

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1860th
MEETING**

Monday, 1 December 1969,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda items 12, 13, 23, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70 and 71	
General debate (continued)	273

Chairman: Mr. Théodore IDZUMBUIR
(Democratic Republic of the Congo).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Penchev (Bulgaria),
Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEMS 12, 13, 23, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70
AND 71***

Agenda item 12 (continued)
(A/7603 chapter XIII (section C))

Agenda item 13 (continued) (A/7564, A/7604, A/7663)

Agenda item 23 (Territories not covered by other items)
(continued) (A/7550 and Add.1-6, A/7623/Add.4 and
Corr.1 and 2, A/7623/Add.6 (parts I and II), A/7623/
Add.7, A/7785, A/7786)

Agenda item 63 (continued) (A/7623/Add.8, A/7753)

Agenda item 66 (Question of Fiji) (continued)
(A/7623/Add.5 (part I))

Agenda item 67 (Question of Oman) (continued)
(A/7623/Add.5 (part II))

Agenda item 68 (continued) (A/7752 and Add.1)

Agenda item 69 (continued) (A/7623 (part III), A/7725)

Agenda item 70 (continued) (A/7496, A/7735)

Agenda item 71 (continued) (A/7744)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the end of the 1859th meeting some delegations had expressed a wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

2. Mr. EILAN (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that at the previous meeting the representative

* For the title of each item, see under "Agenda" in the prefatory fascicle.

of Mauritania had questioned the right of the delegation of Israel to make statements in the Fourth Committee. He therefore felt that it was appropriate to recall the circumstances in which Mauritania had been admitted to membership of the United Nations. At its 1043rd plenary meeting, on 27 October 1961, the General Assembly had decided by 68 votes to 13, with 20 abstentions, to admit the Islamic Republic of Mauritania to membership in the United Nations.¹ He wished to point out that eleven of the thirteen negative votes had been cast by Arab States, whereas Israel had voted in favour of Mauritania's admission. In view of the statement made by the Mauritanian representative at the 1859th meeting, he wondered whether the vote on 27 October 1961 might not perhaps have been a mistake.

3. Mr. PARSI (Iran), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, recalled that at the 1859th meeting he had said that it was obvious from General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV) of 15 December 1960 that it was for the General Assembly to determine whether or not an obligation existed to transmit the information called for under Article 73 e of the Charter. Since the representative of the United Kingdom had subsequently, in the same meeting, interpreted that resolution in a different manner, he wished to emphasize that at the time that resolution 1541 (XV) had been adopted neither the sponsors of the text of that resolution nor the delegations which had not opposed its adoption had had any doubt about the competence of the General Assembly in that matter.

4. He thought it might be useful to recall certain statements which had been made at the time of the introduction of the report of the Special Committee of Six on the Transmission of Information under Article 73 e of the Charter. At the 1031st meeting of the Fourth Committee, on 1 November 1960, the Chairman of the Special Committee of Six had said that the Committee felt that it had formulated principles on the basis of which the General Assembly would be able to determine in each specific case whether or not an obligation to transmit information existed under Article 73 e of the Charter.²

5. At the same meeting, another member of the Special Committee of Six, the representative of Mexico, in a statement which had subsequently been reproduced as an official document at the request of the representative of Morocco, supported by the representative of the United Kingdom had said that principle III laid down that the fulfilment of the provisions of Article 73 e of the Charter

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, vol. II, 1043rd meeting.

² *Ibid.*, Fifteenth Session (Part I), Fourth Committee, 1031st meeting, para. 6.

was an international obligation and that if that obligation was accepted, then supervision by the General Assembly must be accepted also.³

6. At the 1032nd meeting of the Fourth Committee, the representative of the Netherlands, a country which at that time was an administering Power, had said that the language of the principles was logical and clear, adding that his delegation had no doubt that the principles would be a useful guide to the Fourth Committee in determining whether an obligation existed to transmit the information called for in Article 73 *e* of the Charter.⁴

7. The mere fact that in the title of resolution 1541 (XV) mention was made of "Members" indicated that in the minds of the sponsors of those principles it was for Members collectively to determine whether or not an obligation existed.

8. With regard to the competence of the General Assembly in that respect, he pointed out that in the third preambular paragraph of resolution 742 (VIII) of 27 November 1953 the General Assembly had explicitly recognized that it was competent to consider the principles that should guide the United Nations and the Member States in the implementation of obligations arising from Chapter XI of the Charter and, in operative paragraph 3 of the same resolution, it had recommended that the list of factors annexed to the resolution should be used by the Administering Members as a guide in determining whether any Territory, due to changes in its constitutional status, was or was no longer within the scope of Chapter XI of the Charter.

9. Mr. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, explained that when Mauritania had applied for admission to the United Nations, it had never solicited Israel's vote, for the good reason that it had never recognized Israel's existence. He expressed satisfaction that the representative of Israel now considered that his country's vote in favour of Mauritania had been a mistake.

10. In his statement at the 1859th meeting, the Mauritanian representative had explained what the Zionist State represented for his country: namely, a State where violence reigned and whose authorities were the spearhead of colonialism and imperialism. Just as it supported all peoples struggling for independence, Mauritania supported the people of Palestine. It had never accepted, and would never accept, what had happened in the part of Palestine which was under military occupation. In the environment in

which it found itself, Israel was an alien element which sooner or later would disappear because it should not exist.

11. At the 1859th meeting, the representative of Israel had said that foreign economic interests did not constitute an obstacle to the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination. That statement proved that Israel was among the States which sought to perpetuate foreign domination of certain parts of the world. That raised the question of why Israel was a member of the Fourth Committee, which had the specific task of dealing with the question of decolonization. He hoped that the day would come when the Committee would become aware that Palestine too should be decolonized and that it would deal with that question just as it was now dealing with Namibia and other Territories.

12. Mr. LEE WILLIAMS (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of the right of reply and referring to the statement made by the representative of Iran on the question of the interpretation of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV), reaffirmed the position of his delegation on that question as it had been stated at the 1859th meeting. He wished, however, to draw the Committee's attention to the third preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 of resolution 1541 (XV). In operative paragraph 3 of that resolution, the General Assembly had decided that the principles should be applied in the light of the facts and circumstances of each case.

13. Mr. EILAN (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out that he had certainly not said that he regretted Israel's vote in 1961 in favour of Mauritania; he had referred only to the vote of the General Assembly as a whole.

14. Just as it was revolting to hear the representatives of totalitarian régimes speak of freedom, so it was revolting to hear the representative of a State which owed its very existence to the wishes of industrial interests now denounce the activities of economic interests in dependent Territories.

15. Mr. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he did not consider that the allusion by the representative of Israel to representatives of dictatorial régimes applied to him. He thought that it was the duty of everyone not to allow the Zionists, who had come from all parts of the world, to drive people from their homes by violence and plunder. For that reason, despite its limited resources, Mauritania would continue to do everything in its power to assist the liberation movement, which was struggling against a régime that could only be described as a colonial régime.

³ *Ibid.*, 1031st meeting, para. 23.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1032nd meeting, para. 1.

The meeting rose at 3.45 p.m.