United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION
Official Records

93rd PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 10 December 1981, at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

President: Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Kamil (Indonesia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 102

Financial emergency of the United Nations:
(*a*) Report of the Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations;
(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE
(A/36/772)

AGENDA ITEMS 105, 8(*b*) AND 12

Pattern of conferences:
(*a*) Report of the Committee on Conferences;
(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General
Adoption of the agenda and organization of work (*concluded*):*

* Resumed from the 46th meeting.

(*b*) Subsidiary organs of the General Assembly
Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)**

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE
(A/36/787)

AGENDA ITEM 109

United Nations pension system:
(*a*) Report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board;
(*b*) Report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE
(A/36/773)

1. Mr. MARTORELL (Peru), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the reports of the Fifth Committee on agenda items 102, 105, 8(*b*), 12 and 109.

2. The first of these reports is contained in document A/36/772 on agenda item 102. In paragraph 8 of the report, the Fifth Committee recommends two draft resolutions for adoption by the General Assembly.

3. The second report that the Fifth Committee is submitting to the General Assembly deals with agenda items 105, 8(*b*) and 12, and is contained in document A/36/787. The recommendations of the Fifth Committee appear in paragraphs 13 and 14 of the report. Finally, the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 109 is contained in document A/36/773. The recommendation is in paragraph 26.

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

4. The PRESIDENT: Statements will be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Fifth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records. May I remind Members that, under decision 34/401, the General Assembly agreed that when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in the General Assembly, unless that delegation's vote in the Assembly is different from its vote in the Committee. May I also remind Members that, in accordance with the same decision, explanations of vote should not exceed 10 minutes and should be made by representatives from their seats.

5. We shall consider first the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 102.

** Resumed from the 84th meeting.

6. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolutions recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report [*A/36/772*]. We begin with draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 115 votes to 13 (resolution 36/116 A).[1]

7. Mr. GOH (Singapore): My delegation did not intend to participate in the vote on draft resolution A.

8. Mr. JOHNSON (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation did not intend to participate in the vote on draft resolution A.

9. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Poland, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Australia, Congo, Dominican Republic, Portugal, Romania.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 103 votes to 23, with 5 abstentions (resolution 36/116 B).[2]

10. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda items 105, 8(*b*) and 12 [*A/36/787*].

11. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolutions and the draft decision recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraphs 13 and 14 of that report.

12. Draft resolution A, entitled "Future work of the Committee on Conferences", was adopted by the Fifth Committee by consensus. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution A?

Draft resolution A was adopted (resolution 36/117 A).

13. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution B, entitled "Simultaneous distribution of documents in the different languages of the United Nations", was adopted by the Committee by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution B?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 36/117 B).

14. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution C is entitled "Control and limitation of documentation for treaty bodies". May I consider that the General Assembly adopts draft resolution C?

Draft resolution C was adopted (resolution 36/117 C).

15. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution D is entitled "Control and limitation of documentation for special conferences". May I take it that the General Assembly adopts draft resolution D?

Draft resolution D was adopted (resolution 36/117 D).

16. The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 14 of its report, the Fifth Committee recommends the adoption of a draft decision which it adopted by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 36/427).

17. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the recommendation in paragraph 26 of the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 109 [*A/36/773*]. Draft resolutions I A, I B and I C refer to the report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board. The Fifth Committee adopted draft resolution I A without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts draft resolution I A?

Draft resolution I A was adopted (resolution 36/118 A).

18. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution I B was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I B was adopted (resolution 36/118 B).

19. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution I C was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I C was adopted (resolution 36/118 C).

20. The PRESIDENT: We shall now take decisions on the draft resolutions concerning investments of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund. The Fifth Committee adopted draft resolution II A without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II A was adopted (resolution 36/119 A).

21. The PRESIDENT: The Fifth Committee also adopted draft resolution II B without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II B was adopted (resolution 36/119 B).

22. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II C was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II C was adopted (resolution 36/119 C).

AGENDA ITEM 31

Question of Palestine: report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (*concluded*)*

23. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Senegal to introduce all the draft resolutions pertaining to this agenda item.

24. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour, on behalf of the sponsors and the members of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, to submit to the Assembly draft resolutions A/36/L.31/Rev.1, L.32, L.33/Rev.1, L.50/Rev.1, L.51 and L.52/Rev.1, which have been drawn up on the basis of previous resolutions, taking fully into consideration the events that have taken place this year in the region concerned. In drawing up these texts the sponsors also took into consideration the opinions expressed by delegations at this present session on this item.

25. Draft resolution A/36/L.31/Rev.1 reaffirms the recommendations made by the Committee in its report [*A/36/35, paras. 49-53 and annex I*] and endorsed several times by the General Assembly, including in resolution 31/20. It requests the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine and other relevant United Nations bodies to co-operate fully with the Committee and authorizes the Committee to continue its work and to make proposals to the General Assembly or the Security Council, as appropriate.

26. Draft resolution A/36/L.32 deals with the organization of the work of the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat and the dissemination of documents produced by it. It recalls the need to restructure that body in accordance with paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 34/65 D. The political importance of the Unit is the basis for this new dimension.

27. Draft resolution A/36/L.33/Rev.1 suggests that an international conference be convened under United Nations auspices on the question of Palestine. Representatives will recall that the United Nations has organized conferences on *apartheid* and on Kampuchea. The sponsors consider that a conference of this kind could make a great contribution towards the understanding of the problem of Palestine; therefore, it could help to formulate proposals for a just and comprehensive solution of this question. The success of a conference of this kind depends on careful preparation, which is why the sponsors have proposed a period of four years for such preparation.

28. Draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 is the key text submitted for the Assembly's approval. It reaffirms the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, in particular its right to establish its own independent sovereign State in Palestine; Israel's withdrawal from all the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since June 1967; Israel's obligation to comply with all resolutions of the United Nations relating to the Holy City of Jerusalem; and lastly the participation of the Palestinian people in any process concerning its future.

29. The draft resolution also requests the Security Council to convene in order to adopt measures for implementing the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which the General Assembly endorsed in its resolution 31/20 of 24 November 1976.

30. Draft resolution A/36/L.51 relates to the Holy City of Jerusalem. It considers null and void all legislative and administrative measures taken by Israel to alter the juridical and historical character of that city. In drafting this text, the sponsors based themselves on the relevant United Nations resolutions on Jerusalem.

31. Draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1 relates to the provisions of any agreement or treaty prejudicial to the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people as defined and adopted by the United Nations. Furthermore, it states that no State has the right to commit or determine the future of the Palestinian people without the participation and consent of that people.

32. As can be seen, this draft resolution does not deny any State the sovereign right to negotiate or conclude agreements. It is more a question of reaffirming the sovereign right of any people to participate fully in deciding its future.

33. All these draft resolutions that I have the honour of submitting to the General Assembly for its adoption are in keeping with the spirit of the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the Organization on the question of Palestine. Their objective is to restore, by peaceful means, peace and stability in the region. That is why the sponsors consider that their adoption and scrupulous implementation could constitute an important and decisive stage in the quest for a just, comprehensive and lasting solution to the question of Palestine.

*Resumed from the 85th meeting.

34. The PRESIDENT: A number of delegations have asked to be allowed to explain their vote before the vote, and I shall now call on them.

35. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The question of Palestine is one of the central problems of the Middle East crisis which, in turn, has become the question before the United Nations which most urgently requires solution. This is the doctrine which Spain for two decades has been presenting to the Assembly in a clear and consistent manner, and which time has now confirmed.

36. Not a single statement made in this forum by successive Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Spain has failed to mention this fact. I shall merely refer to the statement made at the 12th meeting of this session, in which it was said that "peace cannot be envisaged as long as the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people are not recognized".

37. With that idea in mind, my country maintains that a political negotiating machinery must be set up in which all the interested parties would necessarily be represented—including, therefore, the Palestinian people, whose legitimate representation has been recognized as being the Palestine Liberation Organization [*PLO*]—and which must take into account the right of all States in the region to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

38. This year the question of Palestine includes—in addition to questions discussed in the Special Political Committee, in which my delegation took an active part—six draft resolutions, most of which bring up to date draft resolutions considered at previous sessions of the General Assembly.

39. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/36/L.31/Rev.1, L.32, L.33/Rev.1, L.50/Rev.1 and L.51, since they deal with different aspects of the Palestinian drama, such as the work of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the principles which should guide the establishment of peace in the region and the status of Jerusalem.

40. With reference to draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1, I wish to enter a reservation in respect of operative paragraph 9. In my statement at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly I indicated that our participation in the Security Council beginning on 1 January 1981 prevented us from prejudging what that body might decide about references to the question in the texts of that session. Since almost a year has passed since Spain began to take part in the highest political body of the Organization, I would recall the interest with which my delegation has considered all questions which have come before it—in particular Israel's attack on the Iraqi nuclear research installations, an act which the Spanish Government strongly condemned. However, Spain's presence in the Security Council continues to prevent us from prejudging our country's position in that body.

41. My delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1 because, although it considers that it refers to the rights of the Palestinian people only and does not in any way affect agreements which other parties in the area might have concluded, it includes a questionable element that we would not like to see reflected in the United Nations.

42. Lastly, I wish to reiterate that the delegation of Spain, in voting in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.33/Rev.1, which calls for the convening of an International Conference on the Question of Palestine not later than 1984, earnestly hopes that this difficult question will thus find a definitive path towards a solution.

43. The PRESIDENT: I should like to remind members that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and that we shall observe that limitation.

44. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): The question of Palestine continues to be the central source of tension in the Middle East and to threaten world peace and security. Recent developments and the debate on agenda item 31 have revealed two significant facts. First, despite the notable historic accords that could have accelerated the process of peaceful settlement, obstacles continue to be placed in the way of progress towards the attainment of national sovereignty and independence by the long-suffering Palestinian people. Secondly, the major part of the international community is more united than ever in pressing for the immediate and full exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights, including their right to self-determination. It is a regrettable fact that Israel still defies world public opinion and continues to occupy the Arab territories, thereby forcing countless numbers of the Palestinian people—indeed, a whole nation—to remain homeless. Israel's unilateral acts pertaining to the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the relevant United Nations resolutions, have further undermined the prospects for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

45. It is Thailand's position not to recognize Israel's annexation of Jerusalem or that city's becoming Israel's capital. It also considers any change in the demographic status of the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, to be contrary to United Nations resolutions and not in conformity with international law.

46. Thailand's position on the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East has been repeatedly stated and is on record. In a world of interdependence, the explosive situation in the Middle East, aggravated by Israel's attacks on civilian targets in Lebanon and on the nuclear installations in Iraq, threatens the safety and well-being of the rest of the world.

47. The legitimate rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination without external interference, including their right to national independence and sovereignty and their right to return to their homes and recover their property, must be respected. In our view, to enhance the prospects for peace in the Middle East, the PLO, which the General Assembly has recognized as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, must be allowed to participate in the entire peace process.

48. At the same time, the legitimate rights of all States peacefully to exist within secure and recognized borders must also be recognized.

49. Because of Israel's continued presence in the Arab territories occupied since the 1967 war, and in view of the fact that the Palestinians continue to be deprived of their legitimate rights, the international community must redouble its efforts to assure those rights.

50. In the foregoing spirit, therefore, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/36/L.31/Rev.1, L.32,

L.33/Rev.1, L.50/Rev.1 and L.51. With regard to draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1, if operative paragraph 1 is put to a separate vote my delegation will abstain. Otherwise, it will vote in favour of that draft resolution as a whole.

51. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): It is New Zealand's view that central to any solution of the question of Palestine is recognition of the aspirations and rights of the Palestinian people, which include the right to self-determination and the right to set up a separate State, if that is their wish. The question of Palestine is not simply a refugee problem. It is a political problem for which a political solution must be sought. In our opinion, the search for a solution must involve the participation of the Palestinian people, including the PLO, along with all the other parties directly concerned. It is equally the case that the search for a just and comprehensive solution in the Middle East must be based on the implementation of the principles set out in Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

52. New Zealand will abstain in the voting on several of the draft resolutions before us because their provisions do not adequately reflect the balance of principles embodied in resolution 242 (1967), which my delegation holds to be as valid today as when it was agreed to in 1967. I want to refer specifically to the reservations New Zealand has with regard to operative paragraphs 5 and 9 of draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1. Any consideration of the situation must take account of both the principle which provides for Israel's withdrawal from the territories occupied in 1967 and the principle which calls for a termination of all states of belligerency and respect for the right of every State in the area, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

53. Mr. GÓMEZ de la TORRE (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Ecuador, as in previous years, will support with its vote those draft resolutions that, in accordance with the principles guiding its international policy, reject the acquisition of territory by force and defend the right of peoples to self-determination and to decide their own future through free and democratic systems.

54. We have therefore supported all action recognizing the inalienable and legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to national independence and sovereignty, as well as the right of Israel to an existence recognized by all States. At the same time, we have advocated steps aimed at achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

55. We should like to point out that the delegation of Ecuador, together with others from Latin America, supported Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which represented an important step towards a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. That resolution prescribed the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the territories in dispute, the elimination of all states of belligerency and recognition of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States in the area, as well as their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats and acts of force.

56. Ecuador will again support those draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly for its consideration and would only say in reference to draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1 that all United Nations action should be aimed at promoting peace and not at fomenting tensions or criticizing and denying the validity of any step that could lead to a settlement of conflicts or an approach to understanding between countries.

57. Ecuador rejects international settlements if they are imposed by force and maintained through occupation by foreign troops and are not backed by public opinion in the countries directly concerned. This is not the case of agreements freely contracted by sovereign States which have the support of their peoples and which have resulted in the return of territories previously occupied. Our country for a century and a half of international existence has maintained that military victory does not establish rights. We therefore reaffirm our position of principle with respect to every one of the situations before the United Nations which could be resolved through the withdrawal of foreign occupation troops and by granting to the people under occupation the right to decide its own future by itself, free from the tutelage of neo-colonialism, military occupation or the imposition of an ideology from outside.

58. In order not to affect the process of the return of territories envisaged in some international agreements, my country does not believe that it is timely to give an opinion in international forums on commitments to which Governments and peoples of sovereign countries have agreed with regard to their own destiny. It will therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1.

59. Because of those same principles we have supported and voted in favour of proposals made in the Assembly regarding the return of occupied territories, including Jerusalem, the Holy City very important for countries of the Christian faith as well as other monotheistic religions, Islam and Judaism. To act in those areas by exclusion would be unwise and would give rise to conflict, as has happened throughout centuries in history. Only tolerance and the resolution of disputes through joint measures should inspire the positions of the United Nations. Ever since the historic General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, we have maintained the need to care for the Holy Places in Jerusalem and to guarantee free access to them under the protection of the United Nations. The "Basic Law" adopted by Israel, as well as its settlements in territories occupied by force, do not contribute to an overall, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. On the basis of that analysis, Ecuador transferred its diplomatic representation from Jerusalem to Tel Aviv in July of 1980, a few weeks before the Security Council adopted resolution 478 (1980), in accordance with the principle continuously followed by my country of the non-recognition of the acquisition of territory by force, since any forcible occupation is a denial of international law and contrary to the concepts of the peaceful settlement of disputes.

60. Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of Iraq will vote in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1, but we should like to explain that the reference to General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 does not prevent the Palestinian people in any way from achieving their inalienable right to determine their own fate, to liberate their homeland and to establish their own independent State.

61. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The Assembly has before it six draft resolutions on the present item. Taken together they are purposely calculated by their sponsors to impede the peaceful solution of the Arab-Israel conflict, particularly the question of the Palestinian Arabs, one of the interrelated aspects of the conflict. They all engage in undisguised political warfare against a State Member of the

Organization. As such, they are detrimental to the cause of peace, and consequently they are also detrimental to the cause of the United Nations. They should therefore be rejected.

62. Five of those draft resolutions are based on, and take further, the biased, one-sided and obstructive language used in resolutions on this item adopted by the Assembly in previous years. The sixth of the draft resolutions is a new creation, though scarcely innovative.

63. Draft resolution A/36/L.31/Rev.1 extends once again the life of a committee whose establishment was illegitimate in the first place and the perniciousness of whose mandate became clear five years ago when the Committee's illicit recommendations were first submitted. Since that time the Committee has proved itself to be an utterly biased and irresponsible body at the complete disposal of those implacably opposed to peace in the Middle East. Yet the Assembly is being asked once again to squander more of the United Nations limited resources on it, at a time when the Organization is in such dire financial straits that it cannot find even smaller sums of money to fund constructive projects.

64. On the basis of past performance, members of the Committee will engage in numerous travel junkets, mainly at the expense of taxpayers in those countries which contribute the bulk of the United Nations budget and which have consistently voted against the activities of the Committee as a waste of money. It would seem that it is the inalienable right of members of the Committee to be rewarded with inalienable travel facilities, on the most dubious of pretexts.

65. Draft resolution A/36/L.32 renews the mandate of the "Palestine Unit" in the United Nations Secretariat, a unit which does not give a fig for the Secretariat's integrity and which works under what in the draft itself is euphemistically called the "guidance" of the "Palestine Committee". As I have just explained, this for all practical purposes means under the "close guidance" of the PLO. But the draft does not content itself with just renewing the Unit's mandate. It calls for the expansion of the Unit and the expansion of its programme. *Inter alia*, it calls for the translation of its dubious and highly propagandistic publications into languages other than those officially used in this Organization, for the production of yet another United Nations film on the question of the Palestinian Arabs and for the reproduction of the very tendentious exhibition in this building together with other visual material for general use.

66. All those proposals, especially in view of the open-ended way they are formulated, will lead once again to the gross misuse of the limited resources of the United Nations. According to the report of the Fifth Committee [*A/36/794*], the additional appropriation alone under those new draft resolutions will amount to almost $3 million. The main contributors, one can say with confidence, never intended their contributions to be abused in this way.

67. Draft resolution A/36/L.33/Rev.1 is the newcomer to the pack. It resurrects the old idea of holding an international conference on the question before us. Since the Palestine Committee has already convened a phoney emergency special session of the General Assembly on that question, it is not left with many alternatives. The particular route suggested in this draft resolution is for parliamentary reasons, well understood to everyone here, not likely to advance the cause of peace, but then that is hardly its purpose. It is, by the way, no mere coincidence that the proposed international conference has been projected for the George Orwellian year of 1984, since it will sit well with the sponsors' approach of double-talk, double-think and double standards. If held, the conference will thus be a fitting tribute to the memory of George Orwell. It will involve also the squandering of another $700,000, as indicated in the Fifth Committee's report.

68. Document A/36/L.50/Rev.1 is a kind of omnibus draft resolution. Characteristic of so many of the illogical things which happen in the Assembly, it recalls and reaffirms early General Assembly resolutions, such as resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, which the Arab States at the time rejected out of hand and then destroyed by force of arms. It also recalls General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, which the Arabs also rejected at the time and which, as a result of their declarations and actions, they have long been precluded from relying upon.

69. More than that, this draft resolution, in another way also characteristic of what goes on so often in the Assembly, attempts in lieu of any negotiations on the subject to dictate a partisan and impractical approach to the Arab-Israel conflict, arbitrarily positing a "right" of the Palestinian Arabs to establish an "independent, sovereign State", that is, a second Palestinian State for the Palestinian Arabs, in addition to the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan.

70. To achieve that end the draft resolution reintroduces the recommendations of that Committee, which, as is also well known, were consciously designed to bypass Security Council resolution 242 (1967), the only agreed basis for a negotiated settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict. When those recommendations were first formulated in 1976 they were greeted with widespread and well-deserved criticism by countries genuinely interested in peace in the Middle East, for they understood very well that the recommendations were tantamount to the PLO programme for the dismantlement of Israel in stages, merely translated into the legalistic jargon of the United Nations.

71. The sponsors of this draft resolution know that any tampering with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) or any attempt to bypass it can only serve to undermine the current peace process in the Middle East, which is based on it. It is precisely that subversive end which they have in mind.

72. Draft resolution A/36/L.51 concerns Jerusalem and goes as far as to make the grotesque assertion that Israel's measures there are a threat to international peace and security.

73. For my part, I can only repeat what I said at the 81st meeting of this session: "United Jerusalem is and will remain the eternal capital of Israel and of the Jewish people". Any assault of Jerusalem, political or otherwise, is tantamount to an assault on Israel as a whole. That is the real threat to international peace and security.

74. Draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1 rejects out of hand the Camp David framework accord for peace in the Middle East. By clear innuendo it also rejects the Israel-Egypt peace treaty signed in March 1979.

75. In so doing this draft resolution is yet another attempt to hamper the progress of the only constructive, practical and ongoing peace process which has emerged with regard to the Arab-Israel conflict for over three decades. In so doing, this draft resolution conspires to turn the United Nations against its very raison d'être—the prevention of war and the promotion of peace. In brief, this draft resolution, like its companion ones, violates the Charter of the United Nations and all it stands for.

76. The fact is that the sponsors of these draft resolutions cannot bring themselves to accept that two States Members of the United Nations which were at war with one another have signed a negotiated peace treaty and have also undertaken to work towards a comprehensive solution to the Arab-Israel conflict. By any yardstick this is surely not only a legitimate but also a desirable position for two States to take. No third party or parties—and certainly not this Assembly—have the legal or moral authority to question, let alone deny, the validity of the accords attained and of any bilateral treaties deriving from them. Indeed, if the Organization were less topsy-turvy than it is, it would have welcomed the accords and the peace treaty.

77. It goes without saying that all these draft resolutions deliberately ignore the inalienable rights of the State of Israel and of its people. Hence, in this way as well, they violate the Charter of the United Nations and are thus devoid of any validity.

78. We would request all fair-minded States to see these draft resolutions for what they are and to dissociate themselves from them.

79. Mr. RIERA DÍAZ (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The position of Panama on the question of the Middle East is well known, since we have taken part in all the debates of the Assembly on that issue: recognition and defence of the right of Israel to exist as a State within internationally recognized boundaries, but at the same time, and essentially, recognition and defence of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment of a sovereign State in its age-old homeland.

80. Therefore, the delegation of Panama will, in accordance with these principles, vote in favour of draft resolutions A/36/L.31/Rev.1, L.32, L.33/Rev.1, L.50/Rev.1, L.51 and L.52/Rev.1, even though we have reservations concerning the language and meaning of some parts of the texts, which could have been improved in letter and spirit.

81. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I have no intention of repeating the substantive debate on the question of Palestine, which has been exhaustively discussed. The Israeli statement is at best redundant and at worst a defiance of the consensus of the community of nations.

82. If the Israeli representative sheds crocodile tears about the small funds that are being earmarked to explain and promote Palestinian redemption by the Committee on the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Special Unit on Palestine, I would suggest that the United Nations should seek and obtain the money for that funding from the tens of billions of dollars which Israel has plundered from the Palestinian people in their own homeland, where they owned 95 per cent of the total land and properties of Palestine; that it should ask and get it from the aggressor, Israel, which has plundered those properties.

83. The representative of Israel has referred to Jordan as the Palestinian State of Jordan. I should like to remind him that Jordan was an independent State long before Israel was ever created and that Palestine—

84. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

85. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, we are at the stage of explanations of vote. This is not supposed to be the time to exercise the right of reply. I should be grateful if you would instruct the Permanent Representative of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan accordingly.

86. The PRESIDENT: Thank you. Will the representative of Jordan continue?

87. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I would request the President to ask the Israeli representative to call Jordan by its official name recognized by the United Nations since its admission in 1955. The name of Jordan is the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, and that was its name before the partition of Palestine and before there was an Israel. He is out of order in talking about Jordan as the Palestinian State of Jordan. And let me also remind him that the independence of Palestine was recognized by the League of Nations, the United Nations and the British Mandatory Government. Israel itself, before the General Assembly, made a pledge that it would abide by the Assembly resolution of 29 November 1947 as a condition for its admission to the United Nations, because Palestine was regarded as a Trust Territory, and therefore the recommendations of the General Assembly were binding. I am quoting what Israel itself said. I believe that a self-confessed aggressor is really not deserving of a substantive answer.

88. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt): The delegation of Egypt wishes to put on record its agreement with, and approval of, most of the draft resolutions submitted under the item "Question of Palestine". We hope that their adoption will contribute positively to the achievement of a just solution to the Palestinian problem.

89. However, we wish to explain our votes on two of them—A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and L.52/Rev.1.

90. As far as draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 is concerned, I shall confine myself to operative paragraph 9, which would endorse "the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People contained in paragraphs 49 to 53 of its report". My delegation cannot agree with certain insinuations contained in paragraph 52 of those recommendations and, therefore, cannot endorse them. If a separate vote is taken on operative paragraph 9, the delegation of Egypt will abstain; if not, then we shall abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. However, our abstention in the voting on operative paragraph 9, or our eventual abstention on draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 as a whole, should not in any way be construed as rejecting or refusing the other elements in this draft resolution, namely, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people or the centrality of the Palestinian problem to the situation in the Middle East; or as changing our opposition to all policies aimed at the resettlement of the Palestinians outside their homeland, or our position on the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Palestinian territories occupied

since 1967, including East Jerusalem, or our position on the situation in Jerusalem itself.

91. With regard to draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1, we believe that certain difficulties continue, despite the fact that the revised version is a much better formulation and text than the original draft resolution. The difficulties are the following: the reference contained in the first preambular paragraph to certain resolutions adopted by the narrowest majority ever in the history of resolutions on the Middle East. I refer mainly to the resolution adopted at the thirty-fourth session. The delegation of Egypt was among those delegations—approximately 50—that voted against some of its paragraphs. The second difficulty is the restrictions which the draft resolution tends to imply on the right, even the duty, of all States, especially the countries concerned, to work towards the achievement of a just solution to the Palestinian problem and the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Thirdly, we categorically reject the notions of nullity and invalidation of certain international agreements being inserted simplistically and prejudicially in General Assembly resolutions. We shall therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1.

92. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to the voting. We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/36/L.31/Rev.1 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Samoa, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 121 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions (resolution 36/120 A).[3]

93. The PRESIDENT: Next, I shall put to the vote draft resolution A/36/L.32 and Add.1. The administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [*A/36/794*]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 119 votes to 3, with 22 abstentions (resolution 36/120 B).[4]

94. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the Assembly draft resolution A/36/L.33/Rev.1 and Add.1. The administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution are to be found in the report of the Fifth Committee. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico,

Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Canada, Israel, Norway, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 122 votes to 4, with 20 abstentions (resolution 36/120 C).[4]

95. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and Add.1. A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 9 of that draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Burma, Central African Republic, Chile, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Zaire.

Operative paragraph 9 was adopted by 96 votes to 16, with 26 abstentions.[5]

96. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and Add.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Burma, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Nepal, New Zealand, Paraguay, Portugal, Sweden.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 111 votes to 13, with 20 abstentions (resolution 36/120 D).[4]

97. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/36/L.51 and Add.1. A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome

and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 113 votes to 2, with 26 abstentions.[6]

98. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/36/L.51 and Add.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Jamaica.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 139 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions (resolution 36/120 E).[4]

99. The PRESIDENT: Lastly, I shall put to the vote draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Mexico, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

The draft resolution was adopted by 88 votes to 21, with 36 abstentions (resolution 36/120 F).[4]

100. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

101. Mr. ADAM (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and Add.1. That vote does not represent a change in my country's position towards General Assembly resolution 181 (II).

102. Mr. BARBOSA de MEDINA (Portugal): The Portuguese delegation has supported draft resolution A/36/L.31/Rev.1 and Add.1 while having reservations on some of its provisions. Our support of this draft resolution and of draft resolution A/36/L./32 and Add.1 and others does not imply a change in position in relation to the resolutions mentioned in their preambles.

103. We regret having had to abstain on draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and Add.1 owing to reservations in relation to some of the operative paragraphs, especially operative paragraph 9.

104. While supporting draft resolution A/36/L.51 and Add.1, the Portuguese delegation wishes to state its reservations to operative paragraph 2, whose findings, in its

opinion, are within the competence of the Security Council.

105. Mr. TORRES (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Regarding the draft resolutions that have just been adopted, the delegation of Chile believes it relevant to restate its position on the question of Palestine.

106. In our view, the essential element in this area is that the solution of the crisis in the Middle East and of the question of Palestine must necessarily be based on the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of the Organization, in particular those of the Security Council. This, therefore, requires the withdrawal of Israel from all the territories occupied since 1967, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, as well as respect for the right of all States in the region, naturally including the State of Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. The Palestinian people, furthermore, has a legitimate right to self-determination and national independence.

107. Guided by these principles, we have voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and Add.1. Nevertheless, we wish to reiterate that we reject those provisions under which the General Assembly exceeds the powers conferred upon it by the Charter, such as is the case in operative paragraph 10 of this draft resolution, which, had it been put to a separate vote, we would have voted against.

108. Moreover, with regard to draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1 and Add.1, we wish to restate a position of principle, namely, that abstention is due to the fact that we do not recognize the General Assembly's competence to question the validity of agreements or treaties entered into under international law. Furthermore, we have pointed out on various occasions that we will support all peace initiatives that may be based on the use of peaceful settlement procedures envisaged in the Charter.

109. With regard to resolution 31/20, as well as operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and Add.1, we wish to reiterate that, even though we support the appeal to bring the PLO into the negotiations on the future of the Palestinian people, we believe that the Assembly should not grant to that organization exclusive representation until the Palestinian people freely exercise its right to self-determination.

110. Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom): I speak on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community concerning draft resolution A/36/L.33/Rev.1 and Add.1.

111. The 10 member States have no objection of principle to the holding of international conferences, but they believe that the convening of an international conference on the question of Palestine will be worthwhile only if it is likely to assist progress towards a just, lasting and comprehensive peace settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute. The members of the European Community have reservations about the basis proposed in the draft resolution for this particular conference and also about the proposed handling of its preparation by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

112. The members of the European Community voted for draft resolution A/36/L.51 and Add.1 as a whole, as they did for the corresponding resolution last year. However, they have reservations about the reference in operative paragraph 2 to a threat to international peace and security. They also recall their abstention earlier this session on resolution 36/15, to which reference is made in the first preambular paragraph.

113. Mr. PELÁEZ (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and Add.1 in reaffirmation of the support that Peru has always given to the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. We wish, however, to enter reservations concerning the present text of operative paragraph 9 of that draft resolution.

114. My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1 and Add.1, as it did last year when resolution 35/169 B was adopted, because it considers that once again the draft prejudges and limits the sovereign right of States to enter into treaties and to direct their actions to the search for peaceful solutions of the question of Palestine. Without wishing in any way to lessen the unrestricted support that my country gives to the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, my delegation believes that any attempt on the part of States or parties to the conflict to initiate a dialogue or negotiations in this connection should receive our backing. That is why my delegation, inspired by this constructive spirit, voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.33/Rev.1 and Add.1, in which the General Assembly decides to convene, under the auspices of the Organization, an international conference on the question of Palestine.

115. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): The United States has voted against all six of these draft resolutions. In our view, all of them are unbalanced, unfair and biased and none of them contributes to bringing the achievement of legitimate Palestinian rights any closer to practical reality.

116. We have opposed the call for continuation of the activities of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights contained in draft resolutions A/36/L.31/Rev.1 and Add.1 and A/36/L.32 and Add.1, as we have in the past. These highly partisan political bodies and their agenda, including, as we have recently seen, the propaganda activities associated with the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, seriously undermine the dignity, objectivity and moral authority of the United Nations.

117. We also opposed draft resolution A/36/L.33/Rev.1 and Add.1, which calls for an international conference on the question of Palestine. The history of conferences on problems of the Middle East has taught us repeatedly that, in the absence of agreement on basic issues arrived at in advance among all interested States, including the Arab States, such conferences are doomed to failure. To hold such a conference for propaganda reasons alone, without any constructive intent, is mischievous, to say the least. We therefore do not regard this proposal for a conference as a serious or realistic initiative.

118. My delegation voted against draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and Add.1 because it calls for a Palestinian State and for the withdrawal of Israel unconditionally from the territories occupied in 1967. This draft resolution contains no reference to Israel's right to recognition by its neighbours and to live in peace, as called for in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), or to the need for negotiating a settlement of the Palestinian question. It is a one-sided, partisan approach. It works against a settle-

ment in the region that can be based only on justice and equity for both the Palestinians and Israel.

119. With respect to draft resolution A/36/L.51 and Add.1, I wish to affirm that the United States continues to believe that the unilateral actions concerning Jerusalem taken since the 1967 war cannot prejudge the ultimate status of the city, which can be resolved only through negotiations among the parties concerned. We viewed Israel's passage of a basic law on Jerusalem last year within this context. As we have said before, we believe that the ultimate status of Jerusalem should reflect three basic principles. First, in any final settlement, Jerusalem should be undivided, with free movement of persons and goods. Secondly, there should be free access to the Holy Places, and each of the three faiths should have a role in protecting its Holy Places. Thirdly, the basic rights of all of the city's residents should be assured. There are elements of this draft resolution with which the United States agrees. We voted against it because it lacks any reference to the need for negotiations among the parties concerned on Jerusalem and because it characterizes the situation in Jerusalem as a threat to international peace and security, a characterization which raises the implication of sanctions. Our position with regard to the sanctions issue is well known, and we cannot accept its insertion into such a resolution.

120. We voted against draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1 and Add.1, which by implication criticizes the Camp David agreements. I repeat again what United States representatives have said many times. These agreements are the only existing framework for progress towards a negotiated settlement of the Palestinian question on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). It is wrong for the General Assembly to attack a treaty between two sovereign States which is designed to lead to a just and lasting peace by establishing a framework for good-faith negotiations among all the parties concerned. It is doubly wrong for the Assembly to attempt to undermine a process designed to lead towards a settlement of the Palestinian problem in the absence of proposals for a realistic alternative by those who speak loudest in condemning the Camp David approach.

121. Mr. RICARDES (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Argentina voted in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and Add.1, because we consider that the principles enunciated in it are in accordance with those in General Assembly resolution 35/169 A and also in resolution ES-7/2, which was adopted at the seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly held in July 1980.

122. At the same time, my delegation wishes to reaffirm its position that the question of Palestine, which is at the core of the crisis in that continuously unstable region, requires a just and equitable solution based on the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as on all the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

123. Consequently, we firmly believe that a genuine, just, comprehensive and permanent agreement on the question of Palestine must be based on the following principles and conditions, already fully recognized by the majority of the members of the international community: first, recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and national independence; secondly, the right of all States in the area to existence and to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries; thirdly, the unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the territories occupied since 1967; and fourthly, a special régime for the Holy City of Jerusalem in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 303 (IV).

124. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to express its reservations concerning operative paragraph 9, in so far as it makes critical judgements of partial efforts already made towards peace and security in the region.

125. Mr. KERGIN (Canada): The Assembly has again debated the question of Palestine and has adopted six more resolutions to add to the long list on this subject. Looking at these resolutions, we are struck by the sense of tragedy they reflect, of peoples caught in a vicious circle of conflict. That situation has led the Organization to spawn a proliferation of declarations, documents, resolutions, new infrastructures, projects and work programmes.

126. While we appreciate that the provision of information which is objective and impartial has its value, the problem requires, more than anything, that both sides in the conflict be brought together. This is the objective we should be striving to achieve here. Unfortunately, the Assembly has been caught up in a welter of one-sided and polemical resolutions and debates whose effect has been continuing confrontation, not a dialogue.

127. We find it ironic that instead of welcoming and giving strong support to Camp David, the one ongoing peace effort which has seen two parties to the conflict in the area take steps towards the just, lasting and comprehensive settlement which we all desire, the Assembly has repeatedly denounced that peace effort.

128. It has done so again today by adopting draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1 and Add.1. We agree with one basic idea underlying that resolution, namely, that the Palestinian people themselves must be involved in any search for a settlement of the Palestinian question. We have always maintained that all the interested parties must participate in a negotiated settlement of this problem. However, we think it is short-sighted to dismiss, as the resolution implicitly does, the efforts being made within the framework of the Camp David accords to lay the groundwork of a comprehensive settlement. For that reason, we voted against this draft resolution.

129. My Government has maintained that the Israelis and the Palestinians have legitimate rights and concerns that must be taken into account in any settlement. Israel, like all States, has a right to secure and recognized boundaries as well as the right to be fully accepted by its neighbours. The Palestinians also have legitimate rights, including the right to a homeland within a clearly defined territory, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. However, the terms of a settlement must not be prejudged if the negotiations for a just and lasting peace are to be successful. Therefore, we have voted against draft omnibus resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and Add.1, which, in our view, runs counter to the basis for a settlement so painstakingly worked out in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

130. My Government supports the principles which were embodied in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). We therefore look forward to the eventual withdrawal of Israel from territories it has occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem. As my Government made clear last year, we do not recognize the validity of

Israel's annexation of East Jerusalem, which has the effect of prejudging the outcome of a comprehensive settlement on this aspect. Consequently, we continue to support strongly the basic thrust of draft resolution A/36/L.51 and Add.1. We cannot, however, agree with the new element in paragraph 2 of that resolution, since it impinges directly upon the prerogatives of the Security Council set out in the Charter of the United Nations. That body alone has the mandate to determine what constitutes a "threat to international peace and security". We have, therefore, abstained on this particular paragraph while supporting the resolution as a whole.

131. Finally we question, at this time, the purpose of an international conference on the question of Palestine, which is called for in draft resolution A/36/L.33/Rev.1 and Add.1. Whatever its objectives, it will involve additional costs, and we doubt whether this conference, based as it is on General Assembly resolution ES-7/2, could make any contribution to resolving the essential problem I mentioned at the outset, which is to get the interested parties together to negotiate a settlement of their differences. My delegation therefore voted against the resolution.

132. Mr. ELMER (Sweden): The position of the Swedish Government remains that a solution to the conflict in the Middle East must satisfy two basic criteria: the right of Israel to exist within secure and recognized boundaries and the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to establish a State of their own, should they so wish. Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), even though they are incomplete, remain the basis for a peaceful solution. Consequently we hold that a just solution to the Palestinian problem is a necessary condition for the attainment of a durable peace in the region.

133. It is therefore with regret that my delegation has found that most of the draft resolutions dealing with the question of Palestine, just adopted by the Assembly, have been formulated by their sponsors in such a way that it has not been possible for us to support them. As we see it, there is a general lack of balance in these texts, and some formulations are too categorical. More specifically we have abstained on draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and Add.1 for this reason, but also because of reservations about operative paragraph 9 in particular. We have voted against A/36/L.52/Rev.1 and Add.1 because it contains language to which we cannot subscribe, and we have supported A/36/L.51 and Add.1, in spite of our strong objection to its operative paragraph 2. In respect of A/36/L.33/Rev.1 and Add.1, the view of my delegation is that the parties must agree on negotiations and the procedure for such negotiations. Therefore we believe that a decision now to hold an international conference on the basis provided would not be likely to produce positive results. My delegation has abstained in the vote on that draft resolution as we did with regard to those draft resolutions I have not specifically mentioned.

134. Mr. KOLBY (Norway): The Norwegian Government is of the opinion that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East can be brought about only if a solution is found to the Palestinian problem. The legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination, must be recognized and implemented. A solution to the Palestinian problem can, however, be achieved only as part of a negotiated settlement which also recognizes the right of Israel to exist within secure and recognized boundaries. A negotiated settlement requires mutual concessions. The draft resolutions just adopted, however, prejudge a number of difficult issues which, in our view, should be solved through negotiations involving all parties concerned. In our view the draft resolutions do not in an adequate and balanced manner reflect the main principles which must constitute the basis for a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East.

135. It remains the firm conviction of the Norwegian Government that a peaceful solution must be based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

136. Mr. PIZA-ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Costa Rica, faithful to the position which it has repeatedly expressed on the question of Palestine, voted in favour of draft resolutions A/36/L.31/Rev.1 and Add.1, L.33/Rev.1 and Add.1, and L.51 and Add.1, on whose content we need not add anything further to what we have said on similar draft resolutions, for some of them are literally the same as those of the last session of the General Assembly.

137. With regard to draft resolution A/36/L.52/Rev.1 and Add.1, my delegation wishes to express its firm view that its vote in favour should be interpreted to mean, in keeping with the text, that both theoretical validity and effective means of implementation are lacking in any agreement or treaty which claims to dispose of the future of the Palestinian people without the participation of that people or without the participation of the organization which the international community represented here has recognized as the representative of that people. Those agreements or treaties would lack and indeed do lack validity and practical meaning insofar as they attempt to determine the future of a people, whose individuality and rights we recognize, as we also recognize those of the people of Israel and of all peoples on earth. However, our vote in favour should not and could not be interpreted outside the specific context of that draft resolution since my delegation would never censure, but on the contrary would praise and continues to praise, any agreement or treaty that seeks to bring peace to States or regions and specifically it praises the Camp David accords, for they tend to consolidate peace between Egypt and Israel.

138. With regard to draft resolution A/36/L.50/Rev.1 and Add.1, my delegation abstained because even though we share the principles behind it, insofar as it reiterates the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence and to return to their homes, repeats Israel's obligation to withdraw from the occupied territories and reaffirms the principle that a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine will not be possible without full consideration of all the factors and without the participation of all the interested parties—most specifically the peoples of Israel and Palestine—our abstention is nevertheless due to the fact that the draft resolution which has been adopted lacks the balance which would reflect such a need; it emphasizes the rights and participation of one party, omitting all references to those of the other, and it exclusively emphasizes some previous resolutions of this Assembly and of the Security Council but omits others which are as important, such as 242 (1967) of the Security Council.

139. The PRESIDENT: The observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to make a statement. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX).

140. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Today is Human Rights Day, and the Assembly has clearly upheld the human rights of the Palestinian people, as it has done in the voting process that we have witnessed.

141. I should like to extend to the States Members of the United Nations—even to those who did not vote in favour—our gratitude for their ever-increasing support of the struggle of the Palestinian people to attain its inalienable rights so that we Palestinians may return to our homes and property and live in peace, to exercise our inalienable right of self-determination and to establish our sovereign independent State in our homeland in Palestine.

142. The PLO was invited here as a representative of the Palestinian people, and the Palestinian people consider the PLO as its sole and legitimate representative. This is the will of the Palestinian people as far as representation goes.

143. We wish to reiterate our thanks to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and express our sincere hope that the Committee will continue its sincere efforts to make known, to explain and to defend those rights.

144. The investment of a few million dollars is an investment for peace; it is an investment to pre-empt expenses amounting to scores and hundreds of millions of dollars being spent on peace-keeping forces which the United Nations dispatches and deploys as a result of Israel's continued acts of aggression and State terrorism against the Palestinian people and the Arab States.

145. The PLO and the Assembly have asserted the competence of the United Nations to intervene when the rights of a people are trampled on, despite the phoney slogan of "working for peace". The Camp David accord is not a process conducive to peace. Time is our best witness that it is a process that leads to the exacerbation of the situation. Peace cannot be attained, and the Assembly will not permit the attainment of a shaky peace, at the expense of violating the rights of peoples.

146. Finally, the PLO wishes to affirm that we are encouraged by the clear support demonstrated here and we shall continue our struggle in order to attain peace in the Middle East through peace in Palestine.

Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 36

Question of Namibia (*continued*):*
(*a*) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
(*b*) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia

147. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives to introduce the draft resolutions on the item.

148. Mr. FAFOWORA (Nigeria): Since assuming the historic mandate of protecting the legitimate rights and interests of the Namibian people, the community of nations has committed itself to obtaining the unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia and the early exercise by the people of the Territory of their rights to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia.

149. After South Africa's blatant refusal to implement the United Nations plan in January of this year, the international community reviewed the question of Namibia in various forums, including the thirty-sixth ordinary session of the Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa of the Organization of African Unity, at Arusha from 19 to 23 January 1981; the thirty-sixth ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, at Addis Ababa from 23 February to 1 March 1981; the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February 1981; the resumed thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly in New York, from 2 to 6 March 1981 [*102nd to 111th meetings*]; the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries on the Question of Namibia, held at Algiers from 16 to 18 April 1981; the Security Council, from 21 to 30 April 1981,[7] with the unprecedented participation of 19 ministers for foreign affairs from Africa and the non-aligned movement; the International Conference on Sanctions Against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981; the thirty-seventh ordinary session of the OAU Council of Ministers and the eighteenth session of the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government, held at Nairobi from 15 to 26 June and 24 to 27 June 1981 respectively; the Security Council, from 28 to 31 August 1981;[8] and the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, held from 3 to 14 September 1981 [*1st to 12th meetings*].

150. In all those forums the international community condemned the Pretoria régime for its persistent refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions on Namibia and for its repeated acts of aggression against the front-line States, in particular against Angola, and called on the Security Council to impose, as a matter of urgency, comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations to ensure Pretoria's immediate compliance with United Nations resolutions and decisions on Namibia.

151. The consideration within the United Nations of the question of Namibia has always called forth the broadest and most spontaneous demonstration of solidarity by the international community in its desire to put an end as soon as possible to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

152. Bearing all this in mind, and on behalf of more than 50 sponsors, my delegation has the honour today, in its capacity as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia and as one of the sponsors of all six draft resolutions on the question of Namibia, to introduce one of the six draft resolutions submitted this year to the General Assembly, draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1 on the situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa.

153. The title of this draft resolution indicates its subject and scope. We have been called upon to express our views on a colonial situation and a case of illegal occupation which persists despite several United Nations decisions and declarations on decolonization, despite the specific resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council on the question, and despite the opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June

*Resumed from the 71st meeting.

1971,[9] which has declared South Africa's presence in Namibia illegal.

154. Over the last few years, it has become quite clear that measures of pressure and repression, imprisonment, arbitrary detention and arrest, torture, collective punishment and other means of intimidation can no longer keep in a state of subjugation a people that has become aware of its situation and aspires to independence, freedom, justice and social progress. Indeed, out of complicity and complacency certain imperialist Powers spare no effort to benefit from the exploitation of the natural and human resources of southern Africa, and in connivance with them, the racist régime of South Africa has tried to perpetuate its grip by other means. It is developing its capacity in nuclear weaponry in order to increase its military power and thus set itself up as a valid partner in any discussion concerning the region of southern Africa.

155. Not content with continuing and intensifying its exploitation of the human and natural resources of that international Territory, the racist régime does not hesitate to fasten its grip on Namibia and to crush the legitimate struggle being waged by its heroic people, headed by the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*], to secure its right to self-determination and genuine national independence.

156. The principles that we wish to reaffirm concern, first of all, the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence within the context of a united Namibia, and the legality of the armed struggle that is being waged against the illegal occupation of the international Territory. That is why we appeal to all countries to grant all necessary assistance—political, diplomatic and material—to SWAPO in order to guarantee a successful outcome of the struggle. The draft resolution also reaffirms that the only legitimate parties to the conflict in Namibia are, on the one hand, South Africa, which is illegally occupying the Territory and committing aggression against its people, and on the other hand, the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, supported by the United Nations, which has direct responsibility for the Territory until independence.

157. The draft resolution reiterates that Walvis Bay and the offshore islands of Namibia are an integral part of Namibia.

158. The measures that the illegal occupying régime has undertaken are intended to eliminate physically members of SWAPO and to undermine that movement further. The draft resolution therefore demands that South Africa account for all "disappeared" Namibians and release any who are still alive. It declares that South Africa shall be liable for damages to compensate the victims, their families and the future lawful Government of an independent Namibia for the losses sustained. Furthermore, the draft resolution condemns the collusion of the Governments of certain Western countries and other States with South Africa and calls upon them to refrain from supplying the racist minority régime in South Africa, directly or indirectly, with installations that might enable it to produce uranium, plutonium and other nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment.

159. The draft resolution also deals with the non-recognition of any régime that might be imposed in defiance of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and condemns any political arrangements aimed at continuing with the systematic plunder of the natural resources of the Territory. South Africa's defiance of the United Nations, its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia, its war of oppression against the Namibian people, its persistent acts of aggression launched from bases in Namibia against independent African States, it policy of *apartheid* and its development of nuclear weapons, which constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security, are strongly condemned. We in the Council for Namibia believe that conditions have been met for the implementation of the enforcement provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

160. The final operative paragraph contains a solemn appeal to the Security Council to meet urgently to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa in order to compel it to withdraw from the Territory of Namibia.

161. The draft resolution, which accurately analyses the facts of the Namibian situation and calls for a general mobilization against the South African régime, is now submitted for the attention of the Assembly. We believe that it merits adoption by the broadest possible majority and that it reflects a wide-ranging consensus reached on the question.

162. Mr. OURABAH (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation is honoured, as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia and as a sponsor of all the draft resolutions relating to the question of Namibia, to introduce on behalf of its sponsors draft resolution A/36/L.24 on action by Member States in support of Namibia.

163. This draft resolution, while borrowing much from last year's resolution as well as from the one adopted at the eighth emergency special session, has the advantage of proposing a number of concrete measures whereby collective action against South Africa's defiance can be organized by the international community.

164. Faced with South Africa's intransigence and its obstinate rejection of all United Nations appeals, this draft resolution proposes effective isolation of that rebel régime politically, economically, militarily and culturally.

165. First, the draft resolution calls upon all States to sever all trade relations with South Africa, to stop investment in that territory and in Namibia and to annul contracts already entered into with that régime. It also renews the appeal to all States fully to implement the provisions of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted on 27 September 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia,[10] if necessary by recourse to legislative and enforcement measures.

166. The draft resolution next calls on all States to implement a total petroleum embargo and to strengthen the arms embargo against South Africa. That appeal covers, in particular, the ban on the sale of petroleum or petroleum products to that régime, as well as to occupied Namibia. This measure is accompanied by a ban on activities that promote prospecting for petroleum in the two territories.

167. At the same time, the draft resolution requests all States to cease forthwith the provision to South Africa of arms and related *matériel* of all types. Finally, it refers to some juridical measures which Member States are called upon to undertake individually, to denounce any represen-

tation of Namibia by South Africa at the level of both bilateral and multilateral treaties.

168. As its last provision, the text requests all States Members to report to the Secretary-General and to the Council for Namibia on the measures upon which they have decided to ensure the implementation of this resolution.

169. In recommending these measures, the sponsors only wanted to implement the provisions which have already been decided upon by the United Nations on previous occasions to ensure the isolation of the racist régime of South Africa. The sponsors also felt that this was an effective weapon to force that régime to abide by the injunctions of the international community. Those concerns are broadly shared, and it is therefore natural for this draft resolution to receive the support of everyone. That is the appeal of the sponsors, an appeal that I make on their behalf.

170. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): I have the honour to introduce on behalf of the sponsors draft resolution A/36/L.25 on the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia. The draft resolution seeks to authorize the Council for Namibia to continue its work in the discharge of its mandate in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V). Though the Council has so far been unable to realize its ultimate objective of obtaining the withdrawal of the illegal occupation régime of South Africa from Namibia, it has done commendable work by promoting the cause of Namibia internationally and by imparting training to Namibians with a view to enabling them to shoulder the responsibilities of nationhood. Moreover, the Council for Namibia safeguards the interests of Namibia by representing it at international organizations and conferences in its capacity as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence. The Council deserves the support and encouragement of the entire membership of the international community as it espouses the cause of the United Nations and the cause of the oppressed people of Namibia.

171. There has been some criticism that the resolutions prepared by the Council are unjust, unhelpful and unrealistic. In fact, they contain only pronouncements already made by the General Assembly, the OAU or the Council for Namibia in the course of the past year following the collapse of the Geneva talks and the failure of the Security Council to respond to the situation. My delegation views those pronouncements as reflective of the frustration of the international community over the failure of the negotiations for the implementation of the United Nations plan. The Council for Namibia is not a party to those negotiations. My delegation is glad to note from the statement of the five Western States on 20 November [*67th meeting*] that the initial response to their current efforts has been encouraging. We hope that those efforts will lead to the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). But care should be taken to ensure that South Africa does not use the negotiations merely as a cover for carrying out its own designs with regard to Namibia.

172. Mr. TANÇ (Turkey): I have the privilege, on behalf of its sponsors, to introduce to the General Assembly draft resolution A/36/L.26 on action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia.

173. My delegation believes that, despite the reprehensible resistance of South Africa to ending its illegal occupation of Namibia, the day is near when we shall acclaim the full independence of Namibia, when it will take its rightful place in the United Nations as a full Member. One of the most important aspects of our continuing efforts in this respect is ensuring the full membership of Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the specialized agencies and other organizations and conferences within the United Nations system, so that the Council, as the Administering Authority for Namibia, can participate in the activities of those agencies and other organizations. That is the main objective of this draft resolution.

174. The draft resolution also requests that all such specialized agencies grant a waiver of the assessment for Namibia during the entire period in which it is represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia. A request is made in the draft resolution to all intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and conferences to ensure that the rights and interests of Namibia are protected and to invite Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, to participate as a full member whenever its interests are involved. In this respect, the draft resolution contains a request to IAEA to grant full membership to Namibia.

175. I should like to mention here that the Council for Namibia is at present a full member of ILO, FAO, UNESCO, UNCTAD, UNIDO and the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. It is an associate member of WHO. Such representation has enabled the Council to promote the interests and aspirations of the Namibian people for genuine independence in international conferences, specialized agencies and other bodies. In fact, the draft expresses the appreciation of the General Assembly to the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system for their assistance to Namibia, to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, to the United Nations Institute for Namibia and to the Nationhood Programme and requests them to give priority to the allocation of funds for material assistance to the Namibian people.

176. The draft resolution also includes provisions for the launching of a programme of co-operation with non-governmental organizations and support groups, in order to intensify international action to promote the cause of the liberation struggle of the Namibian people.

177. As can be seen, this draft resolution pertains to a significant aspect of the responsibility that the General Assembly has assumed for Namibia until it exercises its right to self-determination and full independence.

178. On behalf of the sponsors, I should like to express the hope that the draft resolution will meet with the full approval of the General Assembly.

179. Mr. STARČEVIĆ (Yugoslavia): It is an honour and privilege for me to introduce draft resolution A/36/L.27 on dissemination of information on Namibia.

180. The formulation of the draft resolution has been motivated, as is indicated in the preamble, by the urgent need to mobilize international public opinion on a continuous basis with a view to assisting effectively the people of Namibia in the achievement of self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namibia and to intensify the dissemination of information on the struggle for

liberation being waged by the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO.

181. In pursuance of that goal, the Council for Namibia is requested to consider ways and means of increasing the dissemination of information relating to Namibia. The Secretary-General is requested to ensure that the Secretariat's Department of Public Information in its activities follows the policy guidelines laid down by the Council for Namibia and assists, as a matter of priority, the Council in the implementation of its programme of dissemination of information.

182. The draft resolution contains a decision to launch an international campaign in support of the cause of Namibia. To this end the Council is requested to formulate a programme of activities on the dissemination of information, including the preparation and dissemination of publications, the production and dissemination of radio programmes, the production of material for publicity through radio and television broadcasts, the placement of advertisements in newspapers and magazines and a number of other activities designed to promote the independence of Namibia and to increase public awareness of actions that run contrary to this goal.

183. In addition, the draft resolution contains other provisions aimed at strengthening the co-operation of the Department of Public Information with the Council for Namibia, as well as the request to the Council to continue to inform leading opinion-makers, media leaders, political and academic institutions and other concerned non-governmental organizations, cultural organizations and support groups about the objectives and functions of the Council for Namibia and the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO.

184. Member States are requested to broadcast programmes and publish material about the situation in Namibia and to commemorate and publicize Namibia Day. The issuance of special postage stamps on Namibia by Member States and by the United Nations is also envisaged.

185. The dissemination of information on Namibia represents an important aspect of the overall efforts of the United Nations to achieve freedom and independence for Namibia. In spite of long years of illegal occupation of Namibia, the public in some countries is still not sufficiently aware of the true nature of the problem and the extent of the suffering of the Namibian people as well as the people of those front-line States that are the constant victims of aggressive attacks by the racist régime of South Africa. Either the media of certain countries do not publicize sufficient information on the problem of Namibia or the publicized information is biased in accordance with specific political interests. It is therefore very important for the United Nations to maintain a constant flow of information to the public on all aspects of the question of Namibia. This draft resolution is proposed with that aim in mind, and I recommend it for adoption.

186. Mr. SORENSEN-MOSQUERA (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is my honour to introduce draft resolution A/36/L.28 on the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

187. Since its establishment in 1970 the Fund has become an important support of the Namibian people in its struggle for self-determination, freedom and independence.

188. This year the voluntary contributions to the Fund amounted to $4,300,000, thanks to the voluntary contributions of many countries.

189. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, we find this situation very satisfactory. In increasing its activities the Fund has felt the need to channel its resources through three accounts: the General Account, which services the general activities of the Fund, the account for the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and the Trust Fund for the United Nations Institute for Namibia. The General Account is also responsible for the financial situation of the account of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and that of the United Nations Institute for Namibia.

190. The draft resolution relates to the general activities of the United Nations Fund for Namibia and the activities of the Nationhood Programme and the Institute for Namibia.

191. The decision to establish the United Nations Fund for Namibia was a response to the request addressed to the General Assembly by the Security Council in its resolution 283 (1970) and to the commitment of the international community to the people of Namibia to assist Namibians suffering persecution at the hands of South Africa's racist régime and to finance a global education and training programme for Namibians, with special emphasis on the future administrative responsibilities they will have in the Territory. Consequently the general activities of the Fund are aimed mainly at providing assistance in the educational, social and relief fields. In the educational field this assistance meets needs in primary and secondary education, remedial education, vocational training and university education. Currently, 123 Namibians are studying with scholarships provided by the Fund. In the social field, medical and health care are given, and there are nutritional and social-welfare programmes. The Fund also assists refugees from Namibia.

192. The draft resolution now before the Assembly takes note of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia on the Fund and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained therein. It also expresses appreciation to all those who have made voluntary contributions to the Fund and calls upon the Secretary-General and the President of the Council to appeal to Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to make generous contributions to the Fund. The draft resolution also expresses appreciation to the specialized agencies for their assistance to Namibians.

193. The delegation of Venezuela would be failing in its responsibilities as a member of the Council were it not to take this opportunity to reiterate the appeal to Governments, contained in the draft resolution, to contribute generously to the Fund for Namibia. The conditions now obtaining in Namibia require this of us.

194. The draft resolution decides to allocate to the Fund the sum of $US 1 million from the regular budget of the United Nations for 1982. It also affirms United Nations support of the United Nations Institute for Namibia and praises its efforts in lending substantive support to the struggle for freedom of Namibians. It also expresses appreciation to all States, specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, and governmental and non-governmental organizations that have made voluntary contributions to the Institute and have furnished assistance to the Institute.

195. Lastly, the draft resolution refers to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, the purpose of which is to include all measures of assistance for Namibians during the period of struggle for independence and the post-independence phase and to ensure that the planning and implementation of this assistance will be carried out by means of a harmonious and comprehensive plan of action within the framework of the United Nations. The programme includes projects in the productive areas of the economy, the fiscal infrastructure and services, including transportation, trade, energy and administrative services.

196. The Nationhood Programme for Namibia is planned and implemented in consultation with the representatives of SWAPO. For its part, UNDP has contributed to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia in the amount of $2.5 million for 1982.

197. The sponsors of the draft resolution hope that it will be adopted unanimously by the General Assembly.

198. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote. May I recall that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes.

199. Mr. ARTACHO (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On various occasions, both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, the delegation of Spain has stated its unswerving support for Namibia's right to independence and full territorial integrity. As a point of reference, I refer to my delegation's statement at the 10th meeting of the eighth emergency special session, which was held just before this session of the Assembly.

200. We continue to believe that South Africa's persistent refusal to comply with the Security Council and the General Assembly resolutions regarding the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia is a constant challenge to the international community and a cause of serious concern for us all. That is why—and although we believed then and continue to believe now in negotiations as the means to find a just solution to this problem—when in April this year the Security Council considered steps that might induce South Africa to reconsider its position on Namibia, Spain voted in favour of the draft resolutions which contained concrete economic measures and which strengthened the arms embargo already imposed by the Council itself. In that way, we tried to make use of all available means to bring maximum pressure to bear on South Africa to prevail upon it to observe the provisions previously adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

201. But with the same conviction with which we defend the right to independence of the people of Namibia, we believe that verbal escalation and indiscriminate accusations do not enhance the climate for negotiation which should reign at this time; on the contrary, they can only give rise to increased tension on this delicate question.

202. Spain does not believe that imposing indiscriminate drastic measures can be the best way to attain the objective we seek. Breaking diplomatic relations, political and cultural discrimination and the virtual interruption of communications to isolate a State Member of the Organization, far from representing an element of pressure, could be counter-productive.

203. That is why, despite the fact that on the whole we support the spirit behind these draft resolutions, we shall abstain in the votes on draft resolutions A/36/L.23/Rev.1, L.24 and L.27 and vote in favour of the remaining draft resolutions.

204. The condemnation of some countries by name in the preamble and in operative paragraphs 17 and 31 of draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1 does not seem appropriate to us. Given the complex situation in Namibia, we consider it unfair to condemn some countries in particular and specifically to repudiate the countries of the group negotiating with South Africa, accusing them of undermining resolutions of the Security Council when the mandate for these negotiations was given by the Council itself.

205. For those reasons, we find it unrealistic to try to isolate South Africa in all areas, and the same applies to measures contemplated in various operative paragraphs of draft resolution A/36/L.24 envisaging a total interruption in economic, political and cultural relations. Some of the measures provided for in operative paragraphs 1 to 7 of that draft resolution aim at a total isolation and, in so far as they request control over certain activities of nationals, would presuppose *de facto* interference with the freedom granted individuals by the constitutions of democratic countries.

206. In the same context we cannot support the decision to launch an international campaign to denounce some countries as contained in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/36/L.27, since this step would presuppose imposing directives on the information media incompatible with the system of freedom of the press strictly established by the Spanish Constitution. Nevertheless, considering that the dissemination of information on Namibia is on the whole a positive element of international awareness of the problem, in the Fifth Committee we supported the financial implications of this draft resolution.

207. Since Spain is a member of the Security Council, I also wish to express reservations about some parts of these draft resolutions which appear to prejudge the attitude which the Council should take concerning the application of broad mandatory sanctions established by the Charter.

208. For all those reasons, despite the fact that we support the need to solve the situation in Namibia promptly and that we share the justified impatience of the African countries for a rapid solution of the conflict, we cannot support the application of indiscriminate economic sanctions which, as we have said on previous occasions, could have a boomerang effect for the countries suffering the most from the tension prevailing in southern Africa.

209. In conclusion, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the United Nations Council for Namibia for the work it has done in various forums and countries and especially for the submission of its report [*A/36/24*]. Concerning that part of the report dealing with the mission of consultation of the United Nations Council for Namibia in May this year in Spain, the delegation of Spain, in order to make its position clear, draws attention to the communiqué published at the end of that visit [*ibid., para. 705*].

210. Mr. BARBOSA de MEDINA (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): At the eighth emergency special session last September, my delegation had an opportunity to define once again the position of the Portuguese Gov-

ernment on the question of Namibia. We emphasized the international nature of a problem concerning which a consensus had emerged on the illegality of the South African presence in Namibia—a situation which calls for severe condemnation of any action by the South African authorities designed to ensure a presence which is totally unjustified, especially actions against the inviolability of frontiers and the territorial integrity of neighbouring countries, thus creating dangers for political stability throughout all of southern Africa.

211. In this context my Government has explicitly condemned the acts of aggression against Angola, a country which, to shelter refugees and to defend its sovereignty, has had to allocate resources which the Luanda Government desperately needs to ensure the development of its own country.

212. Similarly, the exercise of the right to self-determination of the Namibian people in free elections based on universal suffrage and supervised by the United Nations, in keeping with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), is supported by my Government, which believes also that this demand is based on the irrefutable consensus of the international community. Hence our attention has been focused on the actions undertaken by the United Nations Council for Namibia, on 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 and of the General Assembly and on the action of the group of African States, particularly the front-line countries. More specifically, we have supported the activities of the countries of the contact group of five Western countries, whose foreign ministers have already during this session revived the negotiations on Namibia interrupted since the pre-implementation talks held at Geneva in January 1981.

213. The Portuguese Government therefore quite clearly and unambiguously supports the principles of self-determination and independence for Namibia. Furthermore, given the specific possibilities for a peaceful and internationally acceptable solution of this problem, we should like once again to stress our total adherence to the search for such a solution with all the consequences deriving therefrom.

214. As long as there is any valid hope of the success of efforts to bring about a peaceful solution, the Portuguese Government will support them, not only because of the pertinent provisions of the Charter, but also because this is in conformity with express stipulations in our political constitution. Such an attitude necessarily implies dissociating oneself from any act or appeal which might damage or endanger a possible agreed solution, particularly acts of violence or appeals to armed struggle.

215. Therefore, despite our total adherence to the basic principles of draft resolutions A/36/L.23/Rev.1 and L.24, my delegation is not in a position to give them its support, because of the language and the discriminatory references they contain in the preamble and in operative paragraphs 17, 25, 26, 28, 31 and 34 of A/36/L.23/Rev.1, and also because of the total isolation of the Republic of South Africa which is advocated therein, which would make it impossible for a dialogue to take place on which a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia could be based. My delegation will therefore abstain in the vote on those draft resolutions.

216. On the other hand, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/36/L.25 to L.28 and wishes to stress its support for operative paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/36/L.25, which refers to the establishment in Luanda of an office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia. However, we wish to reserve our position on the question of enlarging the mandate of the United Nations Council for Namibia and to enter specific reservations on paragraphs 5, 6, 9 and 10 of draft resolution A/36/L.26 as well as on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/36/L.28. Above all, we would enter stringent reservations on all the paragraphs of A/36/L.27 which contain discriminatory references to certain States, particularly the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4.

217. Mr. HUTCHENS (Australia): In its statement during the debate on the question of Namibia [*65th meeting*], my delegation made clear Australia's commitment to early and genuine independence for Namibia. In that statement we also described what we regarded as the appropriate form for resolutions under this item. It is a matter of regret to my delegation that the draft resolutions which the General Assembly is now considering depart from that appropriate form in several respects and that as a result Australia will be supporting only one draft resolution and abstaining on the other five. Our regret is heightened by the fact that Australia is a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

218. Many of our reservations are well known, and I can summarize them quickly. Australia cannot endorse armed struggle as a legitimate means of achieving one's goals. We recognize SWAPO as an important protagonist in the Namibian problem, but we maintain that it is for the people of the Territory themselves to choose who will ultimately represent them.

219. At a number of points in several of the draft resolutions, individual countries are named. We regard this as selective and tendentious.

220. Australia fully observes the conditions of the Security Council arms embargo against South Africa—indeed, we imposed our own embargo unilaterally, well before the Security Council imposed its embargo—but we consider that it is the exclusive preserve of the Council to consider any extension of embargoes.

221. Australia is concerned that established United Nations guidelines have not been followed in relation to the convening of meetings away from United Nations conference posts. This has very serious budgetary implications. There are a number of other areas where we feel that enthusiasm for United Nations action on Namibia has not been matched by a proper sense of budgetary restraint. Allocations for travel stand out in this regard.

222. Speaking more generally, the Australian delegation is concerned that the general tenor of most of the draft resolutions before us does not take sufficient account of current efforts aimed at the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The only reference made to those efforts is, in effect, to dismiss them. We do not believe that this is either valid or helpful. The Australian Government supports the efforts of the contact group of Western countries and urges them to intensify their attempts at implementing what is in fact the only plan on the table for bringing Namibia to independence. We are concerned that some of the draft resolutions now

before us ignore this reality and instead engage in doubtful rhetoric and flights of fancy.

223. For this reason, Australia will abstain on the first five draft resolutions and support the sixth, of which we are a sponsor.

224. Mr. TANÇ (Turkey): The gross injustice of the deferment of independence for Namibia is recognized world-wide. In this respect I do not need to reiterate the strong support of my Government for the ever-increasing efforts being made to ensure independence for Namibia without any delay. As a reflection of this strong support, my delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions on this question. In fact, we are among the sponsors of A/36/L.25, L.26 and L.28.

225. However, my delegation wishes to put on record, with regard to the seventh and seventeenth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 17 and 31 of draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1 and operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/36/L.27, that we believe those paragraphs should not have contained selective references to a specific region and specific countries in that region.

226. Mr. DLAMINI (Swaziland): Not only the General Assembly but the world at large is aware of the suffering endured by the people of Namibia, not by their free choice but because of the unfortunate situation they happen to be in. It is a very unfortunate situation, and while it exists the whole of southern Africa will continue to be in a precarious position.

227. The Kingdom of Swaziland is, as everyone here knows, in southern Africa. The people of Namibia and those of Swaziland are one. Their suffering is our suffering. It is the honest feeling of my delegation that the independence of Namibia is long overdue and that the sooner all of us here do something concrete to bring it about, the better. Strategic and ideological interests are not the issue here; the issue is the speedy granting of independence to Namibia.

228. We have a number of draft resolutions before us on the question of Namibia—draft resolutions A/36/L.23/Rev.1 to L.28, to be exact. The central theme of all those draft resolutions is a plea to the international community to clear the way for the independence of Namibia. That being so, and taking into account the situation in Namibia today, the language in some of those draft resolutions needed some seasoning, somehow, so that they could command some kind of consensus among us all.

229. It is a well-established fact that the independent States of southern Africa are highly vulnerable as regards some measures that might be taken by the international community in its endeavours to help the struggling masses of that part of Africa. Here I refer to the question of economic sanctions. The United Nations ECA presented a study on this[11] at the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981; hence, paragraphs 261 to 265 of the Paris Declaration.[12] The OAU has also realized the plight of those States; hence operative paragraph 6 of resolution CM/Res.865 (XXXVII), adopted by its Council of Ministers at its thirty-seventh ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 15 to 26 June 1981 [*A/36/534, annex I*].

230. Hoping that what I have just said puts our position in its correct perspective, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1 and reserves its position on operative paragraphs 31 and 34. Furthermore, we shall abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/36/L.24, in spite of the inclusion of operative paragraphs 26 and 27, because we cannot go along with a large part of it, for instance, operative paragraphs 1 to 14.

231. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria): In the course of the debate on the question of Namibia, Austria had the opportunity [*65th meeting*] to reaffirm its position of principle with regard to Namibia's independence and the endeavours of the United Nations to achieve it. We have consistently stated our firm belief that the transition of Namibia to full independence will have to be achieved by peaceful means only and as a result of the negotiations which are at present under way.

232. Although we can understand the impatience and disappointment of the Namibian people in view of the protracted negotiating process, its long-term benefits should be taken into account versus the sufferings and sacrifices which armed struggle inevitably demands.

233. Austria is convinced that, in the light of the principles and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations, the armed struggle should not be endorsed or supported by General Assembly resolutions, nor should military support for any armed struggle be encouraged. Austria furthermore has strong reservations about the attempt to prejudge and to influence the independent work of the Security Council, an attempt that is in contradiction to the relevant provisions of the Charter. Austria is fully aware of the significant and important role which SWAPO has assumed in the fight of the Namibian people for their independence, as well as in the negotiating process, a role which undoubtedly will continue in the political future of the Territory. The final endorsement of that role, however, will be given by the Namibian people themselves in free and fair elections. The General Assembly should not prejudge that free and democratic expression of political will by the population of Namibia.

234. Austria also does not believe that the arbitrary singling out of certain industrialized States for condemnation is justified or in any way advances the legitimate interests of the Namibian people. We are also concerned about the considerable financial implications of some of the proposals contained in the draft resolutions which demand a very substantial and hardly justifiable increase in the budgetary allocation. We regret that for these reasons Austria has to abstain on several of the draft resolutions before the Assembly. We wish to reiterate, however, that this in no way affects Austria's firm commitment to a peaceful and negotiated transition of Nambia to independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

235. Mr. TOUSSAINT (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): The illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa is a serious challenge to the Organization, and it is high time for the international community to fulfil its responsibilities to put an end to it as soon as possible. Further, the repeated acts of aggression perpetrated by the racist régime against independent African States have seriously threatened international peace and security. It is for these reasons that the Republic of Haiti has always felt that the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, is imperative if we are to break the stubborn resistance of the South African régime. Once again my delegation stresses the timeliness of and the need for such sanctions and urges the permanent members of the Security Council to give a

favourable response to the appeal of the great majority of members of the international community.

236. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the sole basis on which a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem can be reached. It is therefore essential that the necessary pressure be brought to bear to force South Africa to comply, because the oppressed people of Namibia should not be robbed of a victory won at the cost of so much struggle.

237. Despite the considerable efforts made by the international community, South Africa has remained deaf to any dialogue and has attempted by crude manoeuvres to postpone something that is indeed inevitable. It feels that it can tighten its grip on Namibia and confront the world with a *fait accompli* by transferring power to illegitimate puppet groups which serve its interests alone. This must be regarded simply as a diversionary tactic. However, in view of such a situation, it is to be feared that the parties concerned may resort to extreme measures.

238. It is precisely this eventuality that we fear and that must be avoided in the interests of international peace and security. To ensure this South Africa must be completely isolated, and certain Western countries that are in a position to induce it to temper its inflexible attitude of defiance must no longer encourage it in any way. Its most recent wanton incursion into Angolan territory, causing the death of scores of people while the General Assembly was in fact dealing with this very matter of Namibia, can only be regarded as one more challenge to the Organization in its search for a peaceful solution to this trying problem.

239. Faithful to our previous positions, my delegation will support draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1, although we cannot fully associate ourselves with the drafting of certain of its paragraphs.

240. Mr. LESETEDI (Botswana): The delegation of Botswana reserves its position on operative paragraphs 31 and 34 of draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1. We also wish to reserve our position on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/36/L.25, in particular as regards those recommendations in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia which seek to enjoin all States to impose economic sanctions against South Africa.

241. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): My delegation's position on the question of Namibia has often been repeated. It is consistent and is on record. It fully supports the right to self-determination of the Namibian people in a united Namibia. It strongly condemns the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and endorses the demand that such illegal presence be withdrawn immediately and completely from the Territory of Namibia, to enable the Namibian people to achieve independence. Meanwhile, the systematic plundering of the inviolable resources of Namibia must cease forthwith, as must all the aggressive acts committed by South Africa against the front-line States.

242. South Africa's continued manoeuvres to retain its stranglehold on Namibia have made it necessary for the Namibian people to engage in an intensified armed struggle under the recognized leadership of SWAPO. Such intransigence and duplicity on the part of the Pretoria régime compelled my delegation to vote in favour of General Assembly resolution ES-8/2, calling for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Thailand has, in fact, been applying a voluntary trade embargo against South Africa for several years now.

243. By the same token, my delegation will vote in support of all the draft resolutions now before the General Assembly, in order that unremitting pressure on South Africa may be maintained. In this regard, while my delegation notes with deep regret that the Pretoria régime has felt encouraged by its sympathizers, it is apparent that some draft resolutions have made reference to certain countries on a selective and discriminatory basis. This is particularly evident in draft resolution A/36/L.27, in the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4. In this connection, I wish to stress that my delegation deplores any kind of assistance, direct or indirect, reaching the Pretoria régime from any source whatsoever. However, the application of those paragraphs only to "certain Western countries" is too restrictive, and the effect may be to leave open other channels of assistance, whether direct or indirect, particularly in the economic field, by other States. Therefore, if these paragraphs should be put to a separate vote, my delegation will abstain on them. It will, however, vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

244. Mr. NTLHOKI (Lesotho): I wish to place on record my delegation's reservations on operative paragraph 34 of draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1, notwithstanding the positive vote it will cast. These reservations, as in the past, are dictated by considerations of Lesotho's geographical location vis-à-vis South Africa.

245. As for draft resolution A/36/L.24, the actions envisaged in the latter portion of that draft resolution leave us little choice but to abstain in the vote.

246. With regard to the other draft resolutions on this item which make reference to previous conferences and resolutions on which we have stated our position, I wish to note that our votes on those draft resolutions will reflect our position on the question of sanctions against South Africa.

247. Miss FORT (United Kingdom): On behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community, I should like to address certain basic positions of principle with regard to the draft resolutions before the Assembly. In our common statement in the debate [*67th meeting*] we stressed our unwavering commitment to the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence by means of free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, as provided for in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

248. The European Community urges all sides to refrain from actions that would undo the progress achieved so far and would put obstacles on the road towards a peaceful settlement.

249. With this in mind the 10 members of the European Community dissociate themselves from explicit and implicit endorsement of armed struggle. It is the responsibility of the United Nations, in accordance with its Charter, to seek peaceful solutions. The Community's commitment to the Charter and its division of competences remains unchanged.

250. The people of Namibia have the right to choose their own Government through free and fair elections. In the view of the European Community, none of the participants in those elections should therefore be designated in advance as the sole and authentic representative of the people.

251. The European Community rejects all arbitrary and unjustified attacks on individual Member States.

252. The 10 member States of the European Community support the current negotiating efforts initiated by the five Western countries of the contact group to find an internationally acceptable solution to the Namibian problem in 1982. The 10 member States are disappointed that some provisions of the draft resolutions before us cast aspersions on these encouraging efforts.

253. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): New Zealand is totally committed to the achievement of early independence for Namibia. We have consistently supported the efforts of the contact group of Western countries, the Secretary-General and the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia to achieve a peaceful negotiated settlement of the Namibia question in accordance with internationally recognized principles. Equally, we appreciate the efforts made by the front-line States.

254. Progress in the negotiations on Namibia has not been encouraging. New Zealand deplores the intransigent attitude of the South African Government, which has placed obstacle after obstacle in the way of an early settlement. South Africa's continued use of force has brought tension and conflict to the region. South Africa's military operations against Namibia's neighbours make it extremely difficult to bring about conditions in which the people of Namibia can achieve their independence through free and fair elections.

255 New Zealand believes that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) provides a satisfactory basis for a settlement in Namibia. Widening conflict in the region makes it imperative that a settlement based on that resolution should be achieved urgently. My delegation welcomes the renewed efforts that are being made by members of the contact group to bring about a negotiated solution. Once again there is some hope that independence for Namibia, so long awaited, will be achieved. Negotiations are, however, at a critical stage. My delegation believes that every encouragement must be given to the efforts of the contact group to overcome the outstanding difficulties between the parties. Nothing should be done that might in any way jeopardize those efforts. That is why my delegation has reservations about some of the draft resolutions before us today.

256. The general tone of draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1, for example, does not seem well calculated to assist the efforts of the contact group—indeed, it could have the opposite effect. The objectives of draft resolution A/36/L.24 also appear to be somewhat at odds with efforts to build up a climate of confidence between the parties to the dispute. For these reasons, New Zealand will abstain on both draft resolutions.

257. My delegation is also disturbed by the financial implications of certain of the activities proposed in the draft resolutions before us, activities which would require an increase in the budget of more than $2.6 million for 1982. We find it hard to go along with the proposal to hold a series of plenary meetings of the Council for Namibia outside New York at an additional cost of over $400,000. We have our doubts too about the decision to allocate $200,000 for a programme of co-operation with non-governmental institutions, nor are we enthusiastic about the request for an additional appropriation for 1982 of $381,000 for the information activities called for in draft resolution A/36/L.27. We have not been convinced that these and other proposed expenditures are well designed to contribute in a constructive way to efforts to bring about the negotiated settlement in Namibia which has for so long been the Organization's declared objective. New Zealand will abstain on all three draft resolutions.

258. Finally, though we have reservations about the increasing sums that are being allocated from the regular budget to the United Nations Trust Fund for Namibia, New Zealand will vote in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.28. We support the humanitarian purpose of the Fund and we make regular contributions to it.

259. Mr. DORR (Ireland): I set out very fully the views of the delegation of Ireland on the situation in Namibia in the course of the debate in the Security Council in April of this year.[13]

260. Ireland is fully committed to the independence of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and at the earliest possible date. That remains our position. We support the efforts of the United Nations, the OAU, the front-line States and the contact group of five Western countries to achieve that goal. We hope that the renewed efforts at present under way to enable the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) will be successful.

261. Ireland has always accepted that the process of negotiation might have to be supplemented at a particular time through increased pressures by the international community to bring South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia. In our view this could include a series of measures, carefully chosen, graduated in nature and adopted in due form by the Security Council. In accordance with this view and following South Africa's refusal at the pre-implementation talks held at Geneva last January to implement resolution 435 (1978), we voted in the Security Council in April in favour of two of the four draft resolutions then before the Council.[14] Those, if adopted, would have imposed mandatory sanctions in selected areas against South Africa in respect of Namibia.

262. We are aware that, notwithstanding the outcome of that debate, the efforts of the contact group have been renewed in recent months and that those efforts are directed towards the achievement of independence for Namibia in 1982, in accordance with resolution 435 (1978). Of course we realize that there have been times in the past when optimism on Namibia proved to have been misplaced. We nevertheless believe that greater account of these renewed efforts and of the possibilities which they may offer should have been taken when the present resolutions were being drafted.

263. In deciding on our votes on the six draft resolutions we have examined their content closely, and we have also tried to relate this to our view of the present situation with regard to Namibia, as I have just set it out. Against this background we decided to vote in favour of two of these draft resolutions and to abstain on the other four. I should like to set out more specifically the principal considerations which determined this position.

264. We can support many of the provisions contained in draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1. It is with regret, therefore, that we decided to abstain, as this text also contains a number of formulations which we cannot accept. In particular my Government would not wish to be associated with the implication of bad faith on the part of certain members of the contact group of Western countries, as contained in operative paragraph 31. Furthermore, operative paragraph 17 condemns what it calls the collusion of a number of Governments with South Africa. These include two which, as members of the contact group, are actively engaged in negotiations which we hope will bring independence to Namibia, in accordance with resolution 435 (1978). To condemn them in this draft resolution seems to us unwar-

ranted and unnecessarily divisive. Operative paragraph 7 of this draft resolution gives explicit support to armed struggle. We know that the rights of the people of Namibia have so far been denied them, and we fully understand the anger and sense of frustration which drive Namibians to take up arms to secure independence. However, we do not wish to see the Assembly endorse violence, especially at a time when other forms of activity by the international community directed towards the achievement of Namibian independence by peaceful means are under way. As regards the reference to SWAPO in this and other draft resolutions, I would stress that Ireland appreciates fully the leading role which SWAPO plays in seeking independence for Namibia. We note, of course, that when and if free and fair elections are held under United Nations supervision—a proposal which SWAPO has already accepted and which we strongly support—the people of Namibia will themselves have a full opportunity to choose their representatives freely and through a democratic electoral process.

265. Draft resolution A/36/L.24 requests individual Member States to apply unilaterally a broad range of sanctions, many of which we do not favour. It is our view that if sanctions are to be effective they must be carefully chosen and co-ordinated and must be imposed by decisions of the Security Council in full accordance with the Charter. The measures in this draft resolution are in our view excessive. Furthermore, they are unlikely to be effective if adopted merely in the form of a General Assembly resolution. Accordingly, my delegation will abstain on this draft resolution.

266. We shall vote in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.25, because we generally support the activities of the Council for Namibia and many of its recommendations. However, as our voting on some of the other draft resolutions will indicate, we have difficulties about certain recommendations of the Council, and as we have previously indicated, we also have some reservations about the powers of the Council in regard to certain issues.

267. My delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/36/L.26. We recognize fully the importance of action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia, and we support many aspects of the draft resolution. However, we have difficulties with operative paragraph 5. We do not think it wise or useful to instruct the Secretary-General and the Administrator of UNDP to end all dealings by United Nations agencies with unnamed corporations, and we do not wish to see the General Assembly on this rather ill-defined basis interfere with the competences of the specialized agencies as regards contracts.

268. We feel also that it is important that international public opinion should be mobilized so as to assist the people of Namibia in exercising their right to self-determination and independence. For this reason we have in the past voted in favour of draft resolutions on the dissemination of information on Namibia. We would have wished this year to vote also in favour of draft resolution A/36/L.27. However, we note that a new and divisive element has been included in operative paragraph 4. This would have the Assembly decide to launch an international campaign to expose and denounce certain unnamed Western countries for what is called collusion with South Africa. We cannot accept that proposal. We believe it would be harmful rather than helpful to the objectives which we all seek. Accordingly, and to our regret, we are obliged to abstain on a draft resolution which we could have otherwise supported.

269. As heretofore, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution on the United Nations Fund for Namibia, A/36/L.28. I will take this opportunity to say also that the Government of Ireland will in the near future make an additional contribution of 16,000 Irish pounds, that is, some $25,000, to the Fund for 1981. This is in addition to the contribution of $13,000 which Ireland already made in March of this year.

270. Mr. ALBERT (Seychelles): It is indeed a blatant defiance of the United Nations by the South African régime in that to this day, despite all the endeavours of the world Organization, the Pretoria régime maintains its illegal occupation of Namibia.

271. The Republic of Seychelles wishes to take this opportunity to express further its condemnation of the South African régime for its complete disregard of world opinion. At the same time we also wish to draw the attention of the Assembly to the relentlessly increasing aggressiveness of the racist Pretoria régime.

272. The *apartheid* régime of Pretoria has extended the front line to an additional State. Despite the vast expanse of the waters of the Indian Ocean which separate the Republic of Seychelles from South Africa, the Pretoria régime has deemed it acceptable to indulge in subversive activities against the legitimate Government of Seychelles and its peace-loving people. There is every reason to believe that the South African régime was actively engaged in the 25 November 1981 foreign mercenary invasion of the Republic of Seychelles. As the Assembly knows, most of the mercenaries fled back to South Africa in panic by hijacking a civilian aircraft with all its passengers on board. The mercenaries are now free in South Africa. The vigilance, unity and determination of the people of Seychelles led to the foiling of yet another contemptible act of aggression against an African nation by the racists of South Africa. The Pretoria régime will be vanquished.

273. My delegation reiterates the unwavering solidarity of the people of the Republic of Seychelles with the Namibian people in their struggle to free themselves from the domination of the Pretoria régime. We hail SWAPO, the only legitimate representative of the Namibian people, for its victories against the Pretoria régime. Let the recent victory of the people and defence forces of Seychelles be yet another success to add to those of African peoples struggling against the South African racists.

274. The Government of the Republic of Seychelles fully supports draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1 and will vote for it.

275. Mr. TOMA (Samoa): The Samoan delegation fully shares the view reflected in the draft resolutions on Namibia that South Africa has no right whatever to remain in that Territory. The latter must be allowed to achieve independence as soon as possible. Clearly, the thrust of the major draft resolutions is in the direction of pressuring South Africa to relinquish its illegal control of Namibia. We fully support that objective and will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions that are before us.

276. We are not convinced, however, that all the measures proposed in draft resolution A/36/L.24 are entirely helpful in achieving the results that we all so much want to see, nor are we of the view that Governments can properly take all the actions specifically requested of them in that draft resolution. While we agree that Governments should be urged to do all in their power collectively to impress

upon South Africa that it cannot continue to ignore world opinion on Namibia, it is of fundamental importance that the exercise of governmental power does not infringe unreasonably on the rights and freedoms of the individual. The stability of our own society—and I am sure of many others—rests on this fundamental principle.

277. We have no links, contacts or dealings of any kind with South Africa. Nevertheless, we have reservations on some elements contained in operative paragraphs 2 and 6 of draft resolution A/36/L.24.

278. We also have real doubts about the usefulness of selective accusations of the most serious kind such as those contained in draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1 and again reflected in A/36/L.27.

279. In regard to the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, dealt with in draft resolution A/36/L.25, we have reservations and wonder about the appropriateness of mandating a United Nations body such as the Council for Namibia to concern itself with the progress of the military aspects of the armed struggle.

280. Mr. VELLA (Malta): As in previous years, my delegation will support the draft resolutions on Namibia out of respect for the strong feelings of the people of that Territory and of the African continent as a whole. However, that does not mean that we agree with every single provision of the draft resolutions, some of which are, in our view, insufficiently precise or too sweeping in their content.

281. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): On more than one occasion my country has had an opportunity to remind the General Assembly of its Government's position on the question of Namibia. I shall not repeat it now.

282. I wish only to recall the fact that our country adheres very closely to the full and rapid implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which deals with the settlement of the question of Namibia. In this connection, we should like once again to make an urgent appeal to those who sponsored that resolution to do everything in their power to help the Security Council have it implemented.

283. Therefore, for reasons having to do with principle as much as logic, we consider that the wording of operative paragraph 17 of draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1 should have been revised. However, my delegation, which is honoured to be a sponsor of some of the draft resolutions before us, will vote in favour of the texts under consideration, subject to the comments that I have just made.

284. Mr. Van LIEROP (Vanuatu): We have listened with respect to the views of those who have preceded us in explaining their vote on the draft resolutions and, in all sincerity, we appreciate all that those delegations have said. We wish to make it clear that in sponsoring the draft resolutions we have no quarrel with any State except the Republic of South Africa. We share with those who have spoken an abhorrence of violence. It is unfortunate, however, that those who would impose slavery occasionally make it mandatory that some violence be resorted to in defence of freedom.

285. We shall vote for the draft resolutions, and in doing so we again wish to emphasize that that vote is not cast against any other State except the Republic of South Africa and, more importantly, that vote is cast for the people of Namibia and for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

286. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka has consistently supported the principle of self-determination for peoples not yet politically independent. We welcomed the General Assembly's adoption by acclamation of resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, which contains the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In keeping with the spirit and the letter of that Declaration, the Organization has welcomed during the last 21 years a considerable number of former colonial and non-self-governing territories as sovereign independent Member States. Sri Lanka has rejoiced with all others in the Assembly at the increasing degree of universality of membership that that development has produced.

287. We are now about to consider a number of draft resolutions on Namibia, a Territory which is larger in size than most countries represented here, a land rich in mineral resources. This former colony was placed under mandate by the League of Nations at the conclusion of the First World War but unfortunately has continued to be administered by South Africa in violation of both Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and in defiance of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.[9]

288. The Sri Lanka delegation has never had any reservations about the right of the Namibian people to determine its own future, nor have we ever doubted the illegality of South Africa's administration of Namibia. We are very much aware of and have been considerably encouraged by the diplomatic initiatives taken by the contact group of Western countries since 1978 to enable the Namibian people to assert its right to independence through fair and free elections in which all Namibians could participate.

289. It is for that reason that my Government has been a firm supporter of the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which carried with it so much promise of an internationally acceptable solution to this problem that has been on the agenda of the General Assembly since 1947. It is not necessary at this stage for me to refer in detail to the various dimensions of the question of Namibia that form the subject of draft resolutions A/36/L.23/Rev.1 and L.24 to L.28. We are in full sympathy with the objectives of those draft resolutions, and our views are identical with those of the sponsoring delegations in so far as the general thrust of those draft resolutions is concerned. Sri Lanka will therefore vote in favour of each of those draft resolutions.

290. However, the Sri Lanka delegation must once again reiterate and reaffirm its well-known view that we would have been much happier had the explicit and selective references to certain Member States in draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1 been avoided. If a message is to go out from the Assembly to the Government of the Republic of South Africa, then it is our view that that message should reflect the totality and unanimity of the views and feelings of all the States Members of the Organization. Such unanimity would strengthen our call to South Africa immeasurably. The selective references to certain named countries in operative paragraph 17 of that draft resolution are a particular illustration of such a disadvantage in that draft resolution. It is our belief that the draft resolution would have commended itself to the entirety of our membership had those references not been made.

291. Mr. FLEMMING (Saint Lucia): Saint Lucia will vote affirmatively on all the draft resolutions concerning

Namibia. However, Saint Lucia is most distressed by the wording of a number of the draft resolutions, particularly those that single out certain States for condemnation.

292. Saint Lucia has consistently maintained that it is a dangerous Orwellian game to ask the contact group to press South Africa to release Namibia while, on the other hand, asking it to have no contact whatsoever with South Africa.

293. In any event, Saint Lucia's reservations in no way derogate from Saint Lucia's support for the people of Namibia or for SWAPO.

294. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to the vote on the draft resolutions. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions is found in document A/36/815.

295. The General Assembly will first take a decision on draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1 and Add.1, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 27 abstentions (resolution 36/121 A).

296. Mr. CALDERÓN (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation had not intended to participate in the vote on draft resolution A/36/L.23/Rev.1 and Add.1.

297. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution A/36/L.24 and Add.1 is entitled "Action by Member States in support of Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 118 votes to none, with 29 abstentions (resolution 36/121 B).

298. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/36/L.25 and Add.1, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway,

Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 10 abstentions (resolution 36/121 C).

299. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution A/36/L.26 and Add.1 is entitled "Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 127 votes to none, with 20 abstentions (resolution 36/121 D).

300. The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution A/36/L.27 and Add.1, entitled "Dissemination of information on Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 23 abstentions (resolution 36/121 E).

301. The PRESIDENT: Next we turn to draft resolution A/36/L.28 and Add.1, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia". A recorded vote was requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 142 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 36/121 F).

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

NOTES

[1] The delegations of Djibouti, Malawi, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka and Zimbabwe subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of draft resolution A.

[2] The delegations of Djibouti, Malawi and Solomon Islands subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of draft resolution B; the delegation of the Netherlands that it had intended to abstain.

[3] The delegations of Botswana, Congo and Samoa subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[4] The delegations of Botswana and Congo subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

[5] The delegations of Botswana and Congo subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution.

[6] The delegations of Botswana and Congo subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

[7] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year,* 2267th to 2277th meetings.

[8] *Ibid.,* 2296th to 2300th meetings.

[9] *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.

[10] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24,* vol. I, annex II.

[11] A/CONF.107/1.

[12] A/CONF.107/8, sect. X, A.

[13] See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year,* 2275th and 2277th meetings.

[14] *Ibid., Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1981,* documents S/14459, S/14460/Rev.1, S/14461 and S/14462.