

2075th meeting

Tuesday, 4 December 1973, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2075

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (*continued*) (A/9023 (parts II and IV), A/9023/Add.4, A/9023/Add.5, A/9023/Add.6, A/9121 and Corr.1, A/9124, A/9176, A/9247, A/9287, A/9330, A/C.4/L.1041, A/C.4/L.1045, A/C.4/L.1046, A/C.4/L.1052, A/C.4/L.1056, A/C.4/L.1062, A/C.4/L.1063)

QUESTION OF BERMUDA, THE BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS, THE CAYMAN ISLANDS, MONTSERRAT, THE TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS AND THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS: CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.1063)

1. Mr. CISSE (Mali), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/L.1063 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the progress made towards the full implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) indicated the positive role that the United Nations had played in gaining acceptance of the fact that colonialism was an anachronism and an evil to be eradicated as quickly as possible. Much remained to be done, however, and 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 would have to continue until all dependent peoples, without exception, had achieved self-determination.

2. The small Territories to which the draft resolution related were just as important as the larger Territories that had already been considered and their problems of size, geographical situation and natural resources should not serve as a pretext for deferring self-determination and independence. The draft resolution took account of a number of suggestions and recommendations of the Special Committee, based on various General Assembly resolutions. The major concern of the sponsors related to the establishment of a specific time-table for the attainment of self-determination and independence, as pointed out in the fifth preambular paragraph. Their concern was particularly justified in view of the continued refusal of the administering Powers to co-operate with the Special Committee and to allow United Nations missions to visit the Territories under their administration. That attitude contrasted sharply with the praiseworthy spirit of co-operation and realism shown by other administering Powers such as New Zealand and Australia. The United Nations had always held that the sending of missions to dependent Territories was an irreplaceable way of obtaining first-hand information. Hence the request to the administering Powers concerned, in operative paragraph 5, "to reconsider their attitude" in that respect.

3. There was nothing new in the draft resolution that should give rise to any reservations on the part of the administering Powers. Based on the principles enunciated in the Charter of the United Nations, it underlined the overriding responsibility of the administering Powers to accelerate the process that would lead, within acceptable time-limits, to self-determination. To that end, it was essential for the administering Powers to co-operate closely with the relevant subsidiary bodies of the United Nations.

4. The members of the Committee would welcome any indication of a real desire on the part of the administering Powers to co-operate with the Special Committee: such an attitude would not only benefit the population but would also justify the credit which the international community, in good faith, accorded to the actions of the administering Powers in the effective discharge of their mandate.

5. Finally, he announced that the Ivory Coast had joined the list of sponsors.

6. Mr. ARTEAGA (Venezuela), speaking as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1063, reiterated his delegation's past concern about the inclusion of almost all the smaller Territories in a single resolution, which had necessarily been superficial, taking account neither of new developments in the Territories nor of the differences between them. Although that group of Territories had many common characteristics and problems, each case required a specific solution. The Special Committee had devoted considerable time to the question during 1973 and he thought that its work should be reflected in the activities of the Fourth Committee, particularly so when the Committee was trying to follow a course that had yielded positive results. That was why his delegation had participated actively in the consultations culminating in the present draft resolution which, it felt, marked a first step towards a more realistic approach.

7. The draft resolution was based primarily on geographical considerations, all the Territories in question being situated in the Caribbean region or nearby. Most of its provisions applied to all the Territories and stressed the action that the United Nations should take under General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The draft resolution did not deal in detail with the specific circumstances of each island; that had not been the sponsors' intention, at least for the time being. The least that could be done at the present stage, however, was to make a distinction in draft resolutions between Territories on the basis of their geographical situation, as was done in the reports of the Special Committee.

8. His delegation hoped to see a continual improvement in the way in which the small Territories were considered. It also hoped that the draft resolution would be given overwhelming support.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1063 and A/C.4/L.1062 would be put to the vote at the following meeting.

QUESTION OF THE COCOS (KEELING) ISLANDS AND
QUESTION OF THE TOKELAU ISLANDS: CON-
SIDERATION OF DRAFT CONSENSUS (A/C.4/L.1056)

10. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to the financial implications of the draft consensus in document A/C.4/L.1056. The expenditures that might be incurred in dispatching a visiting mission under the terms of the proposal would be met from within the appropriations to be made available for the Special Committee's over-all programme of work in 1974; no additional budgetary appropriation would be required should the General Assembly adopt the draft consensus.

11. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would assume that the Committee wished to adopt the draft consensus (A/C.4/L.1056).

It was so decided.

QUESTION OF BRUNEI: CONSIDERATION OF
DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.1046)

12. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1046. His explanation with regard to the draft consensus on the question of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands that had just been adopted also applied to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1046.

13. Mr. HINCHCLIFFE (United Kingdom), commenting on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1046, drew attention to the note verbale which the representative of the United Kingdom had addressed to the Secretary-General on 18 September 1972 on the subject of Brunei.¹ That note had explained why it was no longer appropriate for information about Brunei to be transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter. It was clear from draft resolution A/C.4/L.1046 that the position of the United Kingdom Government and that of the Government of Brunei was not generally understood. He therefore wished, without prejudice to his Government's position that a discussion of Brunei was not within the competence of the Committee, to clarify the situation.

14. First, Brunei had never been a British colony. It was a country with its own Head of State, which had of its own volition chosen to maintain a treaty relationship with the United Kingdom. Because of the nature of his country's relationship with Brunei, it was the view of his delegation that Chapter XI of the Charter had never been applicable. However, with a view to keeping the international community informed of developments in the country, it had been the view of both Governments that, in the spirit of Chapter XI of the Charter, they should annually transmit information on the State as a purely voluntary act. Under the agreement of 1959, the text of which was to be found in annex II of the note verbale to which he had referred, the British High Commissioner, with the full consent of the

Government of Brunei, had had an advisory role. The responsibility for internal policies lay solely with the Brunei Government. That advisory function had been terminated in the amending agreement signed by both Governments on 23 August 1971, the full text of which was to be found in annex I of the note verbale.

15. The United Kingdom Government remained responsible for Brunei's external affairs, in consultation with the Government of Brunei, and had a consultative role in defence in the event of the threat of an external attack on the country. Consequently, the United Kingdom was not an "administering Power". Its relationship with the Government of Brunei was similar to that which it had enjoyed with some Persian Gulf States until 1971 and, as far as his delegation was aware, there had never been any question raised in the Committee that those States had been Non-Self-Governing Territories within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter.

16. Accordingly, his delegation felt that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1046 was not within the competence of the Committee.

At the request of the representative of Australia, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, 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 Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1046 was adopted by 101 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

17. Mr. WALTER (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1046 primarily because it considered that the confusion surrounding the situation should be clarified by the United Nations. However, he reserved his

¹ Document A/8827

delegation's position on the point of principle in the fourth preambular paragraph.

18. Such a situation, where there was a difference of opinion regarding not only the status of the Territory but also the responsibility of the administering Power, underlined the vital importance of the administering Power's working in close co-operation with the United Nations. In his view, the draft resolution should have taken account of the practical difficulties facing the United Kingdom Government.

19. Mr. DA COSTA LOBO (Portugal) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1046 because it did not accept the principle embodied in the fourth preambular paragraph with regard to the powers of the General Assembly under Article 73 e of the Charter.

QUESTION OF THE FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS): CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*concluded*) (A/C.4/L.1052)

20. Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia), supported by Miss BEGIN (Canada), requested that the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052 should be postponed until the following meeting.

21. After a brief procedural discussion in which Mr. DJIGO (Senegal), Mr. TOWO ATANGANA (Cameroon) and Mr. PAQUI (Dahomey), took part, the CHAIRMAN said that the request for postponement of the vote would be acceded to.

AGENDA ITEMS 74 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 (*concluded*)* (A/9023 (part V), A/9051 and Add.1-5, A/9277, A/9330, A/C.4/L.1042/Rev.1)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.1042/REV.1)

22. Mr. THUNE ANDERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Finland, Norway and Sweden, as well as his own to explain their votes before the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1042/Rev.1, said that the Nordic countries, which actively supported increased humanitarian, technical and educational assistance to oppressed peoples or groups, attached great importance to the role of the specialized agencies in that connexion.

23. It was, however, a matter of principle for the Nordic Governments that the statutes of the specialized agencies should be taken duly into account and that the agencies should retain their universal character.

24. In previous years, the texts concerning the specialized agencies had been drafted in such a way that they

precluded members which supported essential parts of them from voting in favour of the draft resolutions in their entirety. In contrast, the present text had been drafted in the light of consultations with the present Nordic member of the Special Committee—Sweden—and consideration had to a certain extent been given to principles upheld by the Nordic Governments. The Nordic delegations greatly appreciated that attitude and, although they would still have preferred some elements of the draft resolution to have been presented differently, would be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

25. Miss BEGIN (Canada) said that her delegation, which had abstained in past years in the vote on draft resolutions concerning the specialized agencies, would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1042/Rev.1. She wished to make it clear, however, that her delegation's positive vote in no way changed its position of principle, according to which the specialized agencies should conform to their respective statutes in their dealings with the liberation movements. Her delegation wished to be realistic and recognize the exceptional situation prevailing in southern Africa. The specialized agencies should do likewise and she hoped that, in so doing, they would be able to reconcile the requirements of their statutes and the humanitarian objectives to which the United Nations drew their attention.

26. Mr. ARTEAGA (Venezuela) said that, while his delegation agreed that the specialized agencies had an important role to play in the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, it had reservations with regard to certain paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1042/Rev.1. It disagreed, mainly on legal grounds, with some of the procedures whereby the specialized agencies would contribute to the cause of decolonization. It had difficulties with operative paragraphs 6 and 7, with some parts of paragraph 4 and with the eighth preambular paragraph.

27. His delegation wished to make it clear that it understood the term "material assistance" mentioned in the text to mean measures principally of a humanitarian nature.

28. His delegation would support the draft resolution, since it agreed with the general idea that the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations could make a useful contribution to decolonization.

29. Mr. KATSAREAS (Greece) said that his delegation had consistently supported all draft resolutions on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). It therefore regretted that, for reasons of principle, it could not vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1042/Rev.1. His delegation felt that to entrust the specialized agencies and international institutions associated with the United Nations with such wide responsibilities would politicize them, develop divisions in their ranks, damage their universality and distract them from the objectives for which they had been established.

At the request of the representative of Australia, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1042/Rev.1.

* Resumed from the 2070th meeting.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, 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, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Nicaragua, Spain, Uruguay.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1042/Rev.1 was adopted by 99 votes to 4, with 16 abstentions.

30. Mr. ÖZENER (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1042/Rev.1, although it had reservations on the tenth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 6. It felt that those paragraphs, if implemented literally, could jeopardize both the principles upon which the specialized agencies were founded and their universal character.

31. Mr. HEIDWEILLER (Netherlands) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1042/Rev.1 because it felt that the specialized agencies should play an active role in implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Its positive vote should not, however, be interpreted as a blanket endorsement of the draft resolution. His delegation had serious misgivings about operative paragraph 6 and would have abstained if a separate vote had been taken on that paragraph.

32. Mr. BOIVINEAU (France) said that his delegation had abstained on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1042/Rev.1, some of whose provisions were debatable. With regard to the eighth preambular paragraph in particular, his delegation had reservations which it had already explained many times.

33. Mr. STEWARD (South Africa) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.4/L.1042/Rev.1 for a number of reasons.

34. First, it could not approve of chapter VI of the Special Committee's report (A/9023 (part V)), which was the

foundation of the draft resolution. His reservations therefore applied to both.

35. Secondly, it could not endorse the status which the draft resolution purported to grant to certain political movements or the legitimacy of what was described as their struggle, particularly since the resolution used terminology which seemed to be understood by some delegations to authorize the use of force and violence. Those were certainly the methods openly advocated and used by those movements. Since the specific and overriding purpose of the United Nations was to promote peace and to ban war and violence, all Members had a duty to oppose any trend and any specific resolution that would directly or indirectly condone recourse to violence. His delegation would follow the guidance of the Charter in that respect.

36. Thirdly, the specialized agencies, as technical bodies, should not be converted into political arenas. The more they became politicized, the greater the loss for the world community and the more they were distracted from their true purposes. His delegation could not associate itself with moves to press the agencies to undertake unconstitutional and unwise activities.

37. Fourthly, the draft resolution singled out specific Governments, including his own, and would have the specialized agencies withhold assistance from them, despite the fact that South Africa, far from being a recipient of assistance, was in fact a donor of assistance. The provisions to that effect in the draft resolution were therefore unwarranted and unconstitutional.

38. His delegation had further reasons for rejecting the draft resolution, but it did not wish to detain the Committee by listing them exhaustively.

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE

39. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to authorize its Rapporteur to submit the report on the question direct to the General Assembly.

It was so decided.²

AGENDA ITEM 75

United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa (*concluded*)* (A/9240, A/C.4/L.1053, A/C.4/L.1059)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*concluded*) (A/C.4/L.1053, A/C.4/L.1059)

40. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Congo had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1053.

41. Mr. HINCHCLIFFE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would be happy to support the draft resolution, whose provisions could help to bring about a practical

² The report was submitted to the General Assembly as document A/9421.

* Resumed from the 2073rd meeting.

contribution to development in southern Africa. Since 1967, his country had contributed over \$770,000 and, subject to parliamentary approval, would make another contribution of £70,000, or approximately \$170,000, for the current year.

At the request of the representative of Australia, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1053.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: None.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1053 was adopted by 115 votes to 2.

42. Mr. BOIVINEAU (France) said that, despite legal reservations on some aspects of the draft resolution, his delegation had taken into account the humanitarian nature of the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and had voted in favour of the draft resolution. France's contribution to the Programme for 1973 was \$100,000.

43. Mr. STEWARD (South Africa) said the fact that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.4/L.1053 was no reflection of the deep concern felt by the authorities in South Africa and South West Africa for the improvement of education. Educational standards at all levels were constantly being improved for all peoples in South Africa and South West Africa, and its record compared favourably with that of most countries. There was thus no need there for any educational and training programme sponsored by the United Nations.

44. Furthermore, the Programme was designed to assist persons who would otherwise have qualified for education in South Africa but had left South Africa of their own volition, not infrequently for political reasons and in

connexion with activities directed against the security of their own State. States Members of the United Nations who were invited to contribute to the Programme were thus being invited to associate themselves with a political cause unfriendly to a Member State in a manner inappropriate for another Member State.

45. In South Africa and South West Africa, there were over 12,000 schools for the black population with over 3.75 million pupils, a 400 per cent increase over 1954. Those schools had a staff of about 55,000 teachers, over 95 per cent of them black. The school system was coping with an annual increase of 250,000 in the total number of black pupils, which involved the provision of more than 5,000 additional classrooms or about 500 schools each year as well as more teachers. Three thousand five hundred Bantu teachers had been trained in 1971 and the number was expected to increase to 5,500 by 1975. Expenditure on black education had increased from 46 million rand in 1969 to 70 million in 1971 and 85 million in 1972. As a result, according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the literacy rate among black people had increased from 21.8 per cent in 1952 to 80 per cent in the age-group 7 to 20 in 1972.

46. Mr. BENYAHIA (Algeria), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of South Africa was not speaking in explanation of vote. Furthermore, when the Committee had dealt with the question of Namibia, the representative of the racist Government had not been present.

47. Mr. DJIGO (Senegal) said that his delegation supported the point made by the representative of Algeria.

48. Mr. FAHNBULLEH (Liberia) agreed with the representatives of Algeria and Senegal and said that the Committee should not be used for political propaganda.

49. Mr. KEITA (Guinea) associated himself with those protests.

50. The CHAIRMAN took note of the statements made by the representatives of Algeria, Senegal, Liberia and Guinea and asked the South African representative to confine himself to an explanation of vote.

51. Mr. STEWARD (South Africa) said that it had not been his intention to delay the work of the Committee. He had quoted statistics to show that education in South Africa was adequate.

52. His delegation felt that the Programme was redundant and an imposition on Members. He drew attention to the inconsistency between the third preambular paragraph, which expressed satisfaction with regard to the contributions, and operative paragraph 5, which would have the United Nations provide a further \$100,000 in 1974. In principle, it was not proper to appropriate amounts from the regular budget for a fund which was intended to be financed by voluntary contributions.

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE

53. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee authorized the

Rapporteur to submit the report on item 75 direct to the General Assembly.

*It was so decided.*³

AGENDA ITEM 70

Question of Namibia (concluded)* (A/9023/Add.2, A/9024, A/9061, A/9065, A/9066, A/9225 and Corr.1, A/9330, A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1, A/C.4/L.1055, A/C.4/L.1060, A/C.4/L.1061)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded) (A/C.4/L.1050 AND CORR.1, A/C.4/L.1055, A/C.4/L.1060, A/C.4/L.1061)

54. Mr. DJIGO (Senegal), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055, noted that, whenever a vote was taken, the representatives of Portugal and South Africa disappeared. Their absence was an indication of their contempt for the principles of the United Nations.

55. The United Nations Fund for Namibia had been established in spite of the attempts by some countries to prevent it. The draft resolution did not differ greatly from that of the year before and its purpose was explained in the third preambular paragraph concerning the direct responsibility for Namibia assumed by the United Nations.

56. Operative paragraphs 6 and 7 were innovations and he complimented the Nordic countries on their co-operation in accepting the wording of operative paragraph 6. He appealed to delegations that usually abstained in the vote on such resolutions to understand that they could not change the course of history. Furthermore, he would suggest that the constant abstainers should forgo their explanations of vote. They should either be fully aligned with those who wanted to liberate people from the colonial yoke or be opposed to them.

57. The sponsors hoped that their appeal would be heard and that the draft resolution would obtain maximum support. The champions of democracy would certainly support it and he hoped that in time the modern colonialists, such as Portugal, would change their mediaeval concept of history.

58. Mr. HAIDER (Pakistan) paid a tribute to the delegation of Finland for its active efforts on behalf of the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

59. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055 reflected the evolution of the responsibility for Namibia: the United Nations Council for Namibia had been established to administer the Territory until independence and, as such, should be given the responsibility of handling its finances. There had been some misgivings regarding the day-to-day operation of the Fund, but the United Nations Council for Namibia could take that point into account in preparing the guidelines requested in operative paragraph 6. There had also been misgivings concerning accountability. In operative para-

graph 10, however, both the Secretary-General and the Council were requested to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session on the implementation of the resolution. The General Assembly would thus be in a position to review the action of the Council. Furthermore, in operative paragraph 7, all Member States were invited to formulate their views on the orientation of the Fund and would thus be involved on a day-to-day basis.

60. Mr. PETRELLA (Argentina) supported the statements by the representatives of Senegal and Pakistan. The United Nations Fund for Namibia was essential to the eventual emancipation of the Territory. His delegation therefore recommended that all Members should give the draft resolution constructive and positive consideration.

61. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Central African Republic, the Congo, Cuba, the Ivory Coast, Liberia, Mauritania, Nepal, Oman, Romania, Rwanda and Somalia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055.

62. Mr. TOWO ATANGANA (Cameroon) said that draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055 was a logical result of the attitude of the General Assembly regarding Namibia. The Assembly was responsible for the fate of the Namibians and, having given the United Nations Council for Namibia certain tasks, it should provide it with the funds to carry out its mandate.

63. He drew the attention of members of the fact that, as soon as the discussion on Namibia had begun, the representative of the Fascist, racist régime had left the room. Yet when the representative of that Nazi group had inflicted his lies on the Committee, members had listened to him. The friends of South Africa should therefore explain to that country that, if it wished to remain in the United Nations, it should be prepared to listen to the opinions of members on the solution of the Namibian problem. Otherwise those members might have to adopt the same attitude as that of the representative of South Africa.

64. The CHAIRMAN took note of the views expressed by the representative of Cameroon.

65. Mr. ZIMBA (Zambia) said that the absence of the representative of South Africa during the debate and vote on Namibia was an indication that that Government realized that it no longer represented Namibians.

66. His delegation believed in the international community and in view of General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) would vote positively on the draft resolutions.

67. Earlier in the discussion, the representatives of South Africa and Portugal had stated that, by allowing the leaders of liberation movements to take part in its discussions as observers, the Fourth Committee was supporting dissident forces. For some time, those delegations had absented themselves from the Fourth Committee. It was significant, however, that, when the Committee had voted on Territories under Portuguese domination, the delegation of the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO) had sat in the seat reserved for national liberation movements, while the Portuguese delegation had also sat in the Committee.

³ The report was submitted to the General Assembly as document A/9422.

* Resumed from the 2072nd meeting.

68. The League of Nations had not given South Africa a permanent mandate to administer Namibia and it might be asked why that country could not follow the example of others that had been given mandates to administer certain Territories.

69. His delegation hoped that South Africa would cease to try to create confusion in the Committee. Only that day, Radio South Africa had announced that there had been an attempted coup in Zambia and that a number of people had been arrested. The fact was that a number of Zambian nationals had been recruited by the South African Government to create confusion in Zambia on the eve of elections there. Those people had been arrested. That morning, when a reporter of the Reuter news agency in Johannesburg had telephoned his colleague at Lusaka, he had been told that if there had been a successful coup in Zambia he would not have been able to contact his colleague, he would have been hearing military music.

70. He recalled that when he had spoken in the Committee with respect to the Portuguese Territories (2030th meeting), Southern Rhodesia (2039th meeting) and Namibia (2046th meeting), his delegation had made it clear that as long as South Africa was involved in those countries there could be no peace in that part of the continent.

71. Mr. HINCHCLIFFE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had always been glad to support programmes designed to offer practical assistance to the people of southern Africa. It could not, however, accept the premises on which some of the preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055 were based. At the preceding session (2024th meeting), in explaining its vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1028, subsequently adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 3030 (XXVII), his delegation had suggested that the execution of the programme financed in the past by the United Nations Fund for Namibia should remain the responsibility of the Secretary-General. It had expressed the hope that the Secretary-General, besides taking into consideration advice from the United Nations Council for Namibia and the *Ad Hoc* Sub-Committee on Namibia, established under Security Council resolution 276 (1970), should also draw upon the already considerable expertise of the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa. Operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution suggested a different course of action and his delegation had some reservations about it. Nevertheless, it would not prejudge the guidelines for the Fund, which would from then on be drawn up by the United Nations Council for Namibia, and it would in due course consider the Council's report that would be before the Committee at the next session. In response to operative paragraph 7, he suggested that when considering the purposes of the Fund, members of the Council should take into account the advice and experience of members of the aforementioned Advisory Committee. In the meantime, his delegation would again vote in favour of the continuation of the Fund but until its direction and purpose were clarified it would continue to contribute exclusively to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, under which Namibians should continue to be eligible for assistance.

72. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1 was similar to General Assembly resolution 3031 (XXVII). His delegation had been unable to associate itself with many of the basic premises of that resolution and could not therefore accept the proposals which flowed from those premises. The same considerations applied to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1. Furthermore, his delegation had strong reservations concerning those paragraphs which endorsed the use of force and those calling upon the specialized agencies to involve themselves in activities which were not in accordance with their terms of reference.

73. In its general thrust, ignoring as it did the realities of the situation in Namibia, the draft resolution was unlikely to make any practical contribution towards resolving the problem and was likely to lead to deadlock and sterile confrontation.

74. The specific question of the continuation of contacts between the Secretary-General and the Government of South Africa was before the Security Council and his delegation therefore reserved its position on operative paragraph 7. It regretted that operative paragraph 5 expressed no word of appreciation for the Secretary-General or any recognition of his considerable efforts in carrying out the request made to him in regard to those contacts under Security Council resolution 323 (1972). For those reasons, his delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1.

75. Mr. PLEUGER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation supported the basic philosophy of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1, which was to enable the people of Namibia to achieve independence as a territorial and political entity in exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination and in accordance with the United Nations Charter. The Charter, however, excluded the use of force as a means to achieve political ends or to settle conflicts. His delegation therefore could not accept the legitimacy of struggle "by all means" as expressed in operative paragraph 1. That formulation not only included force as a last resort for self-defence but also justified its use even before all peaceful ways and means had been explored.

76. With regard to operative paragraph 2, his delegation could see that the policy of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) reflected the desire of the Namibian people to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, but it was not in a position to recognize that organization as the only representative of the people of Namibia. The Committee had also heard Chief Kapuuo, who had spoken at the 2053rd meeting on behalf of the National Convention, which represented a number of other political movements in Namibia.

77. With respect to operative paragraphs 7, 8 and 9, his delegation felt that a resolution of the General Assembly should not anticipate the results of discussions of the Security Council. Furthermore, it was the main task of the United Nations to seek peaceful ways and means for the solution of political problems, including that of Namibia.

78. In view of those difficulties with regard to section I of the draft resolution, his delegation had no option but to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

79. It would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055, although it had some reservations concerning operative paragraph 6. It felt, however, that a final position could be taken only after the guidelines for the orientation of the United Nations Fund for Namibia had been elaborated.

80. Mr. HEIDWEILLER (Netherlands) said that during the discussion at the previous session on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1030, subsequently adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 3031 (XXVII), his delegation had expressed its concern at the fact that the South African Government had not clarified its position on the interpretation of essential and basic facts, in particular the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence (2021st meeting). It appeared that the position of the South African Government was still far from clear. In his report⁴ the Secretary-General stated that renewed contacts with Pretoria had failed to provide a complete and unequivocal clarification of South Africa's policy in regard to self-determination and independence for Namibia. The South African Government had consistently maintained an ambivalent attitude and had so far been slow in complying with operative paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 323 (1972). As a result of that attitude, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity and the Special Committee had called for an end to the dialogue with South Africa. For its part, the Netherlands Government had hoped that at least on the question of Namibia the South African Government would have demonstrated a certain amount of goodwill and good faith. Furthermore, the Government of South Africa had violated its solemn pledge to respect the rights of the Namibian people and, during 1973, had arrested political leaders and banned political activity. It had also continued its so-called "homelands" policy in order to frustrate any national feeling and the ultimate creation of a Namibian State.

81. His delegation wished to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for the painstaking work he had been carrying out on behalf of the international community.

82. His delegation was not satisfied with some of the provisions of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1: while it respected the views of SWAPO, it did not understand why other organizations such as the National Convention had been ignored in operative paragraph 2. It also had grave doubts concerning operative paragraph 7, calling for an end to the contacts with South Africa. It should be remembered that the majority of the Namibian people had expressed the wish that the United Nations should continue to be present in the Territory. Those contacts enabled the international community to maintain pressure on the Government of South Africa. His delegation also had some doubts regarding operative paragraph 1, which reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle "by all means", and operative paragraph 18, which authorized the United Nations Council for Namibia to utilize the resources of the United Nations Fund for Namibia without consultation with the Secretary-General. For those reasons, his delegation could not support the draft resolution.

⁴ Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1973, document S/10921.

83. His delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055 despite its doubts about operative paragraph 6. It did not understand why, contrary to established practice, no role was given to the Secretary-General therein.

84. Subject to Parliamentary approval, his Government had decided to contribute 50,000 guilder to the Fund, for scholarships.

85. Mr. BOIVINEAU (France) said that the fact that his delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1 should not be interpreted as meaning that it approved of all the provisions. It had reservations on certain provisions, in particular those based on the conclusions in the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,⁵ which his Government had not endorsed. His delegation also regretted the lukewarm reference to the Secretary-General's efforts, which, although they had not produced the hoped-for results, had led the South African Government to make certain minor but undeniable concessions. His delegation would abstain, however, to show that it understood and shared the Africans' disappointment at the meagre results achieved. The unequivocal statements that had been expected on Namibia's right to self-determination and independence had still not been received. Moreover, his delegation opposed the Bantustanization policy, and the measures taken with regard to public freedom seemed totally inadequate. His delegation therefore urged the Government of South Africa to take the necessary action to overcome the difficulties.

86. His delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055 to show its concern for the lot of the Namibian people. Its contribution of \$100,000 to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa was clear proof of that concern. He recalled, however, the reservations his delegation had expressed, particularly those relating to texts for which it had not voted. Referring to operative paragraph 6, he said that if the guidelines to be proposed by the United Nations Council for Namibia were not consistent with his Government's views of how the United Nations Fund for Namibia should operate, it might have to revise its views on the Fund at the next session.

87. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia) said he merely wished to draw attention to the reservations which his delegation had already expressed about the continuation of contacts between the Secretary-General and the South African Government.

88. Miss BEGIN (Canada) said that her delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050. In its statement in the general debate (2051st meeting) her delegation had categorically rejected the concept of a society based on the denial of fundamental human rights, such as that in Namibia, and had condemned all attempts to import *apartheid* into Namibia. It had, however, stressed the need for continuing the mandate of the Secretary-General, pointing out that only thus could the international

⁵ Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.

community continue to put pressure on South Africa, and that the only alternative to contacts would be to go on adopting resolutions couched in increasingly strong terms, which would remain unimplemented and thus weaken the value of the United Nations. Her delegation could not, therefore, associate itself with operative paragraph 7, which stated that contacts between the Secretary-General and South Africa should be terminated as being detrimental to the interests of the Namibian people, for it considered such a decision to be contrary to the interests of the Namibian people. If the Committee were to take a separate vote on sections II and III of the draft resolution, her delegation would vote in favour of those two sections.

89. Her delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055, but it was surprised that the usual mention that the \$100,000 appropriation from the regular budget was a provisional measure had been omitted in operative paragraph 2. Her delegation would continue to consider that appropriation a temporary measure. In addition, her delegation was surprised that, while in operative paragraph 1 the sponsors expressed appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General on the operation of the United Nations Fund for Namibia (A/9225 and Corr.1), in operative paragraph 6 they disregarded one of the main recommendations in that report, namely, that the Fund should be administered jointly by the United Nations Council for Namibia and donor countries. The system adopted for the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa had proved one of the most effective. Her delegation feared that, by failing to take account of the Secretary-General's suggestion concerning the operation of the Fund, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055 might deprive the Fund of a number of substantial contributions.

90. Ms. WHITE (United States of America) said that draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1 contained several elements which her delegation could not support. Since it was the Security Council that had authorized the Secretary-General to initiate contacts with South Africa, the Council was the proper forum in which to discuss continuing the mandate. Her delegation joined in deploring recent South African actions in Namibia, but it felt that negotiation rather than force was a more realistic way of obtaining the withdrawal of South Africa. Consequently it would abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

91. Her delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055.

92. Mr. BOUAZZA (Morocco), referring to the comments made by a number of speakers concerning the use of force, said that, as the representative of Uganda had pointed out, the use of "all means" did not necessarily mean the use of force. Secondly, with regard to Chief Kapuuo's statement that SWAPO was not the sole representative of the people of Namibia (2053rd meeting), he pointed out that the Committee accepted only organizations recognized by the Organization of African Unity. Consequently it lay with that body to decide whether to grant Chief Kapuuo's request for recognition of his organization.

93. Mr. SIDIK (Indonesia) said that the United Nations Fund for Namibia might prove to be an important factor in

determining the ability or lack of ability of the United Nations Council for Namibia to implement actions relating to its primary task, namely the preparation of the Namibians for their future independence. The report of the Council (A/9024) gave an account *inter alia* of the participation of the Council in the work of the United Nations and the effort to secure wider participation of the Council in representing Namibia in the United Nations system. More Namibians should be involved in that endeavour from the earliest planning stages to actual participation in international conferences.

94. It was entirely proper that the Council should be named trustee of the Fund, since the experience of Council members could thus be utilized most effectively. At the same time it would be wise for the Council to invite suggestions from donor nations regarding the general guidelines for the orientation of the Fund.

95. His delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055.

At the request of the representative of Australia, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, 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 Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Portugal.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Malawi, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1 was adopted by 99 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Australia, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African

Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Portugal.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055 was adopted by 117 votes to 1.

96. Mr. WALTER (New Zealand) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1, notwithstanding its reservations about the wording of operative paragraph 1 and the substance of operative paragraph 2, which expressed a judgement that his delegation was not in a position to verify. His delegation was prepared to see operative paragraph 7 incorporated in the text, since the results of the Secretary-General's contacts so far had been disappointing and it respected the view of many delegations that the dialogue might have been detrimental to the interests of the people of Namibia. Nevertheless, his Government appreciated the Secretary-General's efforts and was interested in seeing the Security Council continue to explore all possible avenues for a peaceful transfer of power in Namibia.

97. Mr. NEKLESSA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation wished to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055.

98. It was a well known fact that the Soviet Union gave support and assistance, including material assistance, to the national liberation movements of the colonial peoples. The Soviet Union participated in the implementation of a number of United Nations programmes designed to assist the inhabitants of colonial Territories, for example those providing opportunities for education and vocational training for the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

99. As for the operation of funds for the provision of material assistance to the inhabitants of colonial Territories, for example the United Nations Fund for Namibia, his delegation was in favour of the principle of voluntary financing. Since paragraphs 3 and 4 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055 reflected and upheld that principle, his delegation had not opposed the adoption of the draft resolution as a whole.

100. Paragraph 2, however, provided for an allocation from the regular budget of the United Nations, and his

delegation could not agree with such a practice. It considered that the financing of that and similar funds out of the regular budget was illegal; such funds should be financed entirely by voluntary contributions, whether in cash or in kind.

101. Mr. ARTEAGA (Venezuela) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1, although it had reservations about the phrase "by all means" in operative paragraph 1. His delegation also reserved its position on operative paragraph 2, for, in its view, it could not be stated categorically that a specific party or group was the sole representative of the people of the Territory when the people themselves had had no opportunity to decide the question.

102. Miss DE VINCENZI (Brazil) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1 as a sign of its strong support for self-determination and independence for the Namibian people. It had some reservations, however, about operative paragraphs 2 and 18, for it was not for the Committee to decide which political group was the true representative of the people. Pending such time as Namibia attained independence, its people were being represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which had been directed to seek close contact with the people in discharging its mandate. Her delegation had already referred to the need for strengthening the Council's mandate. It would have preferred a more flexible language which would have left it to the Council to decide which representatives of the Namibian people should be associated with its work.

103. Mrs. PINT (Belgium) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055 but it had some reservations regarding operative paragraph 6, which appointed the United Nations Council for Namibia as trustee of the Fund and authorized it to prepare guidelines in consultation with the Secretary-General. Her delegation would have preferred the appointment of an advisory committee consisting of a number of Member States, as had been done in the case of the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa. It did not wish to prejudice those guidelines, however, and would place its trust in the Council, hoping that it would be able to support the Council's proposals the following year.

104. Mr. YOKOTA (Japan) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1, that should not be construed as endorsement of all the provisions or all the wording of the draft resolution. His delegation had difficulties with part of the tenth preambular paragraph and with operative paragraphs 1, 2, 12 and 14 and would reserve its position on those points. With regard to operative paragraph 7, it had already stated its views on the matter and, although it understood the frustration of delegations that wished the contacts to be terminated, it felt that the conclusion that such contacts were detrimental to the interests of the people of Namibia was premature. Nevertheless, there did not seem to be sufficient support in the international community to ask the Secretary-General to continue the contacts. Finally, his delegation wished to place on record its deep appreciation of the Secretary-General's efforts in the matter and the hope that he would play an ever greater role in the peaceful settlement of the problem.

105. Miss KYTÖMAA (Finland) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055 because it welcomed the appeal to the Secretary-General in operative paragraph 5 to begin the implementation of the long-term measures and studies outlined in his report to the Assembly at its twenty-sixth session.⁶ A thorough investigation of the human and natural resources of Namibia must be the basis for any serious future undertaking by the United Nations in that regard. Her delegation supported the idea in operative paragraph 6 that the guidelines for the orientation of the United Nations Fund for Namibia should be prepared by the Council in consultation with the Secretary-General and the invitation to Member States in operative paragraph 7 to formulate their views on the subject. Finland had not sponsored the draft resolution because it considered that it did not pay enough attention to the idea of collective responsibility and co-operation of all Member States. It had some doubts concerning the provision that the United Nations Council for Namibia should be appointed trustee, since the membership of the Council was based on limited geographical and political representation. Moreover, it failed to see the advantages of transferring the daily operation of the United Nations Fund for Namibia from the Secretary-General to an 18-member body.

106. Mr. ZADOTTI (Italy) said that his delegation had had some difficulties with the term "by all means" in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1 because that phrase might be taken to imply something that was contrary to the spirit and letter by which the United Nations was ruled. With regard to operative paragraph 2, his delegation was not convinced that the Committee could determine that SWAPO was the authentic representative of the people of Namibia, since the people themselves had not been able to designate an authentic representative in free elections. His delegation did not agree with the conclusion in operative paragraph 7 that the contacts with South Africa had been detrimental to the people of Namibia. Moreover, no alternative to those contacts was being proposed. Part of the task assigned to the United Nations Council for Namibia would be very difficult to carry out in view of the Council's situation and that of the Territory, and those factors had not been taken into account. Consequently, his delegation had had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1.

107. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1055 because it was a praiseworthy initiative, but it had reservations concerning the recommendations on the operation of the Fund, for there were no indications of the precise criteria for its operation. His delegation would reserve its position until the guidelines for the orientation of the Fund were ready.

108. Mr. THUNE ANDERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Norway, Finland and Sweden in addition to his own, said that they had always supported constructive efforts consistent with the United Nations Charter to bring pressure to bear on South Africa and to bring about self-determination for Namibia. They had some reservations on operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution

A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1, since the matter referred to therein was before the Security Council. For that and other reasons the Nordic countries had been forced to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

109. Mr. MacKERNAN (Ireland) said that Ireland supported the United Nations in its efforts vis-à-vis the South African régime. Consequently, although it would have liked to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1, it had had to abstain in view of its reservations regarding section I and in particular operative paragraph 7. It was not appropriate for the Committee to recommend that the dialogue should be terminated, or to say that it had been detrimental to the people of Namibia.

110. Mr. PAQUI (Dahomey) said that some positive factors had emerged in the discussion, particularly the unreserved condemnation of Bantustanization by some delegations. It was unfortunate that the delegation to whom the appeals were addressed was not present. South Africa's traditional friends should view that absence as an insult to them and to the Committee and he hoped that, as a result, they would reconsider their position in the plenary meeting.

111. Mr. KATSAREAS (Greece) said that his delegation had certain reservations regarding draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1. First, it could not agree to the words "by all means" in operative paragraph 1. Secondly, it understood that there were bodies other than SWAPO which represented the Namibian people and it hoped that operative paragraph 2 would not infringe the competence of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Thirdly, it could not support the wording of operative paragraph 3 or the termination of the contacts with the South African Government. It saw no point in creating an atmosphere of polarization when the alternatives to contacts had not been sufficiently studied. Finally, for reasons it had already explained, it opposed the involvement of the specialized agencies in the matter. Since it agreed with the main provisions, however, it had voted in favour of both draft resolutions (A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1 and A/C.4/L.1055).

112. Mr. KEITA (Guinea) said that both the substance and form of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1050 and Corr.1 had satisfied his delegation and that it particularly supported operative paragraphs 1 and 7, which respectively reaffirmed the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence and urged termination of the contacts between the Secretary-General and South Africa. His delegation would have become a sponsor of the draft resolution had it been consulted.

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE

113. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would assume that the Committee wished to authorize the Rapporteur, in accordance with established practice, to submit the Committee's report on item 70 direct to the General Assembly.

*It was so decided.*⁷

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

⁶ Document A/8473.

⁷ The report was submitted to the General Assembly as document A/9419.