



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.114

16 December 1985

ENGLISH

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 12 December 1985, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. DE PINIÉS

(Spain)

- United Nations Conference for the promotion of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy [37]
 - (a) Report of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference for the promotion of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy
 - (b) Draft resolution
 - (c) Report of the Fifth Committee
- Question of Palestine [33]
 - (a) Report of the Committee on the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people
 - (b) Report of the Secretary-General
 - (c) Draft resolutions
 - (d) Report of the Fifth Committee

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 37

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE FOR THE PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

- (a) REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE FOR THE PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY (A/40/47)
- (b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/40/L.35)
- (c) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/40/1031)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call first on the representative of Yugoslavia, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/40/L.35.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): On behalf of Bulgaria, Italy and Yugoslavia, I am particularly honoured to introduce draft resolution A/40/L.35 relating to the preparations for the convening of the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy. We are gratified that once again this year we have a General Assembly draft resolution sponsored by the Group of 77 as well as the current Chairmen of the regional groups of the East-European Socialist Countries and of the West European and Other States. That indeed reflects the spirit of co-operation and the objective approach and commitment to the aims and objectives of the Conference.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

At the recent sixth session of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, further progress was made in the preparations for this Conference. The key decisions and recommendations of the Preparatory Committee are reflected in draft resolution A/40/L.35.

It consists of four preambular and six operative paragraphs. I need not go into all the details, since I am sure that all delegations are aware of its contents. However, I should like to point out its main features which have been introduced this year especially in the light of the accomplishments of the Preparatory Committee during its sixth session, held in Vienna from 11 October to 1 November 1985.

First, the General Assembly approves the conclusions and decisions contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee on its sixth session and particularly the decision that the Conference should be held at Geneva from 23 March to 10 April 1987.

Secondly, the General Assembly expresses its appreciation for the efforts of the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and the Secretary-General of the Conference in accordance with the resolution adopted by the General Assembly last year.

Thirdly, in view of the constructive efforts made by the Secretary-General of the Conference, the General Assembly requests the Secretary-General to continue with the preparations for the Conference.

Fourthly, the General Assembly invites the International Atomic Energy Agency, the specialized agencies and other relevant organizations of the United Nations to contribute further to the preparations of the Conference by revising and updating, as necessary and appropriate, their input documents for the Conference.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

Fifthly, the General Assembly invites all States to co-operate actively in the preparation for the Conference and to make available at the earliest the information requested in paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 36/78 and in the broad questionnaire circulated by the Secretary-General of the Conference in March 1984.

But, above all, the decisions contained in the draft resolution reflect the fact that the General Assembly had in mind that the decision had been brought at the sixth session of the Preparatory Committee on the establishment of a working group with the mandate to carry out formal and official inter-sessional intergovernmental work under the guidance of the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee. It should be recalled that participation in the working group is open to members of the Preparatory Committee and to other interested Member States, and that the working group should conclude its deliberations in time to submit its report to the Preparatory Committee for consideration at its seventh session to be held in Vienna from 10 to 21 November 1986.

There is every reason to consider that decision of the Preparatory Committee as vital in carrying out further preparations for a successful holding and outcome of the Conference. It is firmly and rightfully expected that the working group, under the guidance of the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, would assess the current situation regarding international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and formulate options and alternatives on appropriate ways and measures for the promotion and enhancement of such co-operation. It is also of crucial importance for the success of the Conference that the working group develop and outline the final document or documents indicating the preliminary structure and possible elements based on its assessment of the current situation in international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

The convening of the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy has attracted the attention of a number of recent international meetings and gatherings. Thus, for instance, the final document of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons expressed its satisfaction at the progress in the preparations for the United Nations Conference.

Also, the Third Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty expressed its conviction that the Conference on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy will fully realize its goals in accordance with the objectives of resolution 32/50 and relevant subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly for the development of national programmes of peaceful uses of nuclear energy for economic and social development, especially in the developing countries.

Furthermore, the Ministerial Conference of the Non-aligned Countries, held in September this year at Luanda, Angola, in its concluding declaration also expressed satisfaction over the progress made in the preparations for the United Nations Conference on the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy for economic and social development, in the interest of developing countries and the international community as a whole. The Ministers of the non-aligned countries have stressed the necessity for continued detailed preparations with the active participation of all countries, in order fully to realize the goals of the Conference. The Ministers have reaffirmed their conviction that the results of the Conference should contribute to free and unhampered access, on a just and non-discriminatory basis, to the nuclear technology, equipment and materials needed for the development of national programmes of peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

These clearly underline the special importance attached to the Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy by the international community as a whole and the fact that the Conference represents the most appropriate forum for consideration of all elements of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

We attach extreme importance to the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, the convening of which was initiated eight years ago. The initiative undertaken at that time was aimed, and still is, at creating an equitable and just basis for international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The intention of that action was to determine principles and to reach a new international consensus which would serve as a basis for relations and the promotion of co-operation in this field on a non-discriminatory basis.

We believe that the momentum reached at the fifth session of the Preparatory Committee will be vigorously pursued and that the outcome of the Conference will be successful.

On behalf of the sponsors, I express the hope that the General Assembly will, this time too, adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now begin the voting process and take a decision on draft resolution A/40/L.35.

The programme budget implications of that draft resolution appear in the report of the Fifth Committee (A/40/1031).

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution A/40/L.35?

Draft resolution A/40/L.35 was adopted (resolution 40/95).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 37.

AGENDA ITEM 33 (continued)

QUESTION OF PALESTINE

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE EXERCISE OF THE INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE (A/40/35)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/40/168)
- (c) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/40/L.23 to A/40/L.25, A/40/L.41)
- (d) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/40/1032)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): May I remind representatives that the debate on this item was concluded at the 103rd plenary meeting, held on Wednesday, 4 December 1985.

The Assembly has before it draft resolutions A/40/L.23 to A/40/L.25 and A/40/L.41.

I call first on the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Mr. Massamba Sarré, to introduce the draft resolutions.

Mr. SARRE (Senegal), Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (interpretation from French): On behalf of the following sponsors: Afghanistan, Cuba, Cyprus, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, India, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Pakistan, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Senegal, and on behalf of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, I would like to introduce the four draft resolutions to which the President has just referred: namely, A/40/L.23, L. 24, L. 25 and L. 41.

The Committee welcomed the serious-minded constructive discussion that was held in this forum and the unanimous support shown for its work and recommendations that appear in its report to the fortieth session of the General Assembly. It was firmly encouraged also by the strengthening of the political will to reach a peaceful solution to the question of Palestine, expressed by the various participants in the discussion in the Assembly on this item, as well as on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of this Organization.

Bearing in mind the desire to reach a comprehensive, equitable solution to this question, expressed by the overwhelming majority of the international community, the draft resolutions now before the Assembly seek primarily to find the means to bring about that goal. Thus the first draft resolution, A/40/L.23 concerns the work of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and also contains its mandate for the year 1986. In this draft resolution the General Assembly endorses the recommendations of the Committee contained in its report and draws the attention of the Security Council to the fact that action is still awaited.

It requests the Committee to continue to keep under review the situation relating to the question of Palestine, as well as the implementation of the

(Mr. Sarré, Chairman, Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People)

programme of action adopted by the 1983 Geneva Conference, and requests that suggestions be made to the General Assembly and the Security Council, as appropriate. Furthermore, it authorizes the Committee to continue to exert all efforts to promote the implementation of its recommendations and is requested to extend its co-operation to non-governmental organizations in their contribution towards heightening international awareness of the facts relating to the question of Palestine.

Draft resolution A/40/L.24 deals with the tasks of the Division for Palestinian Rights, which works in close consultation with the Committee and under its guidance. In this draft resolution the General Assembly notes with appreciation the action taken by the Secretary-General in compliance with last year's resolution and asks him to provide the Division for Palestinian Rights with the necessary resources to accomplish its tasks and to expand its work programme, particularly through additional meetings for non-governmental organizations.

The Assembly also invites governments and organizations to co-operate with the Committee and with the Division for Palestinian rights in the performance of their tasks, and it notes with appreciation the action taken by Member States to observe annually, on 29 November, the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People.

Draft resolution A/40/L.25 deals with the activities of the Department of Public Information regarding the question of Palestine. The resolution enumerates the activities that the Department of Public Information has been performing for two years and of which the Committee, in its annual report, takes note with satisfaction.

(Mr. Sarré, Chairman, Committee on the
Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of
the Palestinian People)

The only new parts of this resolution and of last year's resolution are those regarding the production of new films and radio and television broadcasts on the question of Palestine.

Draft resolution A/40/L.41 deals with the most important aspect of the work of our Committee, namely the convening of an international conference for peace in the Middle East. As representatives know, the international community now acknowledges that this is the best way to achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting solution, not only for the question of the Middle East, but also for the question of Palestine which, as the Assembly knows, is the core of the Israeli-Arab conflict.

In its work programme, the Committee gave priority to continuing efforts to bring about the convening of that conference, and it was strongly encouraged by the positive reply by governments concerned, which understand more than ever before the need urgently to take specific steps.

In this draft resolution the General Assembly reaffirms its endorsement of the call for convening the conference, in keeping with its previous resolution. While it regrets the position of two Governments with regard to the conference, as indicated in the report of the Secretary-General, the General Assembly nevertheless calls upon these Governments to reconsider their positions with regard to convening the conference as a way of establishing peace in the Middle East. Furthermore, it stresses the urgent need for additional constructive efforts by all governments in order to convene the conference without further delay.

Finally, it calls upon the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Security Council, to continue efforts in that direction.

The Committee prepared these draft resolutions in a constructive spirit and in the hope that it can contribute to the efforts made by the international community

(Mr. Sarró, Chairman, Committee on the
Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of
the Palestinian People)

to resolve a question that has beset this Organization for so long and which has caused so much material destruction and human suffering to all parties concerned.

As the General Assembly can see, the draft resolutions now before the Assembly for its endorsement are devoid of any emotion, any criticism, any condemnation. They are based solely on objectivity and they also reflect international realities. It is essentially on this basis that these draft resolutions are submitted.

We believe that it is in the interests of all parties concerned to ensure that the draft resolutions are adopted in order that the relevant bodies of the United Nations may finally embark on the long-awaited dialogue to restore peace to the Middle East and to ensure that the rights of all peoples and of all States in the region can be observed in the best way, which is to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and thus end the threats to international peace and security.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on any or all of the four draft resolutions. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their votes after all the votes have been taken.

I should like to remind the Assembly that, under rule 88 of the rules of procedure, "The President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment".

May I also remind representatives that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. PHILIPPE (Luxembourg) (interpretation from French): It is my honour to speak on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community, as well as Spain and Portugal, to explain our votes on the draft resolutions before us.

Our views on the principles that should be applied to ensure peace in the Middle East are well known to the Assembly, where they were again stated last week.

We are ready to support any constructive effort which seeks a solution to the question of Palestine and more generally to work out a comprehensive, just, lasting settlement to the Middle East conflict.

As we have stressed so many times, we have no objection in principle to the convening of international conferences. At an appropriate time the holding of an international conference could provide a major contribution to bringing about a negotiated settlement. However, we believe that considerable preparatory work remains to be done if we wish to bring together the necessary elements for a successful outcome. We think that we should maintain and intensify our efforts towards a process of negotiation and in this context we again note the value of the action taken by the King of Jordan and the Jordanian-Palestinian Agreement concluded on 11 February 1985.

(Mr. Philippe, Luxembourg)

Draft resolution A/40/L.41 seems to lack balance, particularly because of the weight it places on the views of one of the parties concerned in the conflict. The eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution is unacceptable because it does not reflect the balanced position adopted by all Member States of the United Nations on terrorism in resolution 40/61 of 9 December 1985.

We wish to reaffirm our categorical condemnation of all acts of terrorism wherever they occur and whoever the perpetrators might be. Furthermore, we believe that language such as that found in the fourth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, which would isolate and criticize two of the proposed participants in a conference, is not useful or productive.

As regards draft resolution A/40/L.25, we hope that the Department of Public Information will in its work continue to base itself on the principle of impartiality and that it will stick to its usual decision-making process.

With regard to draft resolutions A/40/L.24 and A/40/L.25, we regret that the total amount of the supplementary expenditures is several times over the amounts reflected in the draft programme budget. We believe that, given the difficult international financial situation, all efforts should be made not to impose unnecessary burdens on the United Nations budget.

Mr. OKUN (United States of America): The United States has one overriding criterion in deciding its position on United Nations General Assembly resolutions pertaining to the Arab-Israeli conflict: Do they advance or retard efforts towards peace? The United States has worked ceaselessly for the establishment of the just and lasting peace without which restoration of legitimate Palestinian rights are impossible. The draft resolutions before this body today

(Mr. Okun, United States)

are unbalanced, unfair and unpromising. Rather than helping to create the atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence vital to the negotiating process, their partisan rhetoric only contributes to putting off the day when the parties to the conflict can sit down together to reach a mutually acceptable resolution of their differences. My Government has no choice but to vote no on these draft resolutions.

Draft resolutions A/40/L.23, L.24 and L.25 endorse the work of two agencies which the United States has consistently opposed because of their inherent and blatant biases: the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat. The draft resolutions call for activities by these two bodies and by the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat which - in addition to being costly - invariably propagate partial, partisan views of the Palestine issue. Such views neither hope nor seek to advance negotiated solutions.

Draft resolution A/40/L.41 raises yet again the chimera of an international peace conference on the Middle East. My Government understands the importance of a supportive international context for efforts to bring peace to the region. However, as the United States has stated repeatedly in this body and other forums, an international conference as envisaged by this draft resolution would neither yield a constructive examination of the Middle East question nor contribute to the urgent task of finding a lasting solution to the Palestinian problem. Instead, such a conference would be an ideological and propagandistic exercise directed against the State of Israel and would serve the ends only of those nations which feel they benefit from a continuation or an increase in tensions of the region.

There is but one route to peace which can provide positive results, that of direct negotiations. The process begun at Camp David in 1978 and the Egypt-Israel Treaty the following year, which were firmly based on the principles set forth in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), established peace between

(Mr. Okun, United States)

two neighbours which had been at war for a generation and led to an Israeli withdrawal. These successes should leave no doubt as to the truth of our assertion that direct negotiations are the road to peace.

My Government also finds totally unacceptable the critical references in this draft resolution to American opposition to an international conference and its call upon us to reconsider our position. We find this intrusion on United States Government policy decisions extremely inappropriate in a United Nations resolution and harmful to peace efforts.

My Government finds equally unacceptable the paragraph of this draft resolution which describes Israel as guilty of:

"... acts of terrorism ... against the Palestinian people and the Arab nation". (A/40/L.41, eighth preambular paragraph)

We categorically reject this charge, which equates the Government of Israel with the perpetrators of the vicious acts of terrorism which have so tragically marked the Middle East.

We remain convinced that President Reagan's proposals of 1 September 1982, still embody the most workable elements for a peace which can reconcile the legitimate security concerns of Israel and the legitimate needs of the Palestinian people. We invite the parties to the conflict to take up the challenge of peace and to resolve in direct negotiations among themselves the issues involved in this long-standing dispute.

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I should like to comment on draft resolutions A/40/L. 23, L. 24 and L. 25 all together, in one unit. I shall not comment on the distorted nature of the material and the symposiums and the forums recommended here, and the various facilities and the material that flows through them. I shall dispense with the detailing of the distortions and derailing of the truth and deal with something else: that is, the misallocation of resources.

The allocation of money, some of which is detailed here, is part of the total allocation of the United Nations budget for the matters relating to the question of Palestine. For 1986, by our calculation, we are dealing with more than \$6 million for services involving the issue of Palestine. This does not include the \$0.5 million cost of the actual debate on the Palestine issue. Some of these overall allocations include \$1 million for public information on the question of Palestine; \$2.2 million for conference and library services for the question of Palestine; \$1.3 million for the division of Palestine refugees, in addition to the itemized numbers just circulated here in the plenary meeting.

It is instructive, I think, to compare that allocation in the United Nations - over \$6 million - with the total allocation, by our compilation, for the question of apartheid, which amounts to roughly \$1.5 million. In other words, more money will be spent just on the conference and library services for the question of Palestine than for all the services combating apartheid combined. This money will be used for the question of Palestine on various Palestinian divisions, travel and conference arrangements, air travel and hotel bookings - which are not by any means of the lowest class, to put it mildly.

Arab oil producers have earned an estimated \$100 billion in revenues for 1985. They have not however put their money where their mouths are. Instead, they have not only hijacked the United Nations agenda, as they often have in the past,

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

have hijacked the budget, the resources, of the United Nations for tremendous sums of money that could otherwise have been channelled to end hunger, to combat apartheid or to a number of other worthy causes that truly merit the attention and resources of this Organization.

For those and other reasons, my Government will vote no on draft resolutions A/40/L.23, L.24 and L.25.

On draft resolution A/40/L.41, on the international conference, again I do not want to go into a detailed discussion of our position vis-à-vis an international conference; we have spoken about it many times, as have the leaders of Israel. We believe, as we have stated repeatedly, that the one sure and tested road to peace is through direct negotiations and, of course, we would welcome a faithful and genuine expression of support by the international community.

When some of those well-meaning countries which have supported the concept of an international conference - with which we often disagree, but I am talking about well-meaning countries alone - look at this draft resolution and its language, I think they immediately identify its grossly distorting elements. There is not much one can add to a draft resolution that praises the PLO, lauds the PLO position and condemns Israel for terrorism and singles out Israel and the United States. These matters are obvious, but let me point out what perhaps is not all that obvious. Those that are not genuinely concerned with peace and would like to arrange such a conference are actually defeating their own purposes, because they call for a conference with Israel and at the same time condemn it as a non-peace-loving State. That is close to the worst thing that can be said about a State in the United Nations. One does not call for a peace conference with a nation that one condemns as a non-peace-loving State. There is a built-in contradiction here, and

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

it derives from the true intention of those that have drafted this very extreme and very unbalanced draft resolution. It is that they do not really wish the conference to be a forum of genuine peace, but simply to use it as a propaganda forum, for which this draft resolution is merely the beginning.

For those reasons, my Government will of course vote "no" on draft resolution A/40/L.41 as well.

Mr. ARTACHO (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): In a statement made on 3 December in the General Assembly, the Ambassador of Luxembourg set forth the central elements of the position of the member countries of the European Community on the question of Palestine, which my country fully shares.

My delegation wishes to express the Spanish Government's deep concern with regard to the lack of tangible results on the problem of Palestine. For my Government, the just and peaceful solution of the question of Palestine is a necessary condition of the establishment of lasting peace in the Middle East. Such a solution must be based on Israel's withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967; the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries; and respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination.

To the extent that they reflect those basic principles, Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) are a sound point of departure in the search for a just and comprehensive solution to the Middle East conflict. However, the Spanish Government considers that the Security Council should definitively spell out the foundations for the solution of the problem, supplementing resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) with a formulation expressing clear and unequivocal recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

(Mr. Artacho, Spain)

In conformity with this position of principle, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/40/L.23, L.24 and L.25.

The Spanish Government has supported the repeated call for an international conference on peace in the Middle East, because we believe that no peace initiative should be ruled out a priori if it could lead to a just, comprehensive solution of the problem. My delegation could have continued endorsing that appeal, as contained in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/40/L.41, but the introduction into the text of controversial elements, in the fourth and eighth preambular paragraphs and in operative paragraph 5 will prevent us from supporting it.

Mr. McDowell (New Zealand): Resolution of the Palestine question remains the key to a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East. For too long, and unjustly, the Palestinian people have been denied their legitimate rights, including in particular their right to self-determination, and to national independence if that is their wish.

New Zealand's recognition of the rights of the Palestinians is balanced by our recognition of Israel's right, like that of all States, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force. New Zealand, like most Members of this Organization, is confident that resolution 242 (1967) establishes the principles for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, a peace that will be achieved only through discussion, negotiation and conciliation. Regional proposals too have pointed the way to a settlement. We have been encouraged to believe that the statements made here a few weeks ago by King Hussein of Jordan and Prime Minister Peres of Israel, together with the Jordan/Palestine Accord of February this year, offer the prospect of a genuine dialogue. It is surely the responsibility of this Organization to build on these beginnings.

We are therefore disappointed that draft resolution A/40/L.41, containing the call for a Middle East peace conference, fails to take cognizance of these recent positive developments. New Zealand sees merit in the idea of a conference under United Nations auspices at which all the parties concerned could conduct direct negotiations. It will not, however, be timely to convene such a conference until those parties demonstrate the will and flexibility to resolve the dispute by peaceful means and the intention to achieve agreements that will ensure a just peace. Regrettably, that time does not yet appear to have come. For that reason, and because the draft resolutions being considered under this item do not reflect

urately the balance of principles in resolution 242 (1967) or provide a basis for a realistic settlement of the Palestinian problem, my delegation will abstain in the votes on all four draft resolutions.

Mr. TEO (Singapore): My delegation believes that the question of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East conflict. We shall therefore vote in favour of the draft resolutions before this Assembly today, since we regard them as positive contributions to the search for a comprehensive political solution.

My delegation is of the view that a just and durable solution of the question of Palestine must at one and the same time recognize the rights of the State of Israel. In this regard we would suggest the exchange of recognition between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). In order to encourage Israel and the PLO to move in this direction, the international community should urge them to pursue a course of mutual accommodation and compromise. Those who continue to urge Israel not to have any dialogue with the PLO are not helping the process of mutual accommodation. On the other hand, those States which continue to deny the right of Israel to exist are also not helping the cause of peace.

My delegation therefore appeals to both Israel and the PLO to recognize each other's legitimate rights.

My delegation supports the establishment of a Palestinian homeland in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and cannot accept the annexation of those territories by Israel. My delegation also fully supports the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, particularly resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which establish the fundamental basis for a genuine, stable and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Mr. SKOGMO (Norway): Norway has always supported all efforts which could lead to a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, based on the principles of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). We have also maintained that it must be up to the parties to the conflict themselves to determine which negotiating formula would serve progress towards lasting peace in the Middle East. We would be more than willing to support the proposal to convene

(Mr. Skogmo, Norway)

an international peace conference on the Middle East, if this is acceptable to all of the parties who are supposed to take part in the negotiations within that conference.

If the General Assembly should pronounce itself on the convening of an international peace conference, the Norwegian Government believes that it should be done in terms which would make it easier and not more difficult for the parties concerned to accept the conference model. We deeply regret that draft resolution A/40/L.41 before us is a step in the wrong direction. We find it to be singularly unconstructive. We find the formulations contained in the fourth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 5, on the attitudes of the United States of America and Israel to the conference, to be inappropriate, since they do not reflect the constructive steps taken by those two countries during the last few months.

Finally, we find the formulations of the eighth preambular paragraph to be misleading and offensive, since they do not mention some of the most serious terrorist activities in the Middle East. We shall therefore vote against those three paragraphs if they are put to separate votes. Norway will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. LEE (Canada): With regard to draft resolution A/40/L.41, my delegation regrets that this year we find it necessary to vote against the draft resolution on the subject of an international peace conference on the Middle East, because it contains extraneous and unacceptable language. The events of this past year, and especially statements made recently in the Assembly by the leaders of the two parties most directly concerned had led us to believe that an opportunity was close at hand for achieving progress towards agreement on an international format within which a comprehensive peace settlement could be directly negotiated. In

(Mr. Lee, Canada)

that context, a renewed appeal in constructive terms for an international peace conference on the Middle East could have held promise of positive impact.

However, the inclusion in the text of unsubstantiated controversial accusations and intemperate language, which assuredly will not contribute to an atmosphere propitious for peace talks, leaves my delegation no alternative but to vote against draft resolution A/40/L.41.

On the other texts before us this afternoon, the position of my delegation is already well known.

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): My delegation has had occasion in the debate on agenda item 33 in the Assembly to express its position on the question of Palestine. We have expressed our support for the struggle conducted by the Palestinian people to recover its inalienable right to independence and freedom, and its right to have a State, in conformity with General Assembly resolution 181 (II), and Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

For that reason, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/40/L.23 and L.24. However, my delegation will be obliged to abstain in the voting on draft resolutions A/40/L.25 and L.41, because of the criticisms that have been expressed therein against Member States which furthermore are parties concerned in the peaceful settlement to this conflict and which are concerned in the international peace conference in the Middle East - a conference my delegation supports. I refer in particular to paragraph 2 (c) of draft resolution A/40/L.25, and the fourth and eighth preambular paragraphs and paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/40/L.41.

Mr. FLORESTAL (Haiti) (interpretation from French): The question of Palestine, which has been with us for some time but remains ever new, calls our attention once again to the importance of a speedy negotiated solution for peace in the Middle East. My delegation, mindful of the problem and willing as always to co-operate in efforts under way to bring about true peace, would have liked to have supported the three draft resolutions now before the Assembly, which basically aim at that precise goal. Unfortunately, we are obliged to enter reservations on the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/40/L.41, for the following reasons. First, the Sixth Committee in its wisdom preferred to defer consideration of a definition of State terrorism. We wonder, then, what objective criterion was used by the sponsors of the draft resolution. Secondly, the holding of a conference presupposes the co-operation of all parties concerned. That means that there must be not only a halt on the battlefield but also a halt to rhetoric. It is particularly appropriate now to ensure restraint, not only in the field but also in the use of rhetoric which could be inflammatory.

That part of the text to which we object adds nothing to the draft resolution; on the contrary it merely adds grist to the mill of those who believe it is not appropriate now to hold such a conference. That is why we would have preferred

(Mr. Florestal, Haiti)

that the text of that paragraph be amended. If there is a separate vote on it, my delegation will have to vote against, and it will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Before proceeding to the voting, I should like to inform the Assembly that the following countries have become sponsors of draft resolution A/40/L.23: Cyprus, Gambia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Pakistan, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The following countries have become sponsors of draft resolution A/40/L.24: Cyprus, Gambia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Pakistan, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The following countries have become sponsors of draft resolution A/40/L.25: Cyprus, Gambia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Pakistan, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The following countries have become sponsors of draft resolution A/40/L.41: the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia and Pakistan.

The Assembly will now take decisions on the various draft resolutions.

The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolutions is in document A/40/1032.

The Assembly will first take a decision on draft resolution A/40/L.23.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

- In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, 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, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe
- Against: Israel, United States of America
- Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Solomon Islands, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution A/40/L.23 was adopted by 128 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions (resolution 40/96 A).*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/40/L.24.

A recorded vote has been requested.

*Subsequently the delegations of Burkina Faso and the Islamic Republic of Iran advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Solomon Islands, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/40/L.24 was adopted by 129 votes to 3, with 20 abstentions (resolution 40/96 B).*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We turn now to draft resolution A/40/L.25.

A recorded vote has been requested.

*Subsequently the delegation of Burkina Faso and the Islamic Republic of Iran advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Solomon Islands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire

Draft resolution A/40/L.25 was adopted by 131 votes to 3, with 18 abstentions (resolution 40/96 C).*

*Subsequently the delegation of Burkina Faso and the Islamic Republic of Iran advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/40/L.41.

Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the fourth and eighth preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraphs 2 and 5. If I hear no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

I first put to the vote the fourth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Solomon Islands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, Maldives, Mauritius, Nepal, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Zaire

The fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/40/L.41 was adopted by 84 votes to 22, with 39 abstentions.*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now vote on the eighth preambular paragraph.

*Subsequently the delegation of Burkina Faso advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Solomon Islands, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Maldives, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Singapore, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

The eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/40/L.41 was adopted by 79 votes to 33, with 32 abstentions.*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We shall now vote on operative paragraph 2.

*Subsequently the delegation of Burkina Faso advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Sierra Leone had intended to vote against.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, 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, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Canada, Israel, Malawi, Solomon Islands, United States of America

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Belgium, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/40/L.41 was adopted by 111 votes to 6, with 29 abstentions.*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now put to the vote operative paragraph 5.

*Subsequently the delegation of Burkina Faso advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Solomon Islands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Nepal, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Zaire

Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/40/L.41 was adopted by 89 votes to 22, with 33 abstentions.*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

*Subsequently the delegation of Burkina Faso advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, 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, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Solomon Islands, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire

Draft resolution A/40/L.41, as a whole, was adopted by 107 votes to 3, with 41 abstentions (resolution 40/96 D).*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. KEISALO (Finland): The position of the Government of Finland on the question of Palestine is well know and remains unchanged. It has been explained in our statements in plenary meetings as well as in meetings of the Special Political Committee.

*Subsequently the Delegations of Burkina Faso and the Islamic Republic of Iran advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Reisalo, Finland)

My delegation abstained on draft resolutions A/40/L.23, L.24 and L.41 because they failed to represent the balance my Government finds a prerequisite for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement in the Middle East. With reference to draft resolution A/40/L.41, I wish to recall that Finland participated in the International Conference on the Question of Palestine in 1983 and joined in the consensus on the final documents of the Conference with certain reservations, which are on record. Our vote in favour of operative paragraph 2 indicates our support for the idea of convening an international conference on peace in the Middle East. We could not at this time vote in favour of draft resolution A/40/L.41 as a whole because it contains new elements and formulations which are unacceptable to us.

Mr. WOLLTER (Sweden): It is Sweden's position that the most appropriate forum for serious negotiations towards a peaceful solution of the Middle East conflict is to be found within the framework of an United Nations. My Government feels that direct negotiations between the parties within the framework of an international peace conference under United Nations auspices might be a workable arrangement. The positive vote cast by my delegation in the separate vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/40/L.41 demonstrates this view.

Against this background my delegation very much regrets that we are not able to support draft resolution A/40/L.41 as a whole. Last year we were able to support the corresponding resolution, but only after considerable hesitation. We continue to feel that it cannot be the intention of the resolution to attempt somehow to force Governments to come to a conference or to convene one without their agreement to participate. We do not question the sovereign right of the Governments concerned to decide for themselves on their participation.

(Mr. Wollter, Sweden)

Furthermore, we feel that irrelevant new elements have been introduced in this year's draft resolution. I am referring in particular to the sixth, seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs. These elements have created a bias in the resolution which limits the constructive role it could otherwise have played in the attempts to promote the concept of an international peace conference.

Mr. SOMMA (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): The four draft resolutions (A/40/L.23, A/40/L.24, A/40/L.25 and A/40/L.41), introduced on agenda item 33 and adopted by the General Assembly, are essentially inspired, as in previous years, by the Declaration on the Programme of Action adopted in Geneva in 1983 during the International Conference on the Question of Palestine.

In view of its continuing concern for the achievement of a peaceful, just and lasting solution of the problem, Uruguay formed part of the Geneva consensus and therefore voted in favour of the four draft resolutions. However, we wish to reiterate the reservations expressed by our delegation in connection with both of the documents adopted in Geneva contained in the note of 24 September 1983 sent to the Secretary-General of the Conference and included in its final report (A/CONF.114/42).

Mr. LAGORIO (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine delegation abstained from voting on the fourth and eighth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/40/L.41 because it considers that certain ideas in those paragraphs are not specifically relevant to the substance of the resolution just adopted. In particular, the fourth preambular paragraph tends to prejudge the future attitude of two sovereign States.

However, the Argentine delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, because the Argentine Government fully shares the ultimate aim of the draft resolution, that is, the convening of an international peace conference for the Middle East. In that connection, we believe that every effort should be made to bring about a just and lasting peace in this highly volatile area.

Mr. FISCHER (Austria): My delegation would like to explain its vote on resolution A/40/L.41. The Austrian delegation has consistently supported the concept of an international peace conference on the Middle East. Austria believes that such a conference could indeed make a major contribution towards a negotiated, just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict. However, Austria holds the view that the success of the conference will depend to a great extent on the agreement of all parties concerned to participate in such a conference.

The wording chosen by the sponsors does not seem to our delegation to be the most appropriate wording. Indeed, my delegation has some difficulty with the wording of some preambular paragraphs and with operative paragraph 5, because Austria, as a matter of principle, objected and continues to object to the practice of singling out a country or countries for criticism in General Assembly resolutions, something that is certainly not conducive to promoting the cause of peace in the Middle East.

For those reasons, my delegation decided this year to abstain from voting on draft resolution A/40/L.41. It reiterates its continuing support in principle for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, and that statement found its expression in its positive vote on operative paragraph 2 of that resolution.

Mr. GARCIA REVILLA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The Peruvian delegation voted in favour of all the draft resolutions introduced under agenda item 33, the question of Palestine.

With regard to the Geneva Declaration on Palestine and the Programme of Action on the Rights of the Palestinian People, adopted by acclamation at the international conference held in August and September of 1983, my delegation wishes to recall that on that occasion the Peruvian Government made the following statement:

(Mr. Garcia Revilla, Peru)

"In this statement my delegation wishes to reiterate its support for all efforts directed to allowing the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable rights to self-determination and to its establishment as an independent State, as well as the right of all States of the region to exist within secure and internationally recognized boundaries, in accordance with the provisions of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and other agreements adopted by the international community. However, the treatment of certain paragraphs of the draft programme of action prevent us from associating ourselves with the document as a whole, especially paragraphs 5 and 18 of the Programme of Action."

Furthermore, my delegation abstained in the separate votes on the fourth and eighth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/40/L.41, because we believe that they are not conducive to creating the best possible conditions to bring about an international peace conference on the Middle East.

Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation supported the four draft resolutions that were before us concerning the question of Palestine, voting in favour of all of them, both in the separate votes on the paragraphs and on the draft resolutions as a whole.

In this respect my delegation wishes to reiterate that it has reservations on any indication in these draft resolutions that may be construed directly or indirectly as containing or implicitly stating a willingness on the part of my delegation to recognize the Zionist entity or the fait accompli imposed by military might in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories.

Mr. PAPAJORGJI (Albania): As in the past, so also during the fortieth session of the United Nations General Assembly the Albanian delegation has made clear its position on the question of Palestine in the Middle East by once again expressing the full support of the people and the Government of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania for the just and heroic struggle of the Palestinian people against the imperialist Zionist aggression for its national rights. In accordance with that position, it voted in favour of the draft resolutions A/40/L.23, A/40/L.24 and A/40/L.25.

However, we should like to stress that we have reservations about some formulations in certain paragraphs, in particular those paragraphs referring to some previous resolutions. The Albanian delegation did not take part in the voting on draft resolution A/40/L.41, which deals with the convening of the international peace conference of the Middle East, with the participation of the two super-Powers. We have always made our attitude clear on this matter. We fully understand, have shared the concern and have always supported the efforts of our brother Arab peoples and countries to find a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine.

(Mr. Papajorgji, Albania)

But we maintain the view that the aim of the Soviet social imperialists in insisting on convening such a conference is to assure a greater involvement in the course of events in the Middle East and to consolidate their positions in that region in rivalry with American imperialism. We are against such a conference with the participation of the two super-Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, because they would try to manipulate it for their own interests.

Mrs. CARRASCO (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): One of the problems for which the United Nations has a great responsibility is that of the Middle East. There is no doubt that the question is of central importance for the political, economic and military stability not only of the region but of the world as a whole. So long as there prevails frustration, discord and bloodshed in that region, it will be difficult to find a solution to the question of Palestine, which is at the core of the problem.

The international community believes that to achieve the exercise of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of self-determination, it is important that Israelis and Palestinians should pursue steps towards the common objective: a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East through a process of negotiation and without resorting to the use of force.

In that spirit, my delegation commends the ongoing efforts to establish dialogue among all the parties, including within the framework of an international conference for peace in the Middle East, which was supported last year in this forum.

For that reason, my delegation supported draft resolution A/40/L.41. However, we wish to express reservations regarding the language used in the fourth and eighth preambular paragraphs and in operative paragraph 5, since we feel that during the debates at the present session, statements have been made by the parties

(Mrs. Carrasco, Bolivia)

concerned which could be viewed as expressions of a readiness to engage in negotiations with a view to reaching agreements to resolve that conflict.

To conclude, my delegation urges all the parties concerned to make every possible effort to carry forward the peace process in the region. We call for the prompt withdrawal of military forces from illegally occupied territories.

Mrs. ABRAHAMS (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): With regard to draft resolution A/40/L.41 dealing with the International Peace Conference on the Middle East, my delegation believes that such a conference could contribute to bringing peace in the region, provided a number of conditions acceptable to the parties concerned in the conflict were met.

We know that at present there is a negotiating process from which a positive understanding might emerge to create the necessary climate for the holding of that Conference. We take an even-handed view of the problem, and we are hopeful. Also, we feel that a change of attitude is taking place amongst the countries concerned in the situation - something that has been expressed by most of the delegations that took part in the general debate on the Middle East and on the question of Palestine.

However my delegation abstained in the vote on the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/40/L.41 because we believed that we could not single out one particular State as being solely responsible for the terrorist activities in the region. A series of factors have contributed to the present state of conflict in the Middle East. Accordingly, a more general statement of the problem is called for.

Mr. MANGWAZU (Malawi): On draft resolution A/40/L.41, we are not quite happy with the idea of an international peace conference, which was being endorsed in operative paragraph 2. The reason is that we believe that any meaningful peace conference must involve all the parties to the dispute. In this regard, we feel

(Mr. Mangwazu, Malawi)

that one of the parties is not prepared to participate in an international peace conference. As a result, we feel that another method, one which is agreeable to all parties to the dispute, should be adopted. We therefore regard any endorsement for an international peace conference as negative. That is why my delegation abstained in the vote on that draft resolution.

We voted in favour of draft resolutions A/40/L.24 and L.25, with the understanding and the hope that any information gathered and disseminated will be as objective as possible. We realize the importance of dissemination of information on the question of Palestine.

On draft resolution A/40/L.41, we are very concerned over the paragraphs on which separate votes were taken. We felt that if the United Nations were to be effective in acting as arbiter to the problems confronting Member States, it was necessary that we should be as neutral as possible. I believe those paragraphs are partisan, particularly the eighth preambular paragraph which is also in a certain way provocative towards one party. Hence we voted against it. With regard to operative paragraph 5, again we feel that the insinuation in it is not constructive. As a result, we abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. ZAMANINIA (Islamic Republic of Iran) (interpretation from Arabic):
My delegation takes exception to the use of the term "Government of Israel". We believe that Israel should withdraw from all the lands occupied in Palestine.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): In conformity with resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974 of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, I now call on the Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) who has requested to make a statement.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Another year passes. The tragic conditions under which our people live continue. The Israeli terrorist acts against our people continue in their own homes. And yet we come here to hear some statements by some people who even refuse to listen to what we say. Those who have objected to the eighth preambular paragraph refuse to take note of the position of the Palestine Liberation Organization. They were not asked to pass judgement on that. They were just asked to take note of what we say. And this is our position. This was declared very clearly from the rostrum in this Assembly. Therefore, I am really surprised that some people use that as a pretext when they wanted to assert that they refuse to listen.

Others have referred to the monetary implications and allocations, whatever they are. Those people are really penny-wise. The General Assembly will be voting on allocating almost \$12 million per month to a peace-keeping force in south Lebanon. The United Nations will be allocating \$12 million per month to address only one of the derivatives of Israel's aggression against Lebanon.

Yet, when it comes to about \$250,000 or \$300,000 a month in order to rectify the situation, to redress the injustice and do service for the cause of peace, we are told this is wasting money.

We are also told that there is only one road to peace and that one road to peace is direct negotiations. Is it not for direct negotiations that we come to the Security Council, where all the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict sit together in the Security Council, whose message and mission is to maintain

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

international peace? Those who are speaking about one road to peace and about direct negotiations have it very clear in their minds that the Palestinian people do not exist, that the Palestinian people have no right to self-determination, and that the Security Council should not be involved.

For us, this is nothing new in the policy of the United States. It was clearly stated, and is to be found in the secret documents of the United States of 1947, where instructions were given that the question of Palestine should not be brought to the Security Council. Otherwise, the United States, faithful to its commitment to Article 25 of the Charter, would have had to implement that partition decision. This is to be found in Foreign Relations of the United States, 1947, volume 5. And one can easily find them on pages 13, 14, 1157 and 1266.

Even before the decision on partitioning my country was taken, the United States made it very clear that it would not permit the implementation of partition. Yet, they still speak to us about direct negotiations without specifying with whom. Is it not only reasonable that direct negotiations should be with the direct victims and the principal party to the conflict? Yet, we are told that resolution 242 (1967) and resolution 338 (1973) are the basis. I do not want to keep repeating. Even the United States, in 1978, from this very rostrum, told us that resolution 242 (1967) does not address the political dimension of the Palestinian problem.

Then why should we have resolution 242 (1967)? What are we dealing with? Is it not a political issue as well? Yet we are told that resolution 242 (1967) is the basis. Then somebody tells us that the Jordanian-Palestinian accord has not been recorded. I thought that our head of delegation, Mr. Kaddoumi, made it very clear in his statement. He said that we the Palestinians and the Jordanians, have undertaken joint action to promote the peace efforts. That also proved to be a

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

test of the credibility of the United States of America. IF it is really that good, then why do not those who praise it invite the two parties to come and sit together, and see what goes on from there? Unfortunately, this is something that we cannot understand.

Then we were told that the Hussein and Peres statements were not taken into consideration. Mr. Peres made a good statement from here, but it had so many "buts" that it rendered it unreasonable. Mr. Peres excluded completely the role of the Palestinian people and their representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Then, let me recall resolution 38/58 C. Let me read it in Arabic, because some of those who read their statement in Arabic had forgotten something. I will read operative paragraph 4 of resolution 38/58 C. It reads that the General Assembly:

(Spoke in Arabic)

Invites all parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, as well as the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other concerned States, to participate in the International Peace Conference on the Middle East on an equal footing and with equal rights".

(continued in English)

One of the Arab representatives had forgotten that provision in resolution 38/58 C and wanted also to exclude the Palestinian people from the peace conference. I am not naming names.

Finally, on the issue of naming names, what can we do? Do we have to say that the Secretary-General is not working without pinpointing why he is not working? Shall we say that the Secretary-General failed in his mission? Shall we say that the Security Council failed in their mission? Or shall we tell the truth?

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

The Secretary-General told us very clearly in his report:

"... it is clear from the replies of the Governments of Israel (A/39/214) and the United States of America (A/39/130, annex III, appendix) that they are not prepared to participate in the proposed conference." (A/39/130/Add.1, p. 3)

How would the representatives who have expressed reservations wish us to refer to this? We cannot accuse the Security Council or the Secretary-General of failing in their duties. But be that as it may, we are very glad and very satisfied, and my people will be very happy to see that the General Assembly again took a decision with only three red lights. Those red lights eventually will have to disappear from that voting board if those who pushed the red button really want peace in the Middle East.

I wish to thank all those who voted in favour of bringing peace to the Middle East through the good offices of the United Nations and under its auspices.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We have concluded our consideration of agenda item 33.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.