

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly
FORTY-FOURTH SESSION
Official Records

FOURTH COMMITTEE
16th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 25 October 1989
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 16th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 116: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS
- AGENDA ITEM 118: 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
- AGENDA ITEM 119: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA
- AGENDA ITEM 120: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES
- AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/44/SR.16
10 November 1989
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 116: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 a OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (A/44/23 (Part IV); A/44/262 and 553)

AGENDA ITEM 118: 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/44/23 (Part IV), A/44/297 and Add.1 and 2; A/AC.109/L.1705; E/1989/112)

AGENDA ITEM 119: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (A/44/557)

AGENDA ITEM 120: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (A/44/613)

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/44/23 (Part IV); A/44/139, 178, 236, 291, 303, 355, 463 and 477; A/AC.109/975 and Add.1, 976 to 978, 979 and Add.1, 980, 982 to 990, 992 to 998, 999/Rev.1, 1000 and 1007)

1. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take a decision on the draft resolutions and draft decisions listed in document A/C.4/44/L.6.

Draft resolution contained in document A/44/23 (Part IV), chapter VIII, paragraph 9

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, 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, 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.

3. The draft resolution was adopted by 141 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

4. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said that he had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution which had just been adopted because of the wording of operative paragraph 2, which asserted that it was for the General Assembly to decide when an administering Power was no longer under the obligation to transmit information on a Non-Self-Governing Territory. His country believed that such decisions were best left to the Government of the Territory concerned and to the administering Power.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 116.

Draft resolution contained in document A/44/23 (Part IV), chapter VII, paragraph 15

6. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) announced that he would vote against the proposed text. While he welcomed the fact that much of the contentious language employed in previous years had been deleted, the draft resolution still had a number of faults. The most serious, and one that was totally unacceptable to his country, was the twelfth preambular paragraph which stated that the retention of any links with South Africa was tantamount to support for apartheid. While it unreservedly condemned apartheid, his country felt that the recent positive developments in South Africa called for a constructive policy based on encouraging change rather than on further punishment. The draft resolution also implied that the General Assembly was empowered to give instructions to the specialized agencies, in particular the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. They, however, were autonomous bodies and should remain so. Moreover, the draft resolution purported to set a political agenda for those bodies instead of focusing on their potential contribution to resolving the economic and social problems of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Lastly, the suggestion that certain specialized agencies were providing assistance to South Africa was unfounded and totally inadmissible.

7. Mr. RABANA (Botswana) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution. He nevertheless had some reservations concerning paragraph 13, which requested the specialized agencies to impose sanctions on the South African régime. It was surely for the specialized agencies themselves to take a decision in that regard.

8. Ms. MILLER (Canada) said she welcomed the fact that the proposed draft resolution contained several major improvements on the texts of previous years and that she would vote in favour of it. However, she still had some basic reservations. The twelfth preambular paragraph characterized any form of contact with South Africa as an endorsement of apartheid. Did that apply to the recent meetings between distinguished African statesmen and the South African leaders? So far as her country's diplomatic relations with South Africa were concerned, the main objective was to maintain pressure on apartheid and to assist its victims. If there were to be a separate vote on that paragraph, her delegation would abstain. She also wished to reiterate her delegation's reservations with respect to paragraph 10, which ignored the independence of the international financial institutions.
9. Mr. SCARANTINO (Italy), recalling that his country actively supported the contribution of the specialized agencies to decolonization, said that, while the draft resolution under consideration was an improvement on the texts of previous years, it took no account of the principle of the autonomy and universality of those institutions. He would therefore abstain.
10. Mr. TROLLE (Sweden) said that the Nordic countries, on whose behalf he was speaking, would vote in favour of the draft resolution, although they had strong reservations concerning the twelfth preambular paragraph, which ran contrary to important principles they upheld.
11. Mr. CISTERNAS (Chile) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, it was opposed to the idea that the General Assembly should give instructions to the specialized agencies, whose independence must be respected.
12. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal.

13. The draft resolution was adopted by 134 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.

14. Mr. SERRANO (Spain), explaining his vote, said that he welcomed the major improvements made in the draft resolution compared with the texts of previous years, but wished to express his reservations concerning the provision that any link with South Africa was tantamount to support for the policy of apartheid. The encroachments on the independence and status of the specialized agencies were also unacceptable.

15. Mrs. WICKES (Australia) said that she had been obliged to abstain in the vote chiefly because of the twelfth preambular paragraph, which she found unacceptable. It was precisely by retaining links with South Africa that her country was able to bring stronger pressure to bear on apartheid. Furthermore, it was not for the General Assembly to give instructions to the specialized agencies.

16. Mr. CORR (Ireland) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, some elements of the text were still unacceptable. If apartheid were to be eliminated, the international community must adopt a policy of selective, graduated and mandatory sanctions, but it would not improve the situation to isolate South Africa completely. Furthermore, his delegation considered that the draft resolution did not take the independence and status of the specialized agencies sufficiently into account.

17. Mr. MENAT (France) said that, since his delegation still had certain reservations, particularly with regard to the functions allocated to the principal organs of the United Nations, it had felt obliged to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

18. Mr. KEMBER (New Zealand) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but that he keenly regretted the wording of the twelfth preambular paragraph. His country fully supported the appeals for the intensification of pressure on South Africa, but it could not concede that any dialogue with South Africa constituted support for apartheid. The point of maintaining certain contacts was precisely to eliminate that system and not to sustain it.

19. Mr. HAJNOCZI (Austria) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but that he maintained his reservations with regard to the twelfth preambular paragraph, whose wording was unduly peremptory.

20. Mr. DIKTAKIS (Greece) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but that he wished to express reservations with regard to the twelfth preambular paragraph. The total isolation of South Africa would undermine efforts aimed at eliminating apartheid once and for all. There should instead be a genuine dialogue between all representatives of South African society, with a view to establishing a free, democratic and non-racial South Africa.

21. Mr. EHLERS (Uruguay) said that his country, which had always been opposed to violations of human rights and to apartheid, had voted in favour of the draft resolution. At the same time, he could not support the twelfth preambular paragraph, since all means by which a peaceful solution might be reached had not yet been exhausted.

22. Mr. BUDAI (Hungary) said that, although he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, he regarded the twelfth preambular paragraph as being too peremptory. In order to achieve the total elimination of apartheid, contacts between South Africa and countries in that region were essential.

23. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 118.

Draft resolution A/C.4/44/L.3*

24. Mr. CHABALA (Zambia), speaking as acting Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, introduced the draft resolution. He said that the large number of Member States sponsoring the draft resolution reflected the broad consensus of the international community on that very important matter.

25. Since the establishment of the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa in 1968, almost 34,000 applications had been received and over 6,200 scholarship-holders throughout the world had completed their studies in a variety of disciplines. Many of those scholarship-holders were now in prominent positions in their countries. The importance of education and technical training for young South Africans and Namibians was generally recognized. The Advisory Committee was ensuring that the training received corresponded to the situation as it developed and that it offered opportunities of employment. It had therefore decided to undertake an evaluation of the Programme during the current year. Unfortunately, contributions had been erratic or, in the case of certain States, delayed. Operations had been seriously affected and only limited resources had been available to meet major financial commitments. During the year officials had therefore endeavoured to promote co-sponsorship and co-financing arrangements with a number of educational institutions and foundations active in providing assistance to students from South Africa and Namibia. The generosity of those donors had undoubtedly helped to make the Programme one of the most important in

(Mr. Chabala, Zambia)

its field. With the prospects of a political settlement in Namibia, and in view of the critical needs of South African students, it was likely that its activities would assume greater significance than ever before. Thanks should be expressed to all those who had lent their assistance in whatever shape or form.

26. Mr. NGOYI NGONGO LUNKAMBA (Zaire) welcomed the United Nations Plan for the Decolonization of Namibia, but stressed the continuing need for vigilance, as was evident from the difficulties to which the Secretary-General had drawn attention in document S/20983. From the point of view of security, an independent Namibia could benefit from a settlement in Angola, an endeavour to which his country was contributing in its capacity as mediator. It should be able to rely on the economic infrastructure planned for South Africa, and should also be able to count on an administrative structure, which would be of crucial importance in the early years. For those reasons, his country supported the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa (A/44/157) and the draft resolution relating to the Programme.

27. Draft resolution A/C.4/44/L.3* was adopted without a vote.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 119.

Draft resolution A/C.4/44/L.4

29. The CHAIRMAN said that India, Bulgaria, Vanuatu, Burundi and Barbados had joined the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

30. Draft resolution A/C.4/44/L.4 was adopted without a vote.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 120.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/C.4/44/L.2, A/C.4/44/L.5, A/44/23 (Part VI), chap. X, paras. 112 and 113)

Draft resolution A/C.4/44/L.2

32. Draft resolution A/C.4/44/L.2 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolutions I to XII and draft decisions I and II contained in document A/44/23 (Part VI), chapter X, paragraphs 112 and 113

33. Mr. DE SOUZA (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretary-General, having considered the draft text recommended by the Special Committee to Review the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples as contained in chapter X of the report (A/44/23, Part VI, paras. 112 and 113), considered that the implementation of those texts, for which funds had been provided under section III A of the

(Mr. De Souza)

programme budget for the biennium 1990-1991, would not involve additional expenditure or changes in the programme.

Draft resolution I

34. Draft resolution I was adopted without a vote.

35. Mr. MENAT (France) said that his delegation had not requested a vote on the proposed text, which merely endorsed the policy of the French Government and took into account positive developments in the situation in New Caledonia. However, his delegation could not join in the consensus on the resolution. In consideration of Article 73 of the Charter, which had not been amended by General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV), 1541 (XV) and 41/41, his country considered that the Territory, whose population was still not completely self-governing, fell exclusively within its sovereignty. It had recently been noted that that principle was fully compatible with a process leading to a referendum on self-determination organized in conditions regarded as satisfactory by the overwhelming majority of the population of New Caledonia.

36. Mr. MALAPA (Vanuatu) said that it was the responsibility of the specialized agencies of the United Nations to take all the necessary steps to ensure that the granting of independence to New Caledonia was guaranteed by the United Nations. The decolonization process should take place in accordance with the principles and practices of the United Nations.

Draft resolution II

37. Draft resolution II was adopted without a vote.

38. Mr. MENAT (France) said that, although his delegation did not wish to oppose the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution, it expressed reservations concerning preambular paragraph 11 on nuclear testing in the Pacific. The various studies undertaken had proved that French nuclear testing in Polynesia did not adversely affect the interests of the countries of the region, the health of the local populations or the environment.

Draft resolutions III and IV

39. Draft resolution III was adopted without a vote.

40. Draft resolution IV was adopted without a vote.

41. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said that he had not opposed the adoption by consensus of draft resolution IV on Bermuda; however, he raised certain objections. Regarding paragraph 6, the presence, since the Second World War, of military installations not only did not constitute an obstacle to self-determination, but also enabled the Bermudian Government to run the civilian airport very economically. As for paragraph 7, the United Kingdom, which

(Mr. Smith, United Kingdom)

scrupulously observed the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, found it offensive to be urged to avoid involving Bermuda in any offensive acts or interference directed against other States.

Draft resolutions V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI and XII

42. Draft resolutions V, VI, VII, as amended, VIII, as amended, IX, X, as amended, XI, as amended, were adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution XII

43. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the consultations that had taken place between the Chairman of the Special Committee of 24 and various delegations, the Committee should not take a decision at that stage on draft resolution XII on the question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

44. It was so decided.

45. Mr. WILKINSON (United States of America), explaining his position on some of the texts that had just been adopted, said that the Committee should ensure that resolutions accurately reflected the true situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Concerning Guam, the United States recognized the rights of all the people of Guam, including the Chamorro people, and in particular the right to request commonwealth status. However, the draft act currently before the United States Congress posed certain constitutional problems. The resolution adopted by the Committee should therefore not be regarded as an endorsement of that draft act, but simply as a recognition of the right of the people of Guam to self-determination. Regarding the presence, referred to in the resolution, of military installations in the Territory, the Committee was well aware that such presence did not constitute an obstacle to self-determination but rather a preparation for it, since the Territory derived economic and educational benefits from that presence. Furthermore, a very high percentage of the military in Guam were indigenous. Property rights were fully respected, and any property disputes were brought before independent courts.

46. His delegation expressed reservations to certain parts of the resolutions on the United States Virgin Islands and American Samoa, which called in question the perfectly legitimate relations between the American Government and that of the Territories. The overall tone of those resolutions suggested that the United States had not met its obligations to the indigenous populations, whereas they received protection equal to that of other Americans. Lastly, he felt that the failure to communicate the texts of those resolutions to his delegation before their publication and distribution impaired the credibility of the Committee.

Draft resolution A/C.4/44/L.5

47. Mr. DE SOUZA (Secretary of the Committee) informed the Committee that the Secretary-General was not at that point in a position to prepare an estimate of the expenses that might arise in connection with further United Nations activities

(Mr. De Souza)

regarding Western Sahara. If it was necessary to incur any expenses for that purpose in 1990, the necessary arrangements would be made, in accordance with established procedure.

48. Ms. BERMUDEZ (Cuba) introduced draft resolution A/C.4/44/L.5 on Western Sahara, on behalf of the 42 sponsors listed in document A/C.4/44/L.5, who had been joined by Nigeria. Two changes had been made to the proposed text: in paragraph 7, line 1, the word "meeting" had been replaced by "talks"; in paragraph 8, line 2, the word "would" had been replaced by "could".

49. In 1985, practically all the sponsors had asked the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the President of the Organization of African Unity to use their good offices to find a just and lasting negotiated solution to the conflict of Western Sahara. The situation had recently undergone noticeable developments as a result of four essential factors: the appointment of a Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Western Sahara, talks between Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO, the establishment of a technical commission to facilitate the implementation of settlement proposals accepted by both sides, and progress in the processing of data from the 1974 census in Western Sahara, which would make it possible to draw up a list of voters for the referendum. The proposed text had been elaborated on that basis.

50. Draft resolution A/C.4/44/L.5, as orally amended, was adopted without a vote.

Draft decision I

51. Draft decision I was adopted without a vote.

Draft decision II

52. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said that he would vote against draft decision II on Saint Helena, as a whole. Firstly, Ascension Island had purely administrative links with Saint Helena, which was more than 1,000 kilometres away. It had no indigenous population and was not even on the Committee's agenda. It was ludicrous to suggest that the very limited military facilities on Ascension Island should be a source of concern to anyone, least of all to Saint Helena. Secondly, the so-called trade and transportation dependency of the Territory on South Africa amounted to a solitary cargo vessel, which plied the route between London, Saint Helena and the only suitable port in the vicinity, Capetown. He wondered what, in concrete terms was intended by the reminder not to involve Saint Helena in offensive acts by South Africa against neighbouring States. Thirdly, the sponsors of the text totally disregarded the development effort of the British Government, whose assistance to Saint Helena in 1989 would total £21 million, or nearly \$6,000 per head.

53. At the request of the representative of the United Kingdom, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision II.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

54. Draft decision II was adopted by 109 votes to 2, with 28 abstentions.

55. Mr. KEMBER (New Zealand), speaking in exercise of the right of reply to the representative of France, said that the members of the South Pacific Forum were seeking a complete cessation of all nuclear testing by France in the Pacific. Concern was not confined to Forum members, as was shown by reports that the Government of French Polynesia was itself trying to obtain information on the possible medical effects of those tests, which it felt were not well known.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 18.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.