On behalf of my delegation, I join the General Assembly as a whole in wishing Mr. Abdulah all the best in his new post.

48. I should like also to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Under-Secretary-General of the Department of Political Affairs, Trusteeship and Decolonization, Mr. Djermakoye, of Mali, who is retiring from the service of the United Nations. It is a fitting tribute to Mr. Djermakoye that, during his tenure in that Department, the number of countries which won their independence and joined the United Nations grew dramatically. Therefore, he can retire in the knowledge

that his efforts were associated with the successful phase of the decolonization process.

49. Mr. PADILLA (United States of America): I should like, on behalf of the delegation of the United States, to make a few brief points concerning the issue of decolonization.

50. First, the Government and people of the United States fully understand the high priority that the Assembly has attached to the issue of decolonization and the force with which this issue has been debated here. We understand it from our own colonial experience. We have no difficulty, therefore, in appreciating the depth of feeling with which members of the Assembly, many of whom have so recently emerged from the experience of colonialism, approach the issue of decolonization.

51. Our own support for decolonization has been and remains more than rhetorical. At the Paris Conference in 1919, it was President Woodrow Wilson who won recognition for his vigorous advocacy of the concept of self-determination for all peoples. In 1946, in culmination of a process of self-determination that had begun many years earlier, the United States inaugurated the post-war transformation of the colonial world by being the first country to grant independence to its only colonial possession, the Philippines. In the ensuing years, we urged and encouraged other nations to follow our own example with regard to their colonies in Africa and Asia. More recently, the United States has vigorously pursued efforts to bring independence to the States of southern Africa. We are pleased to have been associated with the United Kingdom's successful effort to negotiate the settlement that led to Zimbabwe's independence in 1980, and we have been encouraged by that success to redouble our own efforts to bring about stable, negotiated independence for Namibia.

52. But we also know that the kind of colonialism against which the Assembly's efforts have been directed is, with but a few glaring exceptions, a phenomenon of the past. The proof of this assertion lies in the fact that, in the 35 years since the Organization was founded, fully 100 new States have been added to its membership. Clearly, we cannot relax our efforts until the last remaining vestiges of nineteenth-century colonialism have been eliminated. Certainly the United States will not do so. But, equally clearly, we must acknowledge that the old colonialism is no longer the pervasive concern that it once was.

53. Secondly, the United States takes seriously its responsibilities for the administration of other Territories and peoples. It is not a colonial Power; it harbours no colonial ambitions. Wherever and whenever it has found itself in the role of administrator of other Territories, it has sought to ensure that the peoples of those Territories are fully able to establish freely their democratic political institutions and regularly to express views about their political status.

54. The United States has sought to ensure the exercise of the right to self-determination for the people of Micronesia. Within a matter of weeks, the people of Micronesia will have the opportunity to express their views on a compact of free association with the United States, a compact which the elected leaders of these territories have freely negotiated

with the United States. Their views will be expressed through free and democratic plebiscites supervised by the United Nations Trusteeship Council and in which the political-status options open to them are fully defined. For its part, the United States will fully respect their choice. We trust that the members of this body will also do so.

55. The United States has also sought to ensure the exercise of the right of self-determination of the peoples of Guam, American Samoa and the United States Virgin Islands. In each of these Territories, the people have regularly and routinely elected their own leaders and expressed opinions on their political status, as is their right.

56. If all of these Territories continue to enjoy close relationships with the United States, it is because the people of the Territories have freely chosen to do so. Not only do we respect their choice; we welcome the unique contributions of each to the cultural diversity that has given our own democratic institutions their great strength.

57. In addition, the United States has sought self-determination for the people of Puerto Rico. In Puerto Rico, our people have regularly elected our own officials in quadrennial elections and have stated their political-status preferences in democratic referendums. The members of this Assembly recognized and affirmed that the people of Puerto Rico had achieved local self-government when, in 1953, the Assembly removed Puerto Rico from the United Nations list of Non-Self-Governing Territories [*resolution 748 (VIII)*]. The Assembly has repeatedly reaffirmed that decision. Just a few weeks ago, the General Committee decided once again not to recommend the inclusion of the question of Puerto Rico on the Assembly's agenda [*see A/37/250, para. 20*].

58. Finally, it is because the United States takes seriously its responsibilities as an Administering Authority that it has been prepared to co-operate with the Special Committee wherever such co-operation has been proper and appropriate.

59. At the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, a small group of politically motivated States, led by the Soviet Union, sought to impose its own ideological views on other members of the Committee, and indeed on the larger membership of the Assembly. We were pleased last year when the Assembly rejected that Soviet-inspired attempt to politicize further its work in the area of decolonization. In so doing, the members affirmed that the fundamental obligation of the Organization is not to impose its own will on the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories but, rather, to respect their own freely expressed wishes.

60. We cannot help but note that the influence of this same small group of ideologically motivated States continues to have a negative effect on the Special Committee's work in other ways. This harmful influence is clearly reflected once again this year in the three draft resolutions that have been introduced under the agenda items on decolonization. These draft resolutions are based on interrelated but fundamentally inaccurate premises.

61. First, they seek to perpetuate the confusing premise that self-determination can have but one out-

come, which is independence. This notion, initially embodied in resolution 1514 (XV), is a direct contradiction of other Assembly resolutions, including resolution 1541 (XV), which expressly acknowledges that self-determination is a continuing process for which there can be no imposed, predetermined outcome. Continuing to hold to the false premise of resolution 1514 (XV) is not supporting the principle of self-determination but denying its very essence.

62. Secondly, the draft resolutions before us implicitly promote the view that self-determination applies only to those Territories that the Assembly has traditionally labeled "Non-Self-Governing". This too is a denial of the principle of self-determination. It fails to acknowledge that self-determination is a principle requiring universal application.

63. Because these draft resolutions are fundamentally false, and because they repeat the same inaccurate and inflammatory rhetoric that characterizes so many of the Assembly's previous resolutions on decolonization, the United States cannot support them.

64. We take especially strong exception to the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee on the implementation of the Declaration by the specialized agencies [*see A/37/625, para. 8*]. In that paragraph, the United States and other Western countries are accused of "efforts to deprive the Namibian people of their hard-won victories in the liberation struggle". On its face, that assertion is both absurd and untrue. Furthermore, in view of the leading role of the United States and other members of the contact group in the negotiations aimed at bringing independence to Namibia at the earliest possible time, it is an outrageous insult. Accordingly, we shall call for a separate vote on this paragraph.

65. My delegation does not intend to descend to the level of sterile propaganda to which the Soviet Union and other totalitarian States so regularly descend in the Assembly. But neither can we allow to go unchallenged the many distortions and lies that representatives of these States have attempted to propagate. The representatives of the Soviet Union, supported by a chorus from Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and other totalitarian States, would have the Assembly believe that the principal aim of the United States and other Western democracies is to deny peoples everywhere their right of self-determination. Clearly, the facts are otherwise.

66. It is, after all, not surprising that a State like the Soviet Union, which does not allow free expression at home, should also seek to deny self-determination elsewhere. It is also not surprising that those who forcibly occupied the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia in 1944 in total disregard for their rights of self-determination should, 35 years later, invade and militarily occupy the neighbouring non-aligned country of Afghanistan. Finally, it is not surprising that this same nation should be the principal source of material support for the occupation of Kampuchea and for the continuing denial of the rights of the Kampuchean people to self-determination.

67. What is surprising—and, indeed, insulting—to other members of this body is that the representatives of this same country should presume to lecture

them on the rights of peoples and the responsibilities of States. Yesterday, the Assembly was treated to yet another example of the distortion of truth so commonly practised by totalitarian States. The representatives of Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia and Byelorussia attempted to convince members of the Assembly that they were acting under pressure when they voted earlier in this session to reject the Soviet-inspired move to place Puerto Rico on the Assembly's agenda. Those who live under Soviet rule or who must regularly confront the power of the Soviet State know better than most the true meaning of the words "coercion" and "intimidation". Could it be that the representatives of these countries, unaccustomed as they are to having the freedom to ignore the guidance of their mentor, believe that other members of the Assembly are similarly constrained? This accusation insults those members that take seriously their responsibility to make decisions on the basis of facts.

68. This brings me to the final point I wish to make. I said at the outset that the old, nineteenth-century colonialism towards which so much of the effort of the United Nations has been directed is largely a thing of the past. We need only look around this Hall to confirm this self-evident truth.

69. However, it is regrettably not true that colonialism in all its forms and manifestations is a thing of the past. We agree that it is not. For, even as we continue to work to eradicate the remaining vestiges of the old colonialism, we are obliged to confront the rise of a new colonialism, one that is far more menacing in its potential consequences for both human freedom and international stability.

70. If we are seriously concerned about the principle of self-determination, we must be concerned by the absence of its application in countries which are self-governing in name only. If we are truly concerned about the situation in Namibia, as the United States genuinely is, then we cannot ignore the occupation of Afghanistan and Kampuchea, to cite only two obvious examples where self-determination does not exist.

71. If we are to express concern about the rights of the inhabitants of small Territories, then we must show even greater concern for the inhabitants of vast regions of the world where self-determination is vigorously repressed and denied.

72. In its essence, the concern about self-determination must be a reflection of a broader concern about human freedom. By whatever names we choose to call them, the denial of inalienable rights and the suppression of fundamental freedoms are also forms of colonization. We trust that members of the Assembly will in the future give those new and more threatening forms of colonialism the serious attention they so rightly deserve.

73. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): One of the glorious chapters in the annals of the history of the Organization was written when it adopted, some 22 years ago, the important Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, an act which in itself contributed in a crucial way to the consolidation of the important principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations con-

cerning the equal rights and the right of self-determination of peoples and their inexorable march towards freedom.

74. Today, it is salutary to note that, with the adoption of that Declaration, the right of peoples to self-determination is no longer just a pious hope, but is a recognized principle of international law, a *jus cogens*, a peremptory norm from which no derogation is allowed or permitted. In fact, as proclaimed in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, approved by the Assembly in 1970 [resolution 2625 (XXV), annex], it is now the recognized duty of every State to refrain from any forcible action which deprives peoples of their right to self-determination, freedom and independence.

75. It is a source of immense pride and of great significance to the Organization that, since the adoption of what has come to be known as the anti-colonial charter, more than 70 million people throughout the world have become free and some 60 colonies have attained independent statehood. That we are here today considering the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is both an affirmation of faith and a recognition of the crucial, if not decisive role the United Nations has played in bringing so many former colonies to independence. If the United Nations as a whole has played a crucial, if not decisive role in bringing most of the former colonial Territories to independence, the Special Committee, of which Sierra Leone is proud to serve as a member, has been pivotal in giving effect to the principles of the Declaration. During the past two decades, as the Secretary-General has noted, the Special Committee has made a decisive contribution to the decolonization process by shedding light on the problems arising in that process and by constantly striving to enlist international support for the struggle of peoples under colonial domination to achieve independence.

76. In the course of this year the Special Committee has continued its review of the implementation of the Declaration. It again emerged that, notwithstanding the outstanding role the Organization has played in the process of decolonization, even in this twilight of the twentieth century, colonies still exist in the world, and this aberration is perhaps nowhere more glaring than in Namibia.

77. That the question of Namibia still exists on our agenda is a standing indictment of the international community as represented by the Organization, of its lack of political will and, indeed, of its moral commitment to set the people of Namibia free. For, even as we consider this question in the Assembly, the racist régime in Pretoria is continuing its illegal military occupation of Namibia, in defiance of the wishes of the international community and of the wishes of the Namibian people and, at the same time, is continuing to exploit the natural wealth and resources of that Territory, while converting it into a launching pad from which to carry out armed aggression against the neighbouring territories of Angola and Zambia. In essence, the Pretoria racists not only have seized and continue illegally to occupy a United Nations Territory but also use that Territory to carry

out armed aggression against States Members of the Organization, resulting in extensive loss of lives and destruction of economic and social infrastructures. The danger that such activities pose for the international community and, indeed, for international peace and security is too ominous to contemplate. Therefore, the minimum that is required of the Organization in order to arrest the rapidly deteriorating situation in that region of the world is for the Security Council to impose forthwith comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, under Chapter VII of the Charter.

78. Unfortunately, some States Members of the United Nations in defiance of the expressed position of the General Assembly have continued to provide succour and support and even to give a semblance of respectability to the Pretoria racist régime in its defiance of the Organization. Even more regrettable is the fact that certain Member States have continued military collaboration with South Africa, thus facilitating its ever-increasing military buildup in Namibia, its recruitment of Namibians for tribal armies, the expansion of the so-called South West Africa-Namibia Territory Force, the use of mercenaries to carry out its aggressive military policies against independent African States, its threats and acts of subversion against those countries and its illegal use of Namibian territory to commit such acts.

79. The Sierra Leone Government vehemently condemns such policies of collaboration and collusion and calls for their immediate cessation. On the other hand, the Government of Sierra Leone expresses its firm support for the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people under their sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], to achieve freedom and independence by all possible means.

80. While the Declaration was designed for colonial countries and peoples, it also postulated that all peoples have the right to self-determination and, by virtue of that right, freely to determine their political status and freely to pursue their economic, social and cultural development. Although South Africa possesses the trappings of sovereignty and independence, it is an incontrovertible fact that it does not possess a representative Government, nor have the South African people as a whole ever been allowed to exercise their right to self-determination, to determine freely their political status and to pursue freely their economic, social and cultural development. Instead, the régime maintains itself in power by employing armed action and repressive measures of all kinds against its people. South Africa, therefore, qualifies as a colony. By deductive reasoning, the situation that exists in that territory of South Africa is colonial in character and, as such, warrants the Special Committee's recommending measures on the implementation of the Declaration with regard to that territory.

81. Apart from Namibia and South Africa, the Committee also reviewed the situation of other colonial Territories in various parts of the world. Small though most of these Territories are, their peoples must be encouraged and assisted to determine their own future and destiny freely, without let or hindrance.

82. Considering the fact that inadequate economic or social preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying, let alone denying, independence to a people, every effort must be made by the administering authorities to place the economies of such Territories on a firm and assured footing by organizing effective development programmes, by enlisting to the maximum extent possible the assistance available from the specialized agencies.
83. Having observed the lives of the peoples of some of those Territories at close quarters, the Sierra Leone delegation believes that the United Nations has a duty to help them determine their own destiny. For, after all, and as stated in the first preambular paragraph of the Declaration, they are not only determined to enjoy equal rights and promote for themselves social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, but they also yearn for freedom.
84. During the past three years the Special Committee, which, as I have said, has been pivotal in the implementation of the Declaration and in assisting the movements for independence in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories, has been under the wise and indefatigable chairmanship of Mr. Frank Abdulah, of Trinidad and Tobago. My delegation wishes to pay a warm tribute to him for his excellent statement here yesterday [74th meeting], for his wisdom and outstanding services to the Committee and for his successful efforts in keeping out the harsh ideological struggle which could so easily have engulfed the Committee and thereby made it lose sight of its paramount objective, which is to safeguard the interests of the peoples and Territories under colonial rule. My delegation wishes him further success in his new assignment.
85. We would also wish to pay homage to Under-Secretary-General I. S. Djermakoye, a distinguished son of Africa, who is about to retire from the Organization and who, during his tenure in the Secretariat, has served the Organization with dedication and distinction. We wish him well in his retirement.
86. Finally, if the United Nations is to achieve its main objective of maintaining international peace and promoting equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, it is imperative that an end be put to colonialism, for colonialism not only provokes friction between peoples but also endangers international peace and security. The Organization must therefore accelerate its efforts to bring the colonial chapter to a close.
87. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Trinidad and Tobago, Chairman 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, wishes to make a statement of clarification, and I now call on him.
88. Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago), Chairman 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: It was not my intention to speak again on this item. However, in the light of the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom during the preceding meeting, I felt it my duty, as Chairman of the Special Committee, to set the record straight on some of the points raised by him.
89. First of all, the representative of the United Kingdom, perhaps because of lack of personal involvement in the work of the Special Committee, characterized the method adopted by the Special Committee this year as a departure from a long-standing practice of the Committee.
90. As I said in my statement at the outset of the general debate on this item [*ibid.*], the Special Committee this year endeavoured once again to arrive at decisions on the various matters on its agenda by the broadest possible degree of consensus.
91. With respect to General Assembly decision 34/401, the Special Committee has indeed formulated draft consensuses and draft resolutions covering 17 items on its agenda, of which all but three were adopted unanimously. With respect to those three items, namely, the question of military activities and arrangements in colonial Territories, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the implementation of the Declaration by the specialized agencies, the Special Committee adopted unanimous decisions on the first two items, and on the third item it adopted a draft resolution by a vote in which two members abstained. The texts subsequently converted into the General Assembly format were, of course, identical in substance.
92. As will be noted in reports of the Fourth Committee which the Assembly is about to take up, that Committee, as a consequence of the efforts of the Special Committee, this year adopted more draft proposals by consensus than in any previous sessions. As members can see clearly from the substance of those draft texts submitted by the Special Committee, if the Fourth Committee failed to agree upon its recommendations to the General Assembly by consensus it was not because of the so-called departure from the Special Committee's working method, but was rather due to the insistence by certain members which had abstained in the voting in the Special Committee.
93. The suggestion that the Special Committee rushed through at the eleventh hour its recommendations to the Fourth Committee is also not in keeping with the facts. As the report of the Special Committee clearly indicates, the substance of these recommendations had been thoroughly discussed throughout the year and, as a result, a broad measure of agreement prevailed.
94. As regards the competence and the context within which the Special Committee deals with the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and with Puerto Rico, I can only suggest to my British colleague a careful reading of the relevant chapters of the Committee's report, submitted within the framework of the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly.
95. I am sure we are all pleased to note the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom, an administering Power, to the effect that the Government of the United Kingdom has the political aspirations of the people of its remaining dependent Territories just as much at heart as their economic well-being. As will be noted from the reports of no fewer than 20 visiting missions dispatched in the past decade by the Special Committee, the Committee has continued to emphasize the imperative need for the intensification

of programmes of political education by the administering Powers concerned, in order to deepen the awareness of the peoples of those Territories of the purposes and the objectives of the Charter and the Declaration, including all the political options available to them as regards their future status. I wish to express my hope that the efforts of the Government of the United Kingdom in this regard, as reiterated here this morning, will further enhance the determination of those peoples to move progressively and expeditiously towards the full exercise of self-determination and the achievement of their independence.

96. The representative of the United Kingdom also referred to the manner in which the Fourth Committee was asked to take a position on a draft decision submitted by the Special Committee on military activities and arrangements in colonial Territories, under agenda item 98. In that connection, as the Chairman of the Fourth Committee has rightly pointed out, because of the nature of the recommendations contained in the draft decision, which encompassed broad aspects of the process of decolonization, the draft decision could have been taken up under any of the items allocated to the Fourth Committee by the General Assembly. Indeed, any members, including the United Kingdom, that might have wanted to debate this question could have done so during the ensuing general debate under agenda item 98. The consideration of that item was not concluded until the 9th meeting, held on 26 October, following the introduction of the related chapter by the Rapporteur of the Special Committee at the 4th meeting, on 19 October. Therefore, it is stretching the imagination somewhat to say that the text was slipped in by the back door and that there was no opportunity for substantive debate. I may add here that matters relating to military activities and arrangements in colonial Territories have been a primary concern of the Assembly since 1963. Indeed, in resolution 2105 (XX), of 20 December 1965, the General Assembly, in paragraph 12, requested the colonial Powers to dismantle the military bases installed in colonial Territories and to refrain from establishing new ones.

97. With regard to draft resolution A/37/L.33 and Add.1, the representative of the United Kingdom has taken issue with the reference contained in operative paragraph 1, which concerns the title of the chapter of the report relating to the question of dissemination of information on decolonization and on publicity for the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization. I wish to assure the representative of the United Kingdom that, in keeping with the clearly stated position of the Assembly in operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution, the Special Committee has over the years continued to take measures with a view to effecting the widest possible dissemination of information on the evils and dangers of colonialism, on the determined efforts of the colonial peoples to achieve self-determination, freedom and independence and on the assistance being provided by the international community for the elimination of the remaining vestiges of colonialism in all its forms. I am certain that any examination of the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee will verify this fact.

98. I wish to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to those members who were so kind as to pay warm tributes to the Special Committee, as well as to me personally, during the course of the debate. I am particularly grateful to Mr. Hamilton Whyte, of the United Kingdom delegation, for the kind remarks he made this morning regarding my forthcoming assignment in London. I want to assure him that I look forward to his joining me there soon and to continuing our efforts in that metropolitan capital to ensure self-determination and independence for those still under colonial rule. As I stated in the Fourth Committee, if the work of the Special Committee has been successful it is mainly because its members have demonstrated their continued and firm commitment and dedication to our common objective, which is the full implementation of the Declaration. I once again express my deep gratitude and appreciation for the dedication of the members of the Committee, the unswerving support of the Secretariat for that cause and their unceasing co-operation with the Chairman in this joint undertaking.

99. The PRESIDENT: I suggest that, in accordance with past practice, the Assembly now proceed to the consideration of the recommendations of the Fourth Committee on agenda items 18, 96, 97, 98, 99 and 12, 100 and 101, after which we shall revert to the draft resolutions to be considered directly in plenary meeting, namely draft resolutions A/37/L.32 and Add.1 and A/37/L.33 and Add.1.

AGENDA ITEM 18

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (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 Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 96

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations:

- (a) Report of the Secretary-General;
- (b) 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

AGENDA ITEM 97

Question of East Timor:

- (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 Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 98

Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa:

- (a) 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 Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEMS 99 AND 12

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations:

- (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 Secretary-General
- Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)

AGENDA ITEM 100

United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 101

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General

100. Mr. GARCIA (Philippines), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly for its consideration seven reports of the Fourth Committee, relating to items 18, 96, 97, 98, 99 and 12, 100, and 101 of the agenda. As these reports are self-explanatory, I shall simply point out the key elements which are included in some of the recommendations.

101. The first report [A/37/621] relates to those Territories not covered by other items of the agenda, which the Committee took up under agenda item 18. Set out in the report are the proposals of the Fourth Committee relating to Gibraltar, Western Sahara, the Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Tokelau, Pitcairn, St. Helena, American Samoa, Guam, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, the Turks and Caicos Islands, the United States Virgin Islands, Montserrat, Brunei, St. Kitts-Nevis and Anguilla. As regards these Territories, the majority of the members expressed the view that the General Assembly should reaffirm the full applicability of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples with respect to their populations, as well as the inalienable right of those populations to decide their future status for themselves. Many members noted with appreciation the continuing co-operation of the administering Powers concerned and emphasized again the vital importance of dispatching United Nations visiting missions to these small Territories.

102. The second report [A/37/622] relates to agenda item 96. The Fourth Committee recommends that the Assembly reaffirm that, in the absence of a decision by the General Assembly itself that a Non-Self-Governing Territory has attained a full measure of self-government in terms of Chapter XI of the Charter, the administering Power concerned should continue to transmit information with respect to that Territory.

103. The third report [A/37/623] relates to the question of East Timor, which the Committee took up under agenda item 97. Pursuant to the report's recommendation, the Assembly would, *inter alia*, request the Secretary-General to initiate consultations with all parties directly concerned, with a view to exploring avenues for achieving a comprehensive settlement of the problem, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session.

104. The fourth report [A/37/624] relates to activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration; the Committee took this subject up under agenda item 98. Among other provisions, the General Assembly, in condemning the continued activities of those foreign economic, financial and other interests exploiting the natural and human resources of colonial Territories, would call once again upon all Governments to take the necessary steps to put an end to such activities which run counter to the interests of the inhabitants of those Territories.

105. The fifth report [A/37/625] relates to agenda items 99 and 12, on the role of the specialized agencies and other organizations in the implementation of the Declaration. The General Assembly would, among other things, request the organizations concerned to render or continue to render, as a matter of urgency, all possible moral and material assistance to the colonial peoples struggling for liberation from colonial rule.

106. The sixth report [A/37/626] relates to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, under agenda item 100. In expressing its appreciation to all those who have supported the Programme by providing contributions, scholarships or places in their educational institutions, the Assembly would appeal once again to all States, organizations and individuals to offer greater financial and other support to the Programme to ensure its continuation and expansion.

107. The seventh report [A/37/627] relates to offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories, under agenda item 101. In expressing its appreciation to those Member States that have made scholarships available to the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories, the Assembly would invite all States to make or continue to make generous offers of study and training facilities to the peoples of the Territories.

108. On behalf of the Fourth Committee, I should like to commend these reports to the attention of the General Assembly.

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

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

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

111. We shall now consider the report of the Fourth Committee, under agenda item 18, concerning chapters of the report of the Special Committee relating to specific Territories not covered by other agenda items [A/37/621].

112. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote on any or all—I repeat, on any or all—of the recommendations of the Fourth Committee in its report on this item. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their vote after all the votes on this report have been taken.

113. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria) (*interpretation from French*): My explanation of vote relates to draft resolution IX, entitled "Question of Western Sahara".

114. As I have already explained in the Fourth Committee, Austria has always whole-heartedly supported the efforts of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and its *ad hoc* Committee, efforts which have led to a preliminary agreement on the elements of a peaceful solution, including a general cease-fire and a referendum under the aegis of the OAU and the United Nations. Austria remains convinced that the efforts of the OAU offer the best hope of reaching a negotiated and peaceful solution to the problem.

115. However, the draft resolution submitted for consideration contains very important elements. Above all, it reaffirms clearly and formally the principles contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which advocates self-determination for all Territories under colonial domination, a principle which we hold dear and which Austria has always supported in the United Nations and elsewhere. The draft resolution reaffirms the importance of a negotiated solution and addresses an appeal to the parties to the dispute to start negotiations on a cease-fire, an appeal in which Austria sincerely joins.

116. For this reason, Austria intends to vote in favour of the draft resolution. At the same time, I wish to stress that, in the view of my delegation, it is first and foremost incumbent on the OAU to take appropriate decisions conducive to a peaceful settlement of the dispute.

117. Mr. BATAINAH (Jordan): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the question of Western Sahara. The position of Jordan regarding this question was clearly stated when the Fourth Committee debated this matter at the beginning of this month. We received news of the latest developments in this inter-Arab controversy with concern and pain. A sacred principle, that of self-determination, is here

being abused, misused and distorted. To evoke this principle in this context is a caricaturing attempt based on obvious pseudo-moralism and fuelled by well-defined national interests mixed with unfortunate political adventurism. The negative effects of such an attempt have already spilled over into and undermined the very existence of the OAU. It is very regrettable that two or more brotherly Arab countries should be entangled in such an intractable fashion in this dispute. We very much regret that some have seen fit to flout, ignore and undermine the principle of Arab nationalism. This principle, which we very sincerely uphold, promotes Arab unity, not a further fragmentation of this great nation.

118. In conclusion, the latest negative signs and attempts to undermine the consensus position of Africa on this question could very well force Jordan to reconsider its previous position. Our previous abstention should not be interpreted as lack of concern or interest. It was based only on the fact that we were hopeful that a possible amicable settlement of this matter might emerge. Should negativism, political adventurism and narrowly defined national interests prevail, we reserve the right to reconsider our position in the light of such a development.

119. Mr. MRANI ZENTAR (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): When the current Chairman of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, Mr. Arap Moi, expressly asked all delegations which last year introduced draft resolutions on the question of Western Sahara to withdraw those drafts so as to make it possible for Africa to assume its responsibilities through its competent official bodies, he very wisely wished to avoid a situation in which Africa would present a picture of pointless division, which would damage both its good name and the proper functioning of the peace process unanimously adopted by the OAU.

120. The Chairman intended thus to fulfil his own responsibilities by presenting, on the basis of his own considerable authority, a draft decision faithfully reflecting the decisions adopted by the OAU without any tendentious excesses which would endanger the peace process contemplated or the imposition of misleading formulas designed to prepare or cover up *faits accomplis* directly contrary to the decisions of the OAU and its Implementation Committee.

121. This year again, the representative of the Chairman proposed a draft consensus on behalf of the whole of Africa [A/C.4/37/L.14], which was adopted by consensus by the Fourth Committee, thereby giving the OAU unanimous support, which enhances its prestige and unreservedly confirms its prerogatives concerning the solution of the regional problems which face the continent. On the other hand, and in spite of the appeal launched by the Chairman, which is still in force, for the withdrawal of any other drafts relating to the question, Algeria has sponsored, with a number of other countries, a draft resolution in document A/C.4/37/L.6/Rev.1, which runs counter to the OAU decisions and tends to lead to our adopting a series of measures which are, first of all, contradictory and, secondly, contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. The Algerian draft is designed essentially to designate from outside and in advance the so-called representative of the populations con-

cerned, whereas that is the essential purpose of the self-determination referendum which is to be organized as early as possible and with the OAU. This way of imposing specific choices on the eve of a free consultation under international control constitutes, as we have already said on a number of occasions, a deliberate violation of the conscience and the freedom of the populations concerned.

122. In particular, operative paragraphs 3 and 4 flagrantly contradict the decisions taken by the OAU and its Implementation Committee at the three Nairobi conferences. They destroy the African consensus by reversing the priorities and by arbitrarily taking a decision in advance on behalf of the populations concerned. Such initiatives are designed essentially to block the natural course of the African process leading to the immediate proclamation of a cease-fire and the organization without delay of a self-determination referendum in Western Sahara.

123. We are faced with other manoeuvres involving blows against the legality of the OAU and attempts at *faits accomplis* which threaten to splinter it. Hence, we consider that this draft resolution should not be given any encouragement by the States Members of the United Nations, which are explicitly called upon to observe a strict neutrality pending the free expression of the will of the populations. Such a constructive attitude by the General Assembly will be the best possible contribution to the restoration of peace and harmony to the region of north-west Africa.

124. For its part, the delegation of Morocco will express its complete confidence in and support for the OAU by voting against this draft resolution, which is designed to block the efforts of that organization. Moreover, my delegation considers this draft resolution to be null and void and absolutely will not agree to its being referred to at the time of the implementation of the Nairobi decisions providing for United Nations assistance to the OAU Implementation Committee in the fulfilment of its mandate.

125. Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): As a member 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, Indonesia has always actively participated in and supported the efforts of the Special Committee to fulfil its mandate. However, my delegation wishes to reiterate its strong opposition to chapter X of the Committee's report, which deals with the so-called question of East Timor. In this regard I should like to remind the Assembly that the people of East Timor have achieved independence through integration with the Republic of Indonesia. The process of decolonization in East Timor was completed when the people exercised their right to self-determination in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV), 1541 (XV) and 2625 (XXV). My delegation views any consideration of the so-called question of East Timor since its integration as being clearly outside the competence of the Special Committee or any other body, and therefore any reference to East Timor in the Special Committee's report is interference in the internal affairs of Indonesia.

126. Mr. MORENO-SALCEDO (Philippines) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation has always

taken the position that the people of East Timor already exercised its right to self-determination when it decided to unite as a territory with the Republic of Indonesia. That is the present state of affairs, and it is an undeniable fact. For that reason, my delegation will vote against the draft resolution before the Assembly on this matter. We regard it as interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Indonesia and of the people of East Timor.

Mr. Hollai (Hungary) took the Chair.

127. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to take decisions on the various recommendations of the Fourth Committee. We turn first to the nine draft resolutions recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 27 of its report [A/37/621].

128. Draft resolution I, entitled "Question of American Samoa", was adopted by the Fourth Committee without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 37/20).

129. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Question of Guam". The Fourth Committee adopted it without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 37/21).

130. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "Question of Bermuda". The Fourth Committee adopted it without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 37/22).

131. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Question of the British Virgin Islands". The Fourth Committee adopted it without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 37/23).

132. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution V is entitled "Question of the Cayman Islands". The Fourth Committee adopted it without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 37/24).

133. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will turn next to draft resolution VI, entitled "Question of the Turks and Caicos Islands". That draft resolution was adopted by the Fourth Committee without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 37/25).

134. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VII, entitled "Question of the United States Virgin Islands", was adopted by the Fourth Committee without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 37/26).

135. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VIII is entitled "Question of Montserrat". The Fourth Committee adopted that draft resolution without objection.

May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 37/27).

136. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IX is entitled "Question of Western Sahara". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution appears in document A/37/637. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afganistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominica, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Chad, Chile, El Salvador, Gabon, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Liberia, Morocco, Senegal, Solomon Islands, United States of America, Upper Volta, Zaire.

Abstaining: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malawi¹, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Samoa, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Yemen.²

Draft resolution IX was adopted by 78 votes to 15, with 50 abstentions (resolution 37/28).³

137. The PRESIDENT: I now invite representatives to turn to the draft consensuses recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 28 of its report.

138. Draft consensus I is entitled "Question of Western Sahara". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft consensus appears in document A/37/637. The Fourth Committee adopted draft consensus I without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft consensus I was adopted (decision 37/411).

139. The PRESIDENT: Draft consensus II deals with the question of Gibraltar. The Fourth Committee

adopted it without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft consensus II was adopted (decision 37/412).

140. The PRESIDENT: Draft consensus III deals with the question of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands. The Fourth Committee adopted it without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft consensus III was adopted (decision 37/413).

141. The PRESIDENT: Draft consensus IV relates to the question of Tokelau. The Fourth Committee adopted it without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft consensus IV was adopted (decision 37/414).

142. The PRESIDENT: Draft consensus V deals with the question of Pitcairn. The Fourth Committee adopted it without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft consensus V was adopted (decision 37/415).

143. The PRESIDENT: Draft consensus VI relates to the question of St. Helena. The Fourth Committee adopted it without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft consensus VI was adopted (decision 37/416).

144. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the draft decisions recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 29 of its report.

145. Draft decision I, entitled "Question of Brunei", was adopted by the Fourth Committee without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft decision I was adopted (decision 37/417).

146. The PRESIDENT: Draft decision II deals with the question of St. Kitts-Nevis. The Committee adopted the draft decision without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft decision II was adopted (decision 37/418).

147. The PRESIDENT: Draft decision III concerns the question of Anguilla. The Committee adopted the draft decision without objection. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft decision III was adopted (decision 37/419).

148. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, who has asked to speak in explanation of vote.

149. Mr. SAIGNAVONGS (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): My explanation of vote relates to draft resolution II, on Guam; draft resolution III, on Bermuda; and draft resolution VI, with regard to the Turks and Caicos Islands.

150. Although my delegation joined in the consensus on the adoption of those draft resolutions, it nevertheless has some reservations with regard to certain paragraphs, in particular operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution on Guam, operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution on Bermuda and operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution on the Turks and Caicos Islands. My delegation bases its position on the premise that

the presence of military bases in those colonial or Non-Self-Governing Territories is an impediment to the exercise by the peoples of those Territories of their right to self-determination.

151. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 96 [A/37/622].

152. The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 148 votes to none, with 3 abstentions (resolution 37/29).

153. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 97 [A/37/623]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 13 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Byelorussian

Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, Ireland, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Portugal, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Canada, Chad, Chile, Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Gambia, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Liberia, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, New Zealand, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burma, Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

The draft resolution was adopted by 50 votes to 46, with 50 abstentions (resolution 37/30).⁴

154. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Indonesia, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote.

155. Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): The General Assembly has just concluded consideration of the so-called question of East Timor. As in previous years, my delegation, supported by many Member States, strongly opposed the inclusion of this question on the agenda of the General Assembly.

156. The position of my delegation on this question is well known and has not changed. For the record, I shall simply reiterate that the people of East Timor have themselves completed the process of decolonization. In the exercise of their right to self-determination, they decided to become independent through integration with the Republic of Indonesia, in accordance with resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV), as well as resolution 2625 (XXV).

157. I should like to take this opportunity, however, to draw the attention of Member States to the outcome of the vote in the Assembly. As representatives will have noted, only 50 countries voted in favour of the draft resolution. This number represents less than one-third of the total membership of the Organization. Only about 30 per cent of all members continue to question East Timor's integration with Indonesia. As the record further shows, the number of members supporting Indonesia on this question has, year after

year, shown a steady increase. This year's tally shows 46 countries voting against the resolution. Conversely, the number of members supporting the resolution has steadily diminished. Thus, the difference between the "yes" and "no" votes is now only 4, as compared to 12 last year. Moreover, the large number of countries abstaining this year is undoubtedly an indication that an overwhelming majority of States question the relevance of continued consideration of this item. Indeed, what is the value of a resolution which has the support of only a third of the membership—support which, I may add, continues to decline. This trend, which has been apparent for several years now, is viewed by my delegation as gratifying indeed. We are confident that support for Indonesia's position will continue to grow.

158. The unmistakable conclusion to be drawn from this year's vote, together with the voting trend just noted, is that the time has come to view East Timor on the basis of facts and of realism rather than of baseless accusations and wishful thinking. It is high time the Assembly dispensed with the sterile debate that has been going on for almost seven years on an issue that should never have been on its agenda in the first place.

159. While expressing the hope that the General Assembly will next year be able to strike this so-called question of East Timor from its agenda once and for all, my delegation is again compelled to reiterate its rejection of the resolution just adopted.

160. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 98 [A/37/624]. The Assembly will first take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 10 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United

Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Canada, Honduras, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 128 votes to 7, with 16 abstentions (resolution 37/31).

161. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 11 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

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

The draft decision was adopted by 123 votes to 11, with 15 abstentions (decision 37/420).

162. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda items 99 and 12 [A/37/625].

163. I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote before the voting.

164. Mr. FOLI (Ghana): The international will, as expressed through many resolutions and decisions

of the General Assembly, the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations, upholds fully the legitimacy of the struggle of colonial peoples to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. My delegation seizes this opportunity to reaffirm Ghana's abiding commitment to this historic objective and, in this regard, acknowledges the clear obligation of the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to provide assistance to colonial peoples and their national liberation movements in order that they may break the yoke of subjugation.

165. Bearing this obligation in mind, we are gratified by the positive roles being played by a number of these organizations in the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to those that are still denied it. Organizations such as FAO, ILO, WHO, UNICEF, UPU, UNIDO and UNESCO have achieved real results in their programmes to improve the lot of colonial peoples, particularly the people of Namibia. Some of them have actually severed their links with the Prétoria régime, while others have shown their disapproval of and disgust for *apartheid* by withholding all aid and support for that régime.

166. However, in spite of the laudable contributions of these agencies, the financial institutions affiliated with the United Nations, especially IMF, have either failed or refused to heed the appeals of the world community that they join in the decolonization process. Under the pretext of being apolitical organizations, guided in their operations solely by the tenets of their statutes, these agencies have made common cause with the South African Government and provided such support as has hardened it in its oppressive policies against the black majority of both South Africa and Namibia. Such collaboration has been deplored by the United Nations in several decisions, including this session's resolution 37/2, calling upon IMF to desist from granting a loan of over \$1 billion to the South African Government. IMF chose to ignore this appeal.

167. The so-called apolitical nature of IMF decisions has been questioned many times by the international community. If we have not succeeded in obtaining real co-operation from the Fund, it is because certain of its member States with great power and influence have elected to utilize it to serve their political motives and designs in the third world. We cannot accept that being apolitical is synonymous with not being concerned about the rights of peoples under foreign and colonial domination, or with being free to prop up a régime which perpetrates crimes against humanity.

168. The activities and operations of the specialized agencies and other institutions associated with the United Nations have a telling impact on the lives of great masses of human beings and occupy a prominent place in the scheme of international relations, not least because they help in no small measure to bring the practical reality of the United Nations home to the peoples of the world. These organizations must therefore not be allowed to fail in the obligation fully to support the aims and principles of the United Nations or to frustrate the legitimate aspirations of subject peoples.

169. It is evident, therefore, that my delegation will support all moves designed to make such organizations, especially IMF, aware of their inescapable duty, so that they desist from participation in the crime of *apartheid* and instead ally themselves closely with the rest of us, by doing all that is within their power to promote the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

170. My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution under consideration.

171. Mr. LUCE (United States of America): The United States is vitally interested in the question of Namibia and the future of the southern African region. We wish, therefore, to address several draft resolutions in an integrated way. Specifically, we are determined that South Africa's occupation of Namibia must end and that Namibia must be brought to internationally recognized independence, under the terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), both quickly and peacefully. Together with other members of the Western contact group and the front-line States, we have been working very hard to achieve this objective. While an extensive discussion of these efforts and the progress which has been made is best reserved for the agenda item on Namibia, since these draft resolutions deal principally with Namibia, it is important to register here our conviction that progress has been made toward Namibian independence and that, with the continued co-operation of the parties concerned, the successful conclusion of these continuing negotiations can be achieved.

172. My Government's objections to these draft resolutions, therefore, do not reflect any lack of support for Namibian independence; rather, our problems with them centre on how and in what conditions this independence can be achieved. In fact, we believe that many of the prescriptions contained in these draft resolutions, along with their rhetorical excesses, will not be helpful in bringing Namibia to independence or in encouraging the changes we all agree must take place within South Africa.

173. The United States will vote against draft resolution A/37/L.32 and Add.1. We are compelled to do so, much against our natural inclinations, by the grave deficiencies of the draft resolution itself. The recommendations contained in this draft resolution do not in any way materially advance the progress of decolonization. We are disturbed by operative paragraph 4, which recognizes the legitimacy of peoples under colonial domination exercising their right to self-determination by "all the necessary means at their disposal". Such a statement, it seems to us, comes perilously close to providing blanket endorsement for random and indiscriminate murder, hijacking, or killing of diplomats. These and other such crimes are always wrong, however just the cause, however grave the provocation. Our common humanity demands that certain minimal standards of conduct be obeyed by all parties at all times. My delegation also objects to operative paragraph 7 and to the parallel draft resolution, which suggests that foreign economic or other interests in the Non-Self-Governing Territories are by their very nature somehow detrimental to the interests either of Namibians or of the peoples of other Non-Self-Governing Territories. The United

States categorically rejects this suggestion. My Government's opposition to the recommendations contained in operative paragraph 10 is also well known. The United States does not believe that the presence of military bases in Non-Self-Governing Territories necessarily interferes with the full exercise of the right to self-determination. A call for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all military installations from Non-Self-Governing Territories is heretofore unwarranted.

174. With regard to the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee in document A/37/625, our first and most fundamental objection is to the continued recognition of SWAPO as the sole representative of the Namibian people and the call for United Nations agencies to provide aid to SWAPO. The people of Namibia have not yet had the opportunity to choose a representative in free and fair elections, so as yet there is no authentic representative of the Namibian people. Moreover, my Government believes it is wholly inappropriate for United Nations agencies to provide aid to national liberation movements, particularly those engaged in warfare or other forms of violence, since this serves to politicize these agencies, to undermine their effectiveness and, as we have warned in the past, to jeopardize support for them. In this connection, the United States Congress has passed legislation which specifically forbids funds provided for international organizations and programmes being made available from the United States proportionate share for any programmes for SWAPO.

175. The United States has played a major role in providing assistance to the Namibian people, particularly those who have been displaced by the conflict. For example, of the \$57 million worth of assistance the World Food Programme gave to southern African refugees through 1981, the United States provided approximately \$16 million. Moreover, the United States has provided approximately one third of all the extensive aid to Namibians and other displaced persons in southern Africa by UNHCR, 18 per cent of UNDP aid, 25 per cent of WHO aid, and so on. To the extent possible, consistent with the legislation I have just mentioned and the resources available, we hope to continue our assistance to the Namibian people. However, it will henceforth be incumbent on my Government, before making its voluntary contributions to United Nations agencies, to deduct its share of money for programmes for SWAPO *per se*, though not—as we have seen—for Namibians of any political persuasion.

176. Furthermore, we object to the draft resolution's call for Namibian membership in specialized agencies and international organizations. Membership in such bodies for Non-Self-Governing Territories is not only impractical but also tends to politicize these organizations and hinder their efforts to achieve their proper technical and humanitarian objectives.

177. Finally, in the seventh preambular paragraph of this draft resolution, the United States and other Western countries are accused of "efforts to deprive the Namibian people of their hard-won victories in the liberation struggle". This is an irresponsible accusation, totally contrary to the facts of the situation. It is well known, for example, that after more than a decade of no progress whatsoever toward

Namibian independence, it was the United States which, in 1976, helped bring the Namibian question, along with other southern African issues, to the forefront of international diplomatic activity. After the initial efforts of the United States and its Western contact group partners to negotiate independence for Namibia encountered obstacles—obstacles not of our making—we relaunched Namibian negotiations with redoubled vigour.

178. In fact, this has been one of the very highest priority diplomatic initiatives of the United States Administration. From the President down, we have invested an enormous amount of time, energy and political capital in trying to achieve peaceful independence for Namibia under the terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Our officials at all levels have held innumerable consultations and negotiating sessions here, in Windhoek, in front-line and other African capitals, in Pretoria, and in European capitals.

179. We have taken political risks and put our prestige on the line. Just this past week, our Vice-President visited seven African countries, and Namibian independence was at the top of his agenda. In short, we are working hard for a peaceful transition to internationally recognized independence for Namibia. Moreover, these efforts have made real progress and hold considerable promise. To be accused of working against Namibian independence is a great disappointment. Therefore, we have asked for a separate vote on the seventh preambular paragraph, and we hope that those that are determined, along with us, to continue the arduous search for negotiated independence for Namibia will join us in voting against it.

180. For all these reasons, my delegation will vote against this draft resolution. We will by no means, however, abandon our continuing efforts to bring independence to Namibia and to provide assistance to the Namibian people.

181. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report [A/37/625]. As the Assembly has heard, a separate vote has been requested on the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. If there is no objection, therefore, the Assembly will vote first on the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Roma-

nia, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Honduras, Malawi, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Zaire.

The seventh preambular paragraph was adopted by 87 votes to 26, with 27 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxem-

bourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

The draft resolution, as a whole, was adopted by 128 votes to 4, with 20 abstentions (resolution 37/32).

183. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

184. Mr. LESETEDI (Botswana): Although Botswana voted in favour of the draft resolution, my delegation reserves its position with regard to the seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 6 and 7.

185. Mrs. MAUALA (Samoa): While Samoa supports and voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, we abstained on the seventh preambular paragraph as we have reservations regarding its content. We also wish to place on record our reservations regarding the wording of operative paragraphs 6 and 7.

186. Mr. GOTTRET VALDÉS (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution because we support the struggle being waged by the Namibian people for independence and self-determination. However, we wish to express our reservations concerning the seventh preambular paragraph; it is our view that the wording of that paragraph does not contribute to a positive solution to the problem.

187. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 100 [A/37/626].

188. The Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, which adopted the draft resolution in paragraph 7 of its report without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 37/33).

189. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 101 [A/37/627]. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. The Fourth Committee adopted that draft resolution without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 37/34).

190. The PRESIDENT: We shall now return to the draft resolutions concerning agenda item 18 to be considered directly in plenary meeting, namely those contained in documents A/37/L.32 and Add.1 and A/37/L.33 and Add.1.

191. I call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

192. Mrs. KAPPEYNE van de COPPELLO (Netherlands): Ever since the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in 1960, the Netherlands has remained committed to its early and full implementation. It is a source of great satisfaction to my delegation that, since the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV), the membership of the United Nations has increased by one third. As a matter of fact, the world body has been so successful in implementing

the Declaration that the decolonization process is now rapidly approaching its final stages. We trust that the administering Powers will continue to co-operate with the United Nations in the speedy implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). In this context, my delegation wishes to express its fervent hope that the people of Namibia will soon be enabled to exercise their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

193. Because of the importance the Netherlands attaches to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolutions before us. We regret, however, that draft resolution A/37/L.32 and Add.1, like previous ones on the subject, contains a number of paragraphs on which we have to express our reservations. Specifically, the Netherlands objects to the wording of operative paragraphs 2, 4, 7, 8 and 10.

194. Mr. MONTEIRO (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): At the previous session [79th meeting], the Portuguese delegation had occasion to express its reservations concerning the draft resolution corresponding to the one contained in document A/37/L.32 and Add.1. We should like now to reiterate certain principles which determine our position regarding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, particularly the principle that negotiations should prevail over armed struggle and violence and that the universality which is an inherent part of the Organization must be safeguarded. Furthermore, my delegation wishes to emphasize the need to avoid in texts adopted by the Assembly both the use of generalized formulations which do not take due account of the differences in various situations and the inclusion of material that is not directly germane to the specific item under discussion.

195. Since the draft resolution before us does not fully reflect the ideas which my delegation would like to have seen included in it, we are obliged to express reservations on the text of that draft resolution as well, particularly operative paragraphs 4, 8 and 10.

196. The Portuguese delegation, however, has frequently stressed before the Assembly the paramount importance which my country attaches to decolonization matters. Portugal firmly supports the right of all peoples to express their wishes and to choose their future. Today, as in the past, it is essential for the Organization to ensure observance of the fundamental principles of freedom, self-determination and respect for human rights, in favour of all the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories, whatever their size or level of development. It is in that light that my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/37/L.32 and Add.1 and A/37/L.33 and Add.1.

197. Mr. HARLAND (New Zealand): Since 1945, the United Nations has made a major contribution to the process of decolonization. The aim of the Organization has always been to help the peoples of dependent Territories to decide their own future and to achieve independence peacefully. Its success is demonstrated by the expansion of its own membership.

198. From the outset, New Zealand has attached particular importance to this aspect of the Organization's work. We supported resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960, which contains the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and we have actively sought to give effect to that resolution. New Zealand led the way in the decolonization of the South Pacific. The former Trust Territory of Western Samoa was the first country in the area to become independent. The Cook Islands and Niue made their acts of self-determination a few years later and chose to become self-governing States in free association with New Zealand. The last Territory that remains under New Zealand administration is Tokelau. My Government is committed to helping the people of the three small atolls that comprise Tokelau to decide their own future when they are ready.

199. We are disappointed that the sponsors of the draft resolution before us could not see their way to submitting a proposal that could have been adopted by consensus. The draft could well have placed more emphasis than it does on the need for peaceful change; as it stands, operative paragraph 4 has to be read in the context of the Organization's record and of its wider aims. On the other hand, military bases in Non-Self-Governing Territories have not always impeded the decolonization process, and the call for their withdrawal does not seem to us to be necessary.

200. Despite our reservations on those points, New Zealand will vote in favour of the draft resolution to demonstrate our continuing commitment to the goal of decolonization.

201. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria): There can be no doubt that the process of peaceful decolonization based upon resolution 1514 (XV) constitutes one of the greatest and most significant achievements of the United Nations. Austria has consistently supported the efforts of the United Nations in this regard.

202. In spite of the generalizations and rather sweeping statements in draft resolution A/37/L.32 and Add.1, the Austrian delegation will vote in favour of it—as it has done on similar draft resolutions in the past—as proof of our sincere commitment to the process of decolonization and the implementation of the right to self-determination of all peoples. I wish, however, to express our reservations on operative paragraph 4 and to underline the fact that we understand this paragraph as supporting the struggle by peaceful means only and by means of negotiation, as befits an organization which is built upon the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes.

203. Miss CUERVO DE JARAMILLO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation has always been resolutely and staunchly against *apartheid* and therefore in favour of any process of decolonization, not only in the case of Namibia but in all other cases under similar conditions.

204. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.32 and Add.1 but would like to record its reservation on operative paragraph 4, whose wording and content we cannot agree with.

205. Mr. HAYASHI (Japan): My delegation will vote in favour of the two draft resolutions because we firmly support the Declaration on the Granting of

Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and hope that it will be duly implemented.

206. Our affirmative vote, however, should not be construed as positive support for all the provisions of those documents. My delegation cannot support some parts of the report of the Special Committee which are approved in operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/37/L.32 and Add.1 and operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/37/L.33 and Add.1, and thus we wish to indicate our reservation. For the reasons we have made clear in the past, my delegation has reservations on other paragraphs in draft resolution A/37/L.32 and Add.1 as well.

207. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions A/37/L.32 and Add.1 and A/37/L.33 and Add.1. The administrative and financial implications of those draft resolutions are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/37/636].

208. The Assembly will first vote on draft resolution A/37/L.32 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi.

The draft resolution was adopted by 141 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions (resolution 37/35).

209. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/37/L.33 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, 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, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 148 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 37/36).

210. The PRESIDENT: In connection with agenda item 18, the Assembly also has before it a letter dated 2 November 1982 addressed to me by the Chairman 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 [A/37/594]. In the letter, the Chairman of the Special Committee informs me that, on the basis of consultations held with the presiding officers of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the United Nations Council for Namibia, it has been agreed by the three bodies concerned to recommend to the General Assembly that the title of the "Week of Solidarity with the Colonial Peoples of Southern Africa Fighting for Freedom, Independence and Equal Rights", originally proclaimed under resolution 2911 (XXVII), be changed to "Week of Solidarity with the Peoples of Namibia and All Other Colonial Territories, as well as those in South Africa, Fighting for Freedom, Independence and Human Rights". May

I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that recommendation?

It was so decided (decision 37/421).

211. The PRESIDENT: I now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to explain their vote.

212. Mr. KOLBY (Norway): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and Norway.

213. The Nordic countries have a well-known and abiding commitment to the process of decolonization. That process has very nearly run its course, which is one of the historic achievements of the Organization.

214. The Nordic countries voted in favour of the two draft resolutions just adopted. We regret, however, that we could not do so without reservations.

215. Draft resolution A/37/L.32 and Add.1 contains paragraphs to which we cannot consent. Thus, operative paragraph 4 contains formulations which are contrary to the principle upheld by the Nordic countries, that the United Nations should, according to its Charter, always encourage only peaceful solutions. Furthermore, we find operative paragraph 10 too categorically formulated. We have reservations also concerning certain other paragraphs, some of which seem to run counter to the principle of universality, to which our countries remain committed.

216. Mr. HUTCHINSON (Ireland): Because of the support of the Government of Ireland for the principle of decolonization and for the work of the United Nations in this area, Ireland has always voted, where possible, for draft resolutions on decolonization. My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolutions just adopted.

217. However, as with similar resolutions in the past, my delegation has reservations on some of the provisions of draft resolution A/37/L.32 and Add.1, which have been cast in very general terms. While we support the work of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, we have reservations on some of its recommendations and decisions.

218. With regard to operative paragraph 10 of that draft resolution, I should like to state that, in determining our attitude towards specific military bases and installations, my delegation will be guided by the attitudes, freely expressed, of the inhabitants of the colonial Territories in question.

219. Mr. TANÇ (Turkey): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.32 and Add.1 in accordance with our firm support for and commitment to the efforts being exerted by the international community for the elimination of colonialism. We also voted in favour last year of resolution 36/68, which is referred to in the resolution just adopted. My delegation would like to place on record that in supporting last year's resolution we expressed reservations regarding two of its paragraphs. As regards the present resolution, my delegation wishes to express its reservations regarding paragraph 10, since we do not agree with its exact wording.

220. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation wishes to make it clear that it voted in favour of the two draft resolutions in accordance with its clear-cut and firm position regarding the complete elimination of colonialism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* and the violations of the basic human rights of the peoples in occupied Territories. In addition to this, our delegation sincerely supports national liberation movements, wherever they may be.

221. With reference to operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/37/L.32 and Add.1, my delegation would have liked it to refer by name to countries that collaborate with the racist régime in South Africa, particularly in the nuclear and military fields, and to call upon them to cease forthwith such co-operation. The absence of a specific reference to the Zionist entity, which maintains links of co-operation in the nuclear and military fields with the Pretoria régime, does not exactly help to end the illegal occupation of Namibia, nor does it help to end the occupation of Arab territories.

222. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

223. Mr. KALINA (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Czechoslovak delegation fully concurs with the comments made by the Chairman of the Special Committee on the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom this morning on this item. Czechoslovakia, as Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee and Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Petitions, Information and Assistance, cannot agree with the negative appraisal of the work of the Committee by the delegation of the United Kingdom, especially when such appraisal is made by those that in one way or another are responsible for delaying the process of removing the last vestiges of colonialism. We are not at all surprised, nor could we be surprised, at the fact that a former powerful colonial Power does not agree with the positive results achieved by the Committee this year. It would have been surprising if it had been otherwise. Nor was it surprising that the Special Committee's mission sent to hold consultations with non-governmental organizations was also referred to as costly, unjustified and unnecessary by that delegation. I should like to recall that the mission, which I had the honour of heading, was sent as a result of a resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Special Committee—whether certain people like it or not. The mission completely justified itself, consulting with 55 non-governmental organizations in Europe. I am convinced that its results and its conclusions and recommendations, which have been approved at this meeting of the General Assembly, will further help substantially to mobilize public opinion in Western Europe, including the United Kingdom, alerting it to the purposes of decolonization in southern Africa and in other Territories as well. Undoubtedly this is what worries the representative of the United Kingdom most of all. As consultations which were held in London showed, British non-governmental organizations have a very critical opinion of their country's position on questions of decolonization, in particular those relating to southern Africa.

224. The representative of the United States—in other words, the Mayor of San Juan, Puerto Rico, a country to which the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples have still not been applied although they are fully applicable to it—saw fit to refer to my country in his statement. It seems that he, using the “position of strength” approach, wanted to brush off several issues with one stroke. However, I think the representative of the United States probably confused this meeting of the General Assembly with a meeting of the American Legion in Texas. He tried to lecture us about “American-style democracy”, but he forgot that it was not university students who were present here but representatives of sovereign States.

225. Mrs. NAYAS (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of the United States has presented himself as a champion of anti-colonialism and freedom, a formidable foe of totalitarianism. One would think he had nothing to do with those that stripped Mexico of half its territory; those that invaded Santo Domingo and stood in the way of the people’s victory of 1965 and, in the past, promoted interventionism in our America, as they do now in Central America; those that put forward unacceptable conditions which impede the independence of Namibia; those that sent thousands of Puerto Ricans as cannon-fodder for their imperialist adventure in Korea; those, of course, that occupied Cuba and Puerto Rico in 1898 and still occupy that sister island. This lack of memory is incredible, but typical of the imperialists and their scribes.

226. I asserted that Puerto Rico is a colony. The Mayor of San Juan has confirmed it, because it was that very person who spoke today—but as a member of the United States delegation, because Puerto Rico is a Yankee colony. He did not speak of his people or about the problems related to their political status, because Puerto Rico is a Yankee colony. He did not speak of Hostos, or Betances, or of Puerto Rican identity, again because Puerto Rico is a Yankee colony. He did not speak in Spanish, the language of Puerto Ricans, because Puerto Rico is a Yankee colony. The Mayor of San Juan actually does not want to be Puerto Rican; he would rather be a Yankee. He is in favour of annexation and is proud to be here with those that oppress his people. That is why it should be understood that he was speaking solely on behalf of imperialism, because only a patriot can speak today on behalf of Puerto Ricans.

227. Mr. NIKULIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): In connection with the statement made at this meeting by the representative of the United States, I should like to point out that the method used by that delegation in order to try to divert the attention of the General Assembly from the substance of what is being discussed is not a new one, nor can it mislead anyone. Everybody understands that the United States is trying to hold up the process of decolonization in order to continue its plundering of natural resources in southern Africa and in colonial Territories elsewhere. Everybody in this Hall is aware that American imperialism is the main bulwark of the colonialist and racist régime of Pretoria. Everybody knows that it is the United States itself, first and foremost, together

with racist South Africa, that has made it impossible to reach a settlement in Namibia. It is the United States, after all, that is trying, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Agreement and circumventing the Security Council, to swallow up Micronesia and turn it into its own colonial possession.

228. In the Fourth Committee and in the General Assembly, dozens of delegations have spoken quite properly about this, and today the results of the voting in this Hall clearly and convincingly showed the position and the approach of the United States on questions of decolonization.

229. These are the facts, which the delegation of the United States is not in a position to refute.

230. Mr. ENKHSAIKHAN (Mongolia) (*interpretation from Russian*): In his recent statement, the representative of the United States referred to my delegation, among others. His statement was imbued throughout with arrogance and contempt and showed once again the attitude of the United States to other countries and peoples. Such a big-Power attitude by the United States and certain other Western countries towards other peoples which they see as subjected or subjectable rather than as equal, including the people of Puerto Rico, is the main obstacle in the way of the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Everybody knows that the United States is the main protector of the racist régime in South Africa and gives comprehensive assistance to that country in strengthening its military and economic potential and thus the existing racist order. An obvious example of this is its negative vote on a number of important resolutions on decolonization which have been adopted.

231. As far as the attitude of the socialist countries is concerned, we completely reject the attempts of the United States to denigrate the fraternal relationship between the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, which is based on principles of genuine equality and respect for sovereignty and which, unfortunately, the representative of the United States cannot understand.

232. Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria): Earlier, the representative of the United States, speaking at this meeting on this agenda item, mentioned my country, Bulgaria, and I think I am duty-bound to oblige him by exercising my right of reply.

233. I should like to begin by saying that, in my statement this morning, I dwelt upon the work of the Special Committee and upon the status of the process of decolonization in the world. It cannot be denied that there still exist colonial Territories in various parts of the world and that some of those Territories are still under United States administration.

234. My second point is that the agenda item under which both the United States and the Bulgarian representatives made their statements is entitled “Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples”. The statement of the United States representative included a number of extraneous matters which were outside the agenda item, and I think that those parts should be ruled out of order.

235. Thirdly, in his statement, the United States representative said that a number of countries, including my own, "would have the Assembly believe that the principal aim of the United States and other Western democracies is to deny peoples everywhere their right to self-determination. Clearly, the facts are otherwise".

236. We, at least, would not like the Assembly to believe that. We should simply like to recall to the Assembly what the facts are, the abundance of facts. The votes that were taken today on a number of draft resolutions relating to decolonization clearly show the position of the delegation of the United States. I should like to recall some of the positions expressed over the years by the United States delegation. How did that delegation vote on resolution 1514 (XV)? Certainly not in the affirmative—if that is not correct, I stand to be corrected. How did that delegation vote on the questions of the right to self-determination and independence of the peoples of the former Portuguese colonial Territories, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia in the early and mid-1970s? Is it not a fact that the United States delegation withdrew from participation in the Special Committee in 1971 and after that boycotted its work for a number of years? What was that delegation's position with regard to the recognition which the General Assembly accorded the national liberation movements in southern Africa—SWAPO, MPLA⁵, PAIGC⁶ and others—when they were fighting for the exercise by their peoples of their right to self-determination and independence? How did the United States vote on other resolutions dealing with the right to self-determination and independence of colonial countries and peoples and, in particular, on resolutions recognizing the legitimacy of the national liberation struggle of colonial peoples? Or are we to disregard the veto in the Security Council when the question of imposing sanctions on South Africa was brought up and there was a specific draft resolution?

237. I have one last remark. The resort to language that is rather improper in this Hall does not make the arguments of any representative more convincing, least of all arguments in defence of such an untenable position as the one that the majority of us have been describing today.

238. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Since certain delegations have today touched upon the question of the procedures of the Special Committee, my delegation also would like to say a few words on this matter. The situation in that Committee is that the Western countries are trying to impose on it mandatory rules which would have the effect that no decision or proposal on any of the questions of decolonization would leave the Committee if all the members did not agree with it. If such a rule were to be adopted, it would mean that individual Western countries, and through them the colonial Powers, could block the adoption of any decision or resolution on questions of decolonization discussed in the Special Committee. In that case, the Special Committee could adopt only decisions and recommendations which suited the colonial Powers. The Soviet delegation considers such an approach to the work of the Special Committee unacceptable and is convinced that the majority of those present here also believe that it would be unacceptable if such

control were established by a single group of States, that is, the colonial Powers, over the Special Committee. Such an approach would run counter to the rules of procedure of the Special Committee and of the General Assembly.

239. Of course, the achievement of consensus or agreement is preferable in all instances when it is possible. However, the General Assembly and the Special Committee are fully entitled to observe and monitor the processes of decolonization in any colonial Territory, to express their judgement and to make recommendations in accordance with their democratic rules of procedure. That is the view of the Soviet delegation on the situation in the Special Committee.

240. Certain representatives of the colonial Powers have asserted that colonialism is already a thing of the past, that the struggle against colonialism is simply chasing phantoms. They are trying to convince the African, Asian and Latin American countries that colonialism is no longer in existence and that the struggle against colonialism should cease. All this propaganda is needed by the colonialists in order to dull the peoples' vigilance so that the struggle against colonialism and neo-colonialism will be relaxed, to limit the activities of United Nations bodies, to nullify what is being done by those bodies dealing with problems of decolonization, to undermine the trust in those organs, while at the same time they themselves continue their colonialist and neo-colonialist policies and strengthen their colonial domination in various parts of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

241. Everyone who heard this thesis to the effect that colonialism is simply a phantom may recall that quite recently, in the spring of this year, an armada of warships—two thirds of the fleet of a metropolitan Power, including two aircraft carriers and a number of frigates and even very large passenger liners, filled with expeditionary forces, including mercenaries—was sent 12,000 miles in order to protect this phantom. Also to protect this phantom, a colonial Power required the assistance of another mighty Power. Perhaps these frigates and aircraft carriers were also phantoms? Perhaps South Africa's troops, tanks and helicopters now invading the territory of Angola and annihilating its unarmed citizens and populated areas are also phantoms.

242. We do not intend to discuss here the insinuations of the United States delegation regarding the policy of the Soviet Union on questions which are not relevant in any way to the question of decolonization. Their purpose is quite obvious: to distract the attention of the General Assembly from the item being discussed at the present time, that is, the question of the elimination of colonialism, including colonialism as practised and supported by the United States. It should be recalled that it was the Soviet Union, after all, rather than the United States, that initiated the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and it is the Soviet Union also that has supported and continues to support and assist national liberation movements—those who are fighting against colonialism and racism, whom the United States Administration calls terrorists whilst it gives overt assistance to the most terroristic and racist régime in the world, that of Pretoria.

243. The United States representative touched upon the question of Micronesia. Regarding the decolonization of that Territory, there are at the present time two aspects that should be borne in mind. One is the situation in the Territory itself. The administering Power, the United States, is doing everything it can to annex that Territory, for which the United Nations is responsible. The United States refuses to give the people of Micronesia the opportunity to exercise its inalienable right to independence. In pursuance of its objective, it makes use of all possible means of suppressing the will of the people of Micronesia, including economic, propaganda, military and other methods. Inequitable, fictitious agreements have been concluded regarding the annexation, in the form of "free association", of individual parts of Micronesia by the United States. The Soviet delegation considers that such a policy on the part of the administering Power is unacceptable and that the General Assembly must support the people of Micronesia and confirm its right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration on decolonization. No neo-colonialist agreements between the United States and Micronesia can alter the colonial status of that Territory or deprive the people of Micronesia of its inalienable rights to self-determination and independence.

244. It is a fact that the United States at the present time is the main colonial Power and the main bulwark of the policy of colonialism pursued by other Western countries in various parts of the world. If colonialism still exists, it is simply because that major capitalist Power of the West, the United States, is on the side of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

245. Mr. KINNEY (United States of America): I should like to respond very briefly to the statements of the Soviet Union and of Cuba.

246. The USSR has again said that the United States seeks to suppress "the will of the people of Micronesia". After more than a decade of negotiations, the elected representatives of Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia, or their designated negotiators, have all signed with the United States a compact of free association. This is intended to establish the future political status of those three jurisdictions and their relationship with the United States and to make possible the termination of this the last United Nations trusteeship and the only strategic trusteeship created by the United Nations. The results of these negotiations are about to be submitted to plebiscites in the three jurisdictions, and they must also be acted upon by the three Governments and my own. Thus, self-determination is clearly under way in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the supervision of the Trusteeship Council.

247. Articles 82 and 83 of the Charter of the United Nations state that the Trusteeship Council shall undertake all functions of the United Nations relating to the trust. I must wonder at this juncture whether it can be that some delegations find the prospect of a legitimate act of self-determination so alien to their political beliefs that they seek at this late date to question the work of the Trusteeship Council or to frustrate the will of the people of Micronesia in the upcoming plebiscites. I can think of no other reason for the continuing Soviet obsession with interfering with the

work of the Trusteeship Council as mandated by Articles 82 and 83; indeed, the Fourth Committee reaffirmed that mandate by deciding this year not to take up the trusteeship of the Pacific Islands.

248. I should like in closing to turn to the *ad hominem* Cuban attack on Mayor Padilla, which in my judgement set a new low in United Nations debate, and I must reserve for the Mayor his right to respond personally in writing to that attack. Allow me to say, however, that the voters who elected the Mayor of San Juan were exercising the very political rights which he has defended here against those who would predetermine the political will of the people of Puerto Rico. Unfamiliar as elections and self-determination may be to certain delegations in this Hall, they are the basis of United States participation in United Nations decolonization activities and are, indeed, a core value of our Republic.

249. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to exercise the right of reply a second time.

250. Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In connection with the most recent statement by the representative of the United States, who has attempted to justify United States policy towards the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and Micronesia, and in connection with his words to the effect that the people of Micronesia are now prepared and ready to undertake the process of determining their own future, I should like to quote from a letter from the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Parliament of Palau, which describes how that Territory is being prepared for the holding of a referendum and which to a certain extent sheds light on the true intentions of the United States in the Territory. He says:

"First, we feel that the proposed November plebiscite on the Compact gives us too short a time to conduct meaningful political education throughout the islands of Palau. We have been told that the Compact of Free Association must be presented to the United States Congress by January 1983 in order not to get laid aside in the wake of the elections and other political affairs of the United States.

"This is a poor justification for trying to rush this most important document through the Palauan electorate, and we are left with the suspicious feeling that something is being withheld from us."*

He goes on to say that the United States has allocated \$250,000 for a programme of political education for the population of the Territory. The letter continues:

"All revenues coming into Palau, regardless of the source, must be deposited in our national treasury for disbursement by law. The process with which the United States Government has granted this money to Palau for political education bypasses this constitutional requirement and is unacceptable for us. We see it as an effort of your Government"—that is, the Government of the United States—"to bribe our people into accepting the Compact."*

The same letter says that the people of Micronesia are not familiar with the Compact.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

251. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States has asked to make a second statement in right of reply.

252. Mr. KINNEY (United States of America): I can accommodate my Soviet colleague and assure him that there will be no rush to a November plebiscite. I cannot, however, grant his wish that there be no plebiscite. That is a mandate he can enforce only at home.

253. I would reassure the Assembly that the referendum in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands will be observed by Pacific Member States of the Assembly and by the Trusteeship Council.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹ The delegation of Malawi subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

² The delegation of Yemen subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had not intended to participate in the vote.

³ The delegation of the Comoros subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain and the delegation of Equatorial Guinea that it had intended to vote against the draft resolution.

⁴ The delegations of the Comoros and of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote against the draft resolution.

⁵ Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola.

⁶ Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde.