



General Assembly UN LIBRARY

PROVISIONAL

A/42/PV.89
8 December 1987

ENGLISH

Forty-second session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 2 December 1987, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic)

later: Mr. LEGWAILA (Vice-President) (Botswana)

- The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General [39]
(continued)
- Report of the Security Council [11]
- Question of Palestine [38] (continued)
 - (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.

- Effects of atomic radiation: report of the Special Political Committee [74]
- International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space: report of the Special Political Committee [76]
- United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East: report of the Special Political Committee [79]
- Question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India: report of the Special Political Committee [80]
- Question of the composition of the relevant organs of the United Nations: report of the Special Political Committee [81]

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 39 (continued)

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/42/277, A/42/465 and Add.1, A/42/714)

Mr. KIBEDI (Uganda): The crisis in the Middle East, the crux of which is the question of Palestine, remains one of the most dangerous, daunting and persistent sources of world tension. For over four decades the question has been a concern of the international community and has remained on the agenda of the General Assembly. Five wars have been fought in the Middle East, which have caused immense suffering, death and destruction to the peoples of the region. Each war has been followed by a fragile cease-fire which later gave way to renewed hostilities. Despite the determined efforts of the Secretary-General, the General Assembly and the Security Council the situation remains explosive, posing great danger to international peace and security.

The problem of the Middle East, together with its genesis, the question of Palestine, must, therefore, continue to be in the forefront of the international agenda. It must not be relegated to a secondary place among the problems of the world which have to be dealt with. To adopt such an approach would be a tragic error as the world would have to pay a much higher price in the form of the death and human misery that would arise from the ensuing instability and endless military confrontations.

In order to achieve the peaceful and lasting settlement to the conflict for which we all strive, it is necessary to redress the basic injustice which has been perpetrated over several decades. To put it simply, it is imperative to restore the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. This injustice against the Palestinian people was triggered by the infamous Balfour Declaration 70 years ago. The British Government of the day succumbed to the pressures of the Zionist movement and agreed to carve a Jewish State out of Palestine which was inhabited

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

predominantly by the indigenous Palestinian Arabs. Unable to solve the problem which they had created, the British handed it over to the United Nations, which adopted resolution 181 (II) partitioning Palestine.

General Assembly resolution 181 (II) adopted in 1947, which gave birth to the State of Israel, provides the legal framework for two sovereign States in mandated Palestine, one Jewish and the other Arab. Given the immense efforts exerted by Israel and its supporters and the intense rhetoric they have used to frustrate the emergence of a Palestinian State, it is worth reminding them that the resolution that gives Israel legitimacy equally requires the establishment of a Palestinian State. The passage of time has not invalidated that resolution. Equity requires that anyone taking a benefit from a document, must equally fulfil its other requirements.

The irony is that Israel, which was created by the United Nations, stands here condemned for frustrating the full implementation of the resolution that gave it birth and is itself responsible for sending many Palestinians into the Diaspora through its oppressive and aggressive policies. Right from its inception Israel embarked on a path of swallowing, by hook or by crook, the whole of mandated Palestine and other territories belonging to Arab States, through its actions of aggression.

The 1948 war unleashed by Israel was used as a cover to trample underfoot General Assembly resolution 181 (II), to cause the exodus of millions of Palestinians into neighbouring countries as refugees, and to deny them their inalienable right to set up a State of their own. Most of the land earmarked for establishing the Palestinian State was annexed by Israel.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

The wars that have ensued since then have in essence been wars of aggression and annexation in pursuit of a Zionist dream to create a greater Israel through further annexation of Palestinian and other Arab lands and the liquidation of a Palestinian identity. In complete defiance of the international community, Israel has refused to withdraw from the occupied territories and has annexed the Holy City of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. The establishment of illegal settlements has been augmented in the West Bank, with the clear objective of changing the territory's demographic character.

Even today, after the heroic Lebanese resistance forced the occupying troops to withdraw hurriedly and in humiliation, Israel continues to occupy southern Lebanon. The representative of Lebanon has given a graphic and grim picture of the devastation being carried out by the occupying forces. As is the case in the West Bank and in Gaza, Israel has embarked on a course of devastating the economic and agricultural infrastructure to depopulate the area and drive out the Lebanese and Palestinian refugees. The objective is to impose a permanent Israeli presence and possibly to annex southern Lebanon, in line with the Zionist plan for a greater Israel.

The policies being pursued by Israel in the occupied lands are very well described in the report (A/42/650) of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices affecting the Human Rights of the Populations in the Occupied Territories. The report points out that the general policy of the Government of Israel continues to be based on the principle that the territories constituted an integral part of Israel. That policy includes, inter alia, expropriation of Palestinian lands, collective expulsion and the establishment of illegal settlements. International law, particularly the Fourth Geneva Convention, defines the rights and obligations of an occupying Power. A people under occupation enjoys

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

well-defined rights under the Convention. Israel has, with impunity, continued to violate the Convention. The actions it has pursued are expressly prohibited by the Convention. It is therefore incumbent on the international community to make Israel live up to its responsibilities and obligations.

It is about 20 years since the invading Israeli forces occupied the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and other Arab lands. Rather than preparing to relinquish these territories, the occupation force is reinforcing its grip on the land, and the prospects for voluntary withdrawal seem very slim. For 20 years Israel has used oppression to impose a new status quo. It has reinterpreted laws inherited from the British Mandate, to the detriment of the indigenous population. Furthermore, it has been unwilling to enter into meaningful negotiations for a just and lasting settlement. But we all know that the results have been rather different from those originally hoped for by Israel - namely, to put an end to the Palestinian identity and struggle.

In spite of this de facto annexation, uprisings and general resistance have continued unabatedly. The occupation and all it entails has unwittingly nurtured the modern Palestinian national identity. The uprisings have placed the Israeli authorities in a state of dilemma and commotion. The threat posed by the blossoming Palestinian identity cannot be concealed by arsenals of modern weapons, nor by the myths and the interpretations of history into rhetoric that serves the interests of the occupier.

The United Nations has a special responsibility in the search for a solution in the Middle East. Apart from the historical rhetoric that led to the conflict, the United Nations must be involved because of the danger the question poses to international peace and security and respect for international law. Numerous efforts have been invested by our Organization in the search for a peaceful settlement.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

In 1983 the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held in Geneva in September of that year, adopted a framework for a comprehensive settlement. Its recommendations, which were adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 38/58 C, called for the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East, at which all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), would participate on an equal footing. Since the adoption of that resolution, the Secretary-General has spared no efforts to implement his mandate to convene the called-for International Peace Conference. He has carried out consultations at the highest level. An overwhelming majority of those consulted fully endorsed the Conference. Regrettably, the main obstacle, as has been the case with all previous peace initiatives, is the obstructive attitude of the Israeli Government. In his report contained in document A/42/714, the Secretary-General observes that

"The major obstacle at present, however, is one of a different kind, namely, the inability of the Government of Israel as a whole to agree on the principle of an international conference under United Nations auspices. Until the Israeli Government accepts that such a conference is the best way to negotiate a peace settlement, the way forward will remain difficult". (A/42/714, para. 33)

The pretext given by Israel for its attitude is that this would bring in the PLO. It is particularly encouraged when it is supported in this posture by a permanent member of the Security Council, which in turn has sought also to exclude another Power from the Middle East peace process at various times. As we have stated before, none of the primary parties should be excluded from a peace conference on the Middle East. Any attempt to reach agreement above the head of the Palestinian people is bound to fail. Israel should face up to the reality of

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

the Palestinian existence under the leadership of the PLO, the Palestinians' sole and authentic representative. Equally, the two super-Powers continue to be heavily involved in the area, whether we like it or not. The strategic reality therefore requires the participation of the two major Powers in any process that is going to bring lasting peace to the region.

We are encouraged that there is a growing awareness, even in some quarters which originally opposed a peace conference, that such a conference is necessary to the resolution of this complex problem. In this regard a development which is important, even though it is at an early stage, is the growing body of opinion within Israel which recognizes that the present situation is untenable and distorts the very principles on which Israel professes to be based. These people, though a minority, remember the following words used by Professor Yeshayahu Leibowitz 20 years ago:

"We should withdraw very fast from the territories; otherwise, occupation will corrupt Israel".

It is our hope that Israel's powerful allies will encourage this body of opinion rather than giving Israel the blanket protection which it has thus far enjoyed. The positive trend in the state of relations between the two super-Powers should create a climate for them to play a positive role in resolving the Middle East conflict.

The conflict in the Middle East is too serious a matter to permit any passivity. The United Nations and the international community must fulfil their obligations to the Palestinian people and ensure the restoration of that people's inalienable rights. That is the only way to restore stability and peace in the region. In the view of the Uganda delegation and the Uganda Government, the Fez plan offers the only sound basis for a comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

We are convinced that the only rational and effective way of bringing about a just and lasting peace is through the collective efforts of all concerned parties under the auspices of the United Nations. Any attempts in another direction would be a mere exercise in futility. As the restoration of Palestinian rights would constitute the centre-piece of any settlement, it goes without saying that the Palestinian people - through the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), their sole, authentic representative - must participate in any such negotiations.

Mr. RAJAJIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I wish to commence my statement with a verse from the Holy Koran which exhibits the situation of the people of Palestine, the occupation of whose homeland constitutes the perennial problem of the Middle East. The verse reads as follows:

To those against whom
War is made, permission
Is given (to fight), because
They are wronged; - and verily,
God is Most Powerful
For their aid; -

(They are) those who have
Been expelled from their homes
In defiance of right, -
(For no cause) except
That they say, 'Our Lord
Is God'. Did not God
Check one set of people
By means of another,
There would surely have been
Pulled down monasteries, churches,
Synagogues, and mosques, in which
The name of God is commemorated
In abundant measure. God will
Certainly aid those who
Aid His (cause); - for verily
God is Full of Strength,
Exalted in Might,
(Able to enforce His Will). (The Holy Koran, S. XXII: 39-40)

The core of the problem of the Middle East during the past 40 years has been the Zionist occupation of Palestine. It has created many wars and, as a matter of fact, permanent combat between those who have been dispossessed of their homes,

(Mr. Rajaie Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

their properties and their country and the Zionist forces of occupation who have been expanding their usurpation of Palestinian territory and property.

Palestinian people have always felt duty-bound to defend their usurped rights. The verse I just recited is quite unequivocal about the divine mandate issued to those who have been expelled from their homeland to defend themselves against the illegal occupation of their beloved home. The Islamic tradition explicitly states that whoever is killed in defence of his honour or property is a martyr. Long before the Charter of the United Nations existed, the right to self-defence was recognized and sanctioned by the revealed sources of Islam, and recognition of this right in international norms only reconfirms the due right of the Muslim Palestinian people to continue their legitimate struggle until the last signs of the Zionist aggression are wiped out and the flag of Palestine is rehoisted in the entirety of the land of Palestine. Moreover, Palestine being an Islamic territory, the entire Muslim world is of the firm opinion that defence of Palestine is not only the God-given right of the Palestinian people but the duty of every Muslim as well.

The basic problem of the Middle East is therefore too deeply rooted to be somehow resolved through some pacifying decisions of this international body. The more simplistic and concessionary the United Nations is in its treatment of the illegal occupation of Palestine the less successful it is going to be in bringing an end to this problem. We therefore believe that further internationalization of the problem of the occupation of Palestine through international conferences would only add further insult to the injuries of the Palestinian people who have been betrayed by the international body as well as by the champions of Arab nationalism. The Palestinian Muslims, like the rest of the Muslim people of the world, have no confidence in the international body because this body has always

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

tried to give the status of statehood to the terrorist base that has been established in their beloved Palestine. The international body has always acted as a forum where the Palestinians have been advised to surrender to the aggressor in the interest of peace, while the illegal expansionist policies and practices of the aggressor have been legitimized for the safety and stability of the Middle East. No one ever asks the international body why the Zionist aggressor should be safe at all and on what grounds anyone should expect to restore peace and security to the Middle East when the occupation of Palestine is only expanding.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

It is imperative for those who sincerely wish for a peaceful end to the situation in the Middle East to maximize their objectivity and come to the understanding that peace and the occupation of Palestine are incompatible; and therefore, instead of asking the Palestinians to accommodate to the occupation, they should try to force the usurper forces to accommodate to the repatriation of the Palestinian people to their homeland in order to participate in making their own political destiny. Zionist families which have been natives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any other country are prompted to join the usurping forces under the patronage of international orchestrations, but the natives of Palestine are not permitted to be repatriated to their homeland. Is it not absurd?

My delegation believes that all international moves, whether in the form of United Nations resolutions or of international conferences, will prove counter-productive in so far as they provide for legitimization of the occupation and recognition of the artificial entity that has been set up on the sinking sand of Palestine. We believe that the struggle of the Palestinian Muslims in an Islamic united front is the only practical solution to the problem. If the international body wishes to stop the bloodshed and bring peace to the region it should utilize all its resources to dismantle the Zionist base of occupation and give the Palestinian people the chance to return to their country and participate in a peaceful political decision on their destiny, because Palestine, too, has the right to sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

Mr. ZENENGA (Zimbabwe): The year 1987 marks several anniversaries pertaining to the Middle East problem which constitute sad reminders of the escalation and growing complexities of the crisis in the region. Only a few days ago we were observing the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian

(Mr. Zenenga, Zimbabwe)

People, an occasion which reminded us that for four decades now the Middle East has been plagued by conflicts, terror, hatred and despair, a situation which stems from a single but highly complex issue - the question of Palestine and the fate of the Palestinian people.

Last June marked the twentieth anniversary of the 1967 war, during which Israeli forces occupied the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip, an occupation which Israel has continued to entrench illegally through creeping annexation and systematic and deliberate alteration of the cultural, religious, demographic, socio-economic and other features of those territories, as well as by practising its "iron-fist" policies against the Arab inhabitants of the territories and by the establishment of Jewish settlements.

The year also marked five years of Israel's continued occupation of southern Lebanon, which was invaded in 1982. In his letter to the Secretary-General (A/42/702) the Permanent Representative of Lebanon informs us of the destruction of Lebanon's agricultural and other economic infrastructure by Israeli occupation forces in an attempt to depopulate the so-called security zone in southern Lebanon.

The history of Israel's seizure of Palestine and, subsequently, other Arab territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, is well documented; so is the expropriation by Israeli occupation forces of Palestinian and other Arab properties and the systematic denial of basic human rights to the Palestinian people. It is these injustices that form the very core of the problems facing the Middle East. The international community has on countless occasions stressed that only the restoration of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, particularly their right to self-determination and to the establishment of their own State, and only Israel's total, immediate and unconditional withdrawal from all the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967 can lead to the establishment of peace and stability in the Middle East.

(Mr. Zenenga, Zimbabwe)

The eighth summit Conference of non-aligned countries, held in Harare in September 1986, convinced that attempts at partial solutions confined to some aspects of the Middle East problem while excluding others, could lead only to further complications and a deterioration of the situation, stressed the urgent need to convene the international peace conference on the Middle East as envisaged in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, of December 1983, in order to achieve a just and comprehensive solution to the problem. We remain convinced that such a conference convened under the auspices of the United Nations is the best way to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. This was why we welcomed the adoption last year by the Assembly of resolution 41/43 D, which further endorsed the convening of the peace conference. We are also gratified that the Secretary-General, in pursuance of his mandate under resolution 41/43 D, has undertaken, since early this year a special effort to promote the convening of the conference, an effort which the international community has overwhelmingly endorsed.

We are acutely aware of the problems and hurdles that have thus far hindered progress in the preparatory process for the convening of the conference. In his report (A/42/714) of 13 November 1987 which is before the Assembly, the Secretary-General informs us that the gaps between the parties to the Middle East conflict remain wide and that some of these gaps relate mainly to differences about the procedural aspects of the conference. This only confirms that the same old problem still remains as the major obstacle, that is the reluctance and in some cases the hostile attitude of certain key players on the Middle East scene regarding the concept of the peace conference as envisaged in the pertinent resolutions of the Assembly.

(Mr. Zenenga, Zimbabwe)

However, we share the Secretary-General's view that the procedural differences among the parties involved are not insurmountable. Addressing the issue of these procedural obstacles, the Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Prime Minister Robert Mugabe, in a statement to the Meeting of the Committee of Nine Non-Aligned Countries on the Question of Palestine, held at ministerial level in Harare from 14 to 15 April this year, said the following:

"We in Zimbabwe, not so long ago, were faced with similar hurdles of 'who should attend', and 'who should represent or speak for whom' and so on, at the time of the lead-up to the Lancaster House Conference in 1979. But in the end I think there can only be one overriding, governing factor which, if we wish to succeed at all, must surely be applied: this Conference must of necessity gather together those people who can, in the end and of themselves, deliver the goods. A comprehensive, just and lasting peace is what we seek and, therefore, those who meet around the conference table must be those who are in a position themselves to bring about peace and a complete end to all forms of hostility."

(Mr. Zenenga, Zimbabwe)

The Non-Aligned Movement thus believes that the peace conference cannot stand any hope of success unless the Palestinian people, as represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), are a full and fully recognized party to the Conference, for the PLO can deliver - and the ability to deliver, as mentioned above, is what we are really talking about.

There has also been some reluctance to accept the full international character of the proposed Conference and to its taking place under the auspices of the United Nations. As the conflict in the Middle East, over its 40-year span, has assumed profound complexities with undeniable international ramifications, it goes without saying that the issues cannot be satisfactorily resolved on a bilateral, trilateral or even regional basis. That is why we in the Non-Aligned Movement are convinced that partial and piecemeal agreements cannot be helpful and that only a full international conference can satisfactorily and comprehensively address the Middle East crisis.

We remain deeply saddened by the continuation of the fratricidal conflict raging between the sister States of Iran and Iraq. The human and material losses resulting from that conflict have reached staggering and indeed tragic proportions. The protracted conflict continues to carry all the signs of dangerous escalation and expansion as it has drawn foreign military presence into the Gulf region. We welcome resolution 598 (1987) of the Security Council as well as the Secretary-General's efforts to bring about a just settlement to the conflict that is acceptable to both Iran and Iraq. We must appeal once again to both parties to respect international humanitarian law, cease all hostilities and seek a peaceful solution to their differences in strict accordance with the noble principles of non-alignment.

Finally, we should like at this stage also to declare once again our solidarity with the Government and people of Lebanon, to reaffirm our full support

(Mr. Zenenga, Zimbabwe)

for Lebanese security and its territorial integrity and for the right of the Lebanese Government and people to exercise sovereignty throughout their territory, within their internationally-recognized boundaries, without outside interference in their internal affairs.

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): The core of this debate is the "core argument". It is stated up front, in operative paragraph 1 of last year's resolution A: "the question of Palestine is the 'core' of the conflict in the Middle East". Now the inference goes that if you solve this problem, peace will prevail in the region.

The United Nations - and I may add, this General Assembly - has been subjected to this argument so often, by so many speakers, in so many forums, that it has by now exhausted the immunity to boredom of even the most seasoned diplomats. Resolutions that no one has the patience to read are annually inscribed affirming this basic premise. So the "core argument", as I call it, reigns supreme. It has assumed the cachet of self-evident truth. Or has it?

Because I think things are changing. Perhaps not in this Hall. No, even here they are beginning to change. They are certainly changing outside this Hall. Three weeks ago, at the Arab summit in Amman, the Arab leaders appeared to have discovered a new "core" to the Middle East conflict. In an unusual display of rhetorical unity, they put the old "core", the Palestinian one, on the back burner. What clearly occupied their common attention was the conflagration in the Persian Gulf, a war that for the past eight years has been devouring the flesh of hundreds of thousands, and soon - in fact already, now - of millions. This past year has been the bloodiest to date - but only to date.

Now, not only bloodshed is involved. As the Arab leaders are well aware, the winds of hate blowing from Teheran ultimately threaten their own régimes. And as

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

impartial observers of this conflict have noted, the repeated criminal use by Iraq of chemical weapons steadily erodes the common conceptions of what is permitted and what is forbidden in war. In an already turbulent region, these are very dangerous developments indeed.

Yet, for all its horrors, even the Iran-Iraq war does not fully expose the truth about conflicts in the Middle East. The Assembly will notice that I said "conflicts", not "the conflict". This is the crucial point. The Middle East has no single conflict, no single dispute. No specific territorial or national or ethnic rivalry is at the root of its myriad conflicts. Certainly the Arab-Israeli dispute is there. But so are many other conflicts that have nothing whatever to do with it, and which are more horrifying in any comparative scale of violence and terror and human cost.

From the Sahara to the Sudan and from Beirut to Basra, conflict in the Middle East is endemic, persistent, unyielding. More often than not, violence is the rule, tranquillity the exception.

Let me illustrate this tragic condition in the briefest way that I know. Each year, my Mission prepares a compendium of Middle Eastern violence. It is gleaned by the Foreign Broadcasting Information Service, and it culls world press reports about events in the Middle East. We usually see that most of these reports come from Arab sources, from Middle Eastern sources. I have here an entirely factual listing of these Middle Eastern incidents, a calendar of violence that covers the period 19 November 1986 to 19 November 1987 - exactly one year since I last spoke from this podium in the General Assembly on this very subject.

The full survey will shortly be handed out to members. But let me make three quick points about it. First, none of the violence listed is related to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Secondly, the conflicts encompass all parts of the Middle

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

East and all types of violence: kidnapping, massacres, assassination, bombing of ships, rocketing of cities, and so on. And, thirdly, significantly, this list is considerably longer than last year's list, which I suppose means things are not getting any better.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Here is a brief chronological extract from the first page and I begin with the first date: 19 November, Amal and Palestinian gunmen clash in Lebanon killing 14 and wounding 7; 20 November, a bomb explodes near the Lebanese Commerce Bank in Beirut; 24 November, the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA) kills 86 Sudanese soldiers; 25 November, Iran kills 52 Iraqis; 27 November, unidentified planes bomb northern Sudan injuring 15; 28 November, Muslim revolutionaries kill two Ba'athists in Bagdad; 29 November, Polisario attacks Spanish fishing boat off western Sahara coast.

This is 1986. If one looks at 1987 for the same dates one finds pretty much the same thing - in fact it is worse. The compendium - which forms the appendix to this speech - lists another 811 such incidents; that averages out at over two a day.

There is a simple and inescapable conclusion. In the Middle East violence is often resorted to not as an instrument of last resort but as the preferred means of settling disputes. The armed struggle, as it is called by the champions of this approach, is in their eyes the right way, indeed the only way. Compromise, negotiations, political solutions are adamantly rejected. They smack to those people of a contemptible weakness, a surrender of pride, a prelude to capitulation. That is as true of the conflicts within States as of those between them. That is why, for example, the carnage in Lebanon's capital continues unabated. That is why Syria continues to occupy over 60 per cent of that unhappy country. It is also why the Iran-Iraq war will soon become the longest war of this century.

One does not need both sides of a conflict to espouse the primacy of violence for peace to be pushed back. It is enough that one of them does so. For example, as long as Libya believes it can pummel Chad into submission the war between those two countries will go on.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

That is exactly why the Arab-Israeli dispute has endured to this day. It will persist as long as there are those who remain committed to liquidating Israel rather than to making peace with it. The problem is not, the problem never was, that the Arabs do not have another State in what was Mandatory Palestine. It is that the Jews have one. It is for that very reason that the Arab States rejected the United Nations partition plan 40 years ago. They were not interested in the slightest - not in the slightest - in the Arab State that the plan provided for. When they invaded the newly-born Jewish State, Israel, their sole interest was to destroy it. That is why they attacked, and that attack has continued in one form or another to this very day. It has continued in five wars waged against my country. It continues in the war between the wars that we know as terrorism. It continues here in this Hall, in the various resolutions which call for the destruction of Israel in United Nations-style euphemisms. I am talking about formulations that call for "unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the Palestinian and Arab territory" or "the establishment of a sovereign State in Palestine", formulations which hardly bother to disguise their hidden meanings: that "Palestine" means Israel, that "unconditional and total withdrawal" means the dismantling of the Jewish State.

As long as we have those committed to obliterating their adversaries and blindly obeying "the armed struggle", we shall not have peace - not in Lebanon, not in the Gulf, not in the Arab-Israeli dispute, not in the Middle East as a whole. If we want to speak truthfully about the core of the conflicts in the Middle East, this is it.

That brings us to a question: how, then, to achieve peace? I recommend three things: first, recognizing the separate conflicts in the region; secondly, opposing the forces of violence and terror that inflame them; and, thirdly, encouraging direct negotiations between the States concerned.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

The one dramatic instance where that has been done successfully is the Camp David Accords. All three conditions were met. First, Egypt and Israel did not try to solve all the outstanding problems of the Middle East but focused on a realistic agenda to resolve the Arab-Israeli dispute; secondly, they stood firm against all threats and intimidations from the opponents of peace; and, thirdly, they negotiated directly, face to face.

The value of that approach is borne out by the results: the Egyptian-Israeli peace has recently marked its first decade; Arab countries are gradually restoring their diplomatic ties with Egypt; and another Arab Head of State has met openly with an Israeli leader to try to expand the circle of peace. Israel welcomes these and other positive developments. No country wants peace more. No people has prayed as much for it.

To all those Permanent Representatives of Arab States who have accused Israel of not wanting peace I have a very simple proposal. I am authorized to meet with you, here and now, to discuss peace. I will welcome any permanent representative who wants to go outside, right now, and begin those discussions. I could wait longer - but we all know what the result would be.

The fact that such a direct, simple and clear invitation is not going to be accepted, that it will be rejected with all sorts of excuses and circumlocutions, that this Assembly still has before it a resolution that implicitly rejects Camp David, the only successful peace treaty between Israel and an Arab State - all that speaks tellingly about the real obstacle to the resolution of the Arab-Israeli dispute.

Here, as elsewhere in the Middle East, it is that very rejectionism that constitutes the true core of conflict. As long as that attitude persists, peace will be unattainable. Once it is removed, it could appear with surprising speed.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The voting on the draft resolution submitted under this item will be held later and will be announced in the Journal.

Since the Assembly is now to move to other items on its agenda, I should point out that if any representative wishes to exercise the right of reply on the question of the situation in the Middle East that should be done now.

The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to speak in reply. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974, I now call on the Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)): The General Assembly has received an open challenge, inviting the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict to negotiate.

I understand that the Secretary-General has submitted a report in which he states:

"The major obstacle at present, however, is one of a different kind, namely, the inability of the Government of Israel as a whole to agree on the principle" - I emphasize, on the principle - "of an international conference under United Nations auspices." (A/42/714, para. 33)

Where do we stand here? Do we accept the challenge and go to the negotiating table under the auspices of the United Nations, with the specifics of those people who would attend? We are not dealing in a vacuum here.

The parties to the conflict have been very well and explicitly mentioned, and the challenge still stands. Israel is the only party to the conflict that refuses to go to the negotiating table under the auspices of the United Nations. So, whom do we believe?

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

This is not the place to tell tales. Is the Secretary-General not correct in what he tells us - that the major obstacle is the inability of the Government of Israel to agree on the principle? If not the principle for peace, what, then, do they want to negotiate? This is the question that I raise here.

I reaffirm that the Palestine Liberation Organization fully supports and believes that the best and perhaps the only way to ensure a comprehensive peace is by convening the international peace conference on the Middle East within the precise terms set out and authorized by the General Assembly, which identify the participants and the guidelines. If the principles of the Charter are to be respected, then this is the challenge.

AGENDA ITEM 11

REPORT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (A/42/2)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of the report of the Security Council (A/42/2)?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): That concludes our consideration of agenda item 11.

AGENDA ITEM 38 (continued)

QUESTION OF PALESTINE

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE EXERCISE OF THE INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE (A/42/35)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/42/277)
- (c) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/42/L.33 to A/42/L.35, A/42/L.40)
- (d) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/42/801)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I wish to remind representatives that the debate on this item was concluded at the 82nd plenary meeting, held on Wednesday, 25 November 1987.

I call on the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to introduce draft resolutions A/42/L.33, L.34, L.35 and L.40.

Mr. SARRE (Senegal), Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (interpretation from French): As representatives will have observed, the debate on the question of Palestine was in every respect responsible and constructive. The essence of the debate was the need for the international community to do all in its power as soon as possible to find a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the question. To that end, it was unanimously recognized that the mechanisms or organs entrusted with promoting the attainment of that objective should be given the mandate to continue their work. Furthermore, the peace plan adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 38/58 C, which promotes the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, should be reaffirmed.

On the basis of these considerations, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People is submitting to the Assembly the following draft resolutions: draft resolutions A/42/L.33, L.34 and L.35, sponsored by: Afghanistan, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Madagascar, Pakistan, Senegal, the Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia; and draft resolution A/42/L.40, sponsored by: Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Pakistan, Senegal, the Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

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

Draft resolution A/42/L.33 deals with the work of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. Thanks to the support and understanding of the States Members of the United Nations, the Committee was able, as in the past, to accomplish its task, which was basically to provide the international public with objective information on the question of Palestine. In fulfilling its mandate the Committee has always invited Member States, in particular the parties concerned or interested, to participate in its work. We have always endeavoured to take into account the views and advice given us by States or other organs.

The Committee felt that it should be authorized by the General Assembly to continue to carry out its mandate during the coming year - that is the purpose of operative paragraphs 1 to 4 of the draft resolution - and to help non-governmental organizations in making their contribution to the search for a solution to the question of Palestine, as emphasized in operative paragraph 5. The Secretary-General is invited in the draft resolution to provide the Committee with all necessary facilities for the performance of its tasks.

Draft resolution A/42/L.34 deals with measures taken by the Secretary-General to defend the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, as can be seen in operative paragraph 1. The General Assembly, in paragraph 2, commends those measures and invites him to give the Division for Palestinian Rights the resources it needs to fulfil its obligations. In paragraph 4 it invites the Members of the Organization to co-operate with the Special Committee and the Division for Palestinian Rights; and in paragraph 5 it takes note with appreciation of the measures taken by Member States to observe annually on 29 November the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People and the issuance by them of special postage stamps for the occasion.

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

Draft resolution A/42/L.35 deals with the world-wide dissemination of accurate and comprehensive information on the question of Palestine. I emphasize the words "accurate information", because, as the poet said, "Nothing is more sad than ignorance in action." Ignorance of the Palestinian problem has often caused a tragic lack of understanding and misunderstandings. If well informed, States will be better able to understand the question of Palestine.

In this context, the Committee felt that the United Nations Department of Public Information (DPI) could validly play this role. In other circumstances it has done so with objectivity, competence and dedication. It has unhesitatingly sought the support of all parties concerned or interested in the question of Palestine and there is every reason to express appreciation for the action it has taken this year, as is done in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

For the coming year, and in the genuine interest of all the parties, the Department of Public Information should continue its work, with particular emphasis on public opinion in Europe and North America, as requested in paragraph 2, by, inter alia, organizing meetings of journalists, issuing publications on the various aspects of the question of Palestine, and organizing fact-finding missions for journalists.

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

Draft resolution A/42/L.40 deals with the international peace conference on the Middle East. The convening of such a conference was often mentioned during the general debate, as it was during consideration of the question of Palestine and the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, and at the most recent Arab summit, in Amman. The Secretary-General of our Organization discussed the question at length in his report (A/42/714). Never before has there been such a broad international consensus on the convening of that conference.

In the draft resolution, therefore, the General Assembly could not fail to note and welcome that consensus, which it does in the first preambular paragraph, and endorse the convening of the conference as the best way of arriving at a just settlement of the overall Arab-Israeli conflict, which has now lasted for 40 years.

In operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution the General Assembly reaffirms that the question of Palestine is the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict; and in paragraph 4 it endorses the idea of convening the conference in conformity with the provisions of resolution 38/58 C.

It reiterates, in operative paragraph 5, the call for the establishment, within the framework of the Security Council and with the participation of the permanent members of the Council, of a preparatory committee to take the necessary action to convene the Conference.

In paragraph 6 it stresses the urgent need for additional concrete and constructive efforts by all Governments in order to convene the Conference without further delay; and in paragraph 7 it requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Security Council, to continue his efforts with a view to convening the conference and to report thereon to the General Assembly not later than 31 March 1988.

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

This, briefly, is the substance of draft resolutions A/42/L.33 to L.35 and A/42/L.40. As members will have noticed, these texts contain neither blame nor condemnation of any State. The sponsors, in submitting these draft resolutions to the Assembly, have tried to make a modest contribution to the search for a just and lasting solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. They have taken broadly into account the realities of the international situation and all the sensitivities surrounding this issue. They have also taken into account the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

By adopting these draft resolutions unanimously we shall once again have done useful work. Furthermore, we shall have reflected in concrete deeds the purposes and principles for which we gather together annually in order to find ways and means of fashioning a better world based on justice and love of one's neighbour.

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

I 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."

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

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

(Mr. Murugan, Singapore)

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 Palestine Liberation Organization 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 these territories by Israel. My delegation also fully supports the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, in particular resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which established the fundamental basis for a genuine, stable and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Mr. FOULSEN (Denmark): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community.

In their statement on the question of Palestine on 23 November 1987 the Twelve made clear their views on the key elements which must make up a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

On that occasion we also referred to our declarations of 23 February 1987 and 13 July 1987, when we stated that we were in favour of an international conference, held under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation of the parties concerned and of any party able to make a direct and positive contribution to the restoration and maintenance of peace and to the region's economic and social

(Mr. Poulsen, Denmark)

development. In our view, such a conference would provide a suitable framework for the necessary negotiations between the parties directly concerned and is at present the only formula to allow the peace process to move forward.

The Twelve have taken note with appreciation of the reports of the Secretary-General relative to the question of an international conference (A/42/277, A/42/714). We have recently expressed in this Assembly our full support for the Secretary-General in his efforts to find ways of bridging the gaps between the parties, and we agree with him on the need to consolidate and build on the foundation that has so far been established.

The Twelve share the satisfaction expressed in draft resolution A/42/L.40 at the increasing international consensus in favour of the early convening of an international peace conference under the auspices of the United Nations. We are not, however, convinced that the draft resolution reflects the consensus in its most widely accepted terms. This is particularly so in relation to the call made in the draft resolution for the convening of a predetermined form of international conference. For negotiations to have any chance of success it is essential to avoid prejudging the form in which they may be held, which should be agreed upon by the parties directly concerned.

(Mr. Poulsen, Denmark)

Finally, with regard to the draft resolutions A/42/L.33, L.34 and L.35, which remain largely unchanged from last year, the Twelve have previously explained their position and have, inter alia, stressed the need to take duly into consideration the financial difficulties currently facing the Organization in determining the tasks of the bodies concerned.

Mr. BOEKER (United States of America): The United States Government persists in its practical efforts to launch negotiations to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict, including the Palestinian problem. The Secretary-General in his reports on this agenda item assures us that he will maintain his special effort and continue to explore with the parties ways of advancing the process, and that in this endeavour he will continue to rely on the support of the Security Council.

The day when negotiations can begin has not yet arrived, but constructive steps toward that goal continue to be taken. While we do not agree with all its elements, the Summit Declaration of those Arab leaders assembled in Amman last month is such a constructive step in that it recognizes that there must be a negotiated settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and that there is no military answer. Those Arab leaders supported an international peace conference under the auspices of the United Nations:

"to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict in a peaceful, just and comprehensive manner"

and thus implicitly supported negotiations between Israel and its Arab neighbours. The Government of Israel, for its part, has confirmed its willingness to enter into negotiations with its Arab neighbours to settle the conflict.

The United States Government does not rule out any avenue - including an international conference - for reaching the bilateral negotiations ineluctably required to settle the protracted conflict and resolve its complex issues,

(Mr. Boeker, United States)

including the Palestinian problem in all its aspects. It will take flexibility, imagination and courage on all sides to reach the negotiating table.

If negotiations can be launched by way of an international conference, it will not be the conference described in the unbalanced guidelines enumerated in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C. Those guidelines seek to impose a particular concept of a solution, rather than to launch the parties in negotiating one. The effort, as in draft resolution A/42/L.40 before us, to tie successive General Assembly resolutions back to resolution 38/58 C reveals a one-sided approach which will not advance prospects for reaching an agreed formula for negotiations, and my Government thus cannot support the draft resolution.

The solid basis for United Nations efforts to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict rests on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which embody a principled and even-handed approach to a negotiated peace. The General Assembly's annual succession of resolutions on this same subject have not added to this solid base. They have rather eroded that base by weakening the principles and neglecting the need for an even-handed approach. The three other draft resolutions before us on the question of Palestine, A/42/L.33, L.34 and L.35, perpetuate bodies and activities created by the General Assembly which are dedicated to expounding only the Palestinian perspective. My Government supports legitimate Palestinian rights, but it regrets this body's steps to institutionalize a one-sided perspective. Such steps are sadly inconsistent with the effort to put forward the United Nations as sponsor of a conference to launch negotiations. United Nations auspices would have to be accepted by all sides, and these draft resolutions do not help to achieve that goal. My delegation opposes these draft resolutions in part

(Mr. Boeker, United States)

because we do not wish to contribute to a course which we are convinced diminishes the United Nations prospects for helping to launch negotiations based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

I was encouraged to hear the Israeli representative, in his statement on the question of Palestine, urge the parties to:

"look upon the Palestinian issue as a question to be solved in direct peace negotiations, on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), with or without the assistance of others, based on mutual respect for the rights of Israelis and Arabs alike." (A/42/PV.80, p. 79)

Going back to the basics of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) is the right way to proceed. Those resolutions are the most universally accepted basis for negotiations, and thus the best hope for the United Nations to contribute to a comprehensive settlement. This Assembly has not enhanced that hope by adopting resolutions which purport to add new conditions for negotiations which are not supported by all sides and not universally accepted by Members. In our view, this is not the way forward.

The way forward is straight, but not easy. It is to try to find an agreed framework for launching negotiations on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), to achieve a just, lasting and comprehensive peace which resolves the Palestinian problem in all its aspects. My Government will persist in its efforts to help the parties find a formula for such negotiations. Let us not make the way forward harder and more tortuous, nor depreciate the United Nations original contribution of framing the most widely accepted basis for settling the conflict.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote.

(The President)

I should like to inform representatives that Afghanistan has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/42/L.40.

The General Assembly will now begin the voting process and take a decision on the various draft resolutions before it.

The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/42/L.33, L.34 and L.35 has been issued under the symbol A/42/801.

(The President)

We turn first to draft resolution A/42/L.33. 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, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, 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 Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/42/L.33 was adopted by 131 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions

(resolution 42/66 A)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/42/L.34. 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, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, 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, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, 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 Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The draft resolution was adopted by 133 votes to 2, with 20 abstentions (resolution 42/66 B).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): We turn now to the draft resolution contained in document A/42/L.35. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, 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, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The draft resolution was adopted by 133 votes to 3, with 18 abstentions (resolution 42/66 C).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): Lastly we come to the draft resolution contained in document A/42/L.40. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The draft resolution was adopted by 129 votes to 2, with 24 abstentions (resolution 42/66 D).

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

Mr. OKELY (Australia): Australia has abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/42/L.40. My delegation wishes to comment on a new element in the draft resolution this year, specifically the seventh preambular paragraph.

The Australian Government's policy is guided by a commitment to Israel's right to exist within secure recognized borders and firm support for Security Council

(Mr. Okely, Australia)

resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and by recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination and, if they so choose, to independence and the possibility of their own independent State.

With regard to the proposal for an international peace conference, Australia sees merit in the convening of such a conference as a possible means of facilitating a settlement. It follows that Australia cannot endorse elements of the seventh preambular paragraph which both blur fundamental issues and seek to prescribe the form of an international conference.

Mr. ABE (Japan): Japan voted in favour of draft resolution A/42/L.40 in the belief that an international framework of some kind is indeed in order to solve the Middle East problem and that the maintenance and continuation of the peace process is essential for ensuring stability in the Middle East. I should like to make it clear, however, that Japan does not necessarily support all the views quoted in the draft resolution and that Japan has reservations on some of its paragraphs, in particular on the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4.

Mr. BERGH JOHANSEN (Norway): Norway abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/42/L.40, concerning an international peace conference on the Middle East. However, the very concept of an international peace conference under United Nations auspices as a means of achieving a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict is fully supported by the Norwegian Government. A settlement must be based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and take due account of the basic aspirations and vital interests of all the parties concerned. In this context, the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination, must be taken into consideration.

(Mr. Bergh Johansen, Norway)

The draft resolution we have just voted on, however, contains detailed guidelines concerning the format and modalities of such a conference, which could be construed as imposing a procedure which is not acceptable to all parties and which would prejudice the outcome of the negotiations. The Norwegian Government feels that it is imperative that the framework and contents of the negotiations be freely decided upon by the parties themselves. For those reasons Norway abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

The Norwegian Government favours early negotiations and supports the Secretary-General in his efforts to reconcile the differences of opinion and find ways of bridging the gaps between the parties.

Mr. HOSSEINI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/42/L.33, L.34, L.35 and L.40. In explanation of vote, I should like to mention that my delegation is in principle against any resolution, action or report that might directly or indirectly imply recognition of the Zionist base of terror occupying Palestine. However, it is equally difficult for us to take a position that could be construed as detracting from our general support for our Palestinian brothers or having remained aloof from the cause of Palestine.

Regarding the reference to the international peace conference and the Amman Arab Summit Conference in draft resolution A/42/L.40, our position is well known. We do not wish to see our Palestinian brothers at any negotiating table with Zionist usurpers, nor do we support resolutions of the Amman Arab Summit Conference. It is our conviction that the Zionist base of terror must unconditionally withdraw from all Palestinian territories, including those occupied prior to 1967.

Mr. MALAGA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The Peruvian delegation voted in favour of the four resolutions just adopted by the General Assembly and would like once again to express its support for the just cause of the Palestinian people and its conviction that the solution of the problem of the Middle East can only be found on the basis of the following principles, which constitute the essence of Peru's position on this question: first, the need for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab territories occupied since 1967; secondly, the right of the Palestinian people to return to Palestine and recognition of its right to self-determination, independence and sovereignty, including the establishment of an independent Palestinian State; thirdly, participation of the Palestinians in the peace negotiations through their representative the Palestine Liberation Organization; and, fourthly, recognition of the right of all States of the region, including Israel, to existence within secure and internationally recognized borders.

In this context the Peruvian Government firmly supports the convening of the international peace conference on the Middle East and therefore supports the efforts that are being made in that direction by the Secretary-General.

Ms. RASI (Finland): The position of the Government of Finland on the question of Palestine remains unchanged. There can be no lasting peace in the Middle East without a just solution to the problem of Palestine through the attainment and exercise by the Palestinian people of their legitimate rights, including their right of national self-determination. Israel must therefore withdraw from Arab territories occupied since 1967. Palestinians must be given the right to participate in all negotiations on their own future.

In the voting just accomplished, my delegation abstained on draft resolution A/42/L.33 and A/42/L.34 because they failed to represent the balance which my Government considers a prerequisite for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement in the Middle East.

(Ms. Rasi, Finland)

My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/42/L.35 and L.40 though it has reservations on some formulations. With particular reference to draft resolution A/42/L.40, it will be recalled that Finland participated in the International Conference on the Question of Palestine and joined in the consensus on the final documents of that Conference. We did so, however, with the reservations contained in annex V of the report of the Conference, and in this connection I refer to those reservations.

Mr. SVOBODA (Canada): My delegation abstained on the draft resolution contained in document A/42/L.34 concerning the Division for Palestinian Rights. In changing from a negative vote on similar resolutions in past years, my delegation wishes to underline Canada's concern for the tragic plight of the Palestinian people. We also wish in this way to note our understanding and sympathy for the individual and collective rights of the Palestinian people, which should be furthered through the application of the United Nations Charter, relevant Security Council resolutions and of the Geneva conventions. Canada, as will be well known, endorses the right of the Palestinian people to a homeland on the West Bank and Gaza Strip and to its full participation in negotiations affecting its future. As regards the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) itself, we once again wish to recall that, while we do not recognize the organization as the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, we do see it as an important element in Palestinian opinion. As such, we value effective communications with the PLO.

Having thus set out Canada's guiding principles on these matters, my delegation hopes that our serious reservations about the manner in which the United Nations carries out its functions towards the Palestinians will be better understood.

(Mr. Svoboda, Canada)

Too often, activities undertaken in this area by the United Nations in response to Assembly resolutions are marred by a partisan spirit which we view as detrimental to what should be our fundamental objective, namely doing our utmost to underscore the urgent necessity of reaching a negotiated and just solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. We are concerned as well, in this period of financial restraint, that duplication exists in the mandates of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the Division for Palestinian Rights and the activities of the Department of Information. Taken together, these are the main reasons why we could not support the resolution contained in A/42/L.34.

As regards the draft resolution calling for the convening of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East, my delegation has again abstained. We continue to hold out some modest hope that the umbrella of an international peace conference might, if properly prepared, be a mechanism by which concrete progress in the peace process could be realized. We recognize fully, however, the efforts that will need to be invested by the main parties directly involved to establish an appropriate negotiating format which would meet their concern and facilitate real progress towards a lasting peace in the region.

Canada also wishes to express its appreciation for the efforts that have again been made in drafting this resolution in order to avoid the inclusion of extraneous elements and offensive language that had been unacceptable to my delegation in earlier years. Building on this positive dimension we encourage interested parties to show the necessary flexibility and moderation essential to any sincere effort to find solutions to the problems of the Middle East.

The foregoing notwithstanding, my delegation none the less could not fully endorse resolution A/42/L.40 as it was presented to us. In particular, we retain serious reservations about certain of the provisions of resolution 38/58 C, which is again referred to and which in our view prejudge the outcome of negotiations.

(Mr. Svoboda, Canada)

It is essential that there be, and Canada will continue to encourage, international support for direct negotiations between the parties to the dispute. In this context I wish to make it very clear that Canada does not believe that an international conference is a substitute for such direct talks. It remains our firm view that if there is to be an international framework it must be accepted by all concerned, including Israel, in order that this format will facilitate rather than hinder direct negotiations.

A just and durable settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict must be seen as a primary goal of the community of nations. Recent events resulting in further loss of life in northern Israel and of a nature which too often presages a further cycle of bloodshed, underscore the need to continue to pursue unceasingly this objective. To be successful, the efforts of the international community must, in our view, be fully consistent with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), acknowledged internationally as the foundation of a comprehensive solution. Those resolutions call for a reasonable balance of obligations on the parties involved. Together, they recognize the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and call for Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories. They require respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of every State in the area, including Israel, and stipulate the right of those States to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries.

Without the full application of these principles, we cannot hope to achieve for the Middle East that just and lasting peace to which Canada remains committed.

Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation voted in favour of the four draft resolutions, A/42/L.33, L.34, L.35 and L.40, because we believe in the national and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, foremost among which are the right of the Palestinian people to return to its homeland, its right to self-determination and the establishment of its own independent State on all its national soil.

(Mr. Fartas, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

My delegation has reservations about any references anywhere in these resolutions that could be interpreted, directly or indirectly, as taking away any of these rights.

My delegation has reservations also about any references in the resolutions that could be taken to mean, directly or indirectly, that my country recognizes the fait accompli which was imposed by force in occupied Palestine and which is in contradiction with the national and legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization wishes to make a statement. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)): At the end of an exhibit in the visitors' lobby of this building, we see the photograph of a young Palestinian boy with bright eyes and a smiling face, looking towards a peaceful future. I think that this boy is right to feel that way about the future. The result of the voting on draft resolution A/42/L.40 warrants such a positive and optimistic outlook.

Indeed, the call for the convening of the International Peace Conference in order to bring peace to the Middle East region has now won the day by a ratio of 65 to 1, as compared with 41 to 1 last year. The political implications of those figures are very significant. We are very happy and grateful about this result. We thank all those who have really supported the true path to peace - peace through negotiations under the auspices of the United Nations, with the specific mandate set forth in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C. I repeat that we thank all those who supported this call for peace.

Some truly bewildering statements have been made here. The representative of the United States said that the way forward would be

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

"to try to find an agreed framework for launching negotiations on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), to achieve a just, lasting and comprehensive peace which resolves the Palestinian problem in all its aspects". (supra, p. 43)

We are glad to hear the United States admit that. But it has said in this very Hall that resolution 242 (1967) does not address the political dimension of the question of Palestine. Indeed, in resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) the nine-letter word "Palestine" does not appear anywhere. So how can the present United States Administration try to inject the aspect of the question of Palestine into those resolutions?

Some representatives have expressed concern about the loss of life in northern Israel. But what about the lives of children and women in Gaza, in Nablus, in Hebron? Or does Arab blood mean nothing to them?

Finally, everybody refers to "recognized borders" in connection with resolution 242 (1967). But, please, can the United Nations tell us what are the recognized borders of Israel, and where Israeli expansionism ends?

We in the Palestine Liberation Organization know that there is no economic or social development in the Palestinian territories that are under Israeli occupation. Military occupation does not encourage economic and social development; they do not go hand in hand.

But, as has been stated here and as Chairman Arafat stated in his message in connection with the International Day of Solidarity on Monday last, the Palestine Liberation Organization fully supports General Assembly resolution 38/58 C. Indeed, that resolution was also fully supported in the declaration issued at the summit meeting in Amman.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

I would only repeat that we are happy that this year the ratio went from 41 to 1 to 65 to 1. That is a great achievement. Indeed, those two red lights that obstruct peace should disappear from the voting board in this Hall.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): That concludes our consideration of agenda item 38.*

AGENDA ITEMS 74, 76 AND 79 TO 81

EFFECTS OF ATOMIC RADIATION: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/42/777)

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/42/812 and Corr.1)

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/42/780)

QUESTION OF THE MALAGASY ISLANDS OF GLORIEUSES, JUAN DE NOVA, EUROPA AND BASSAS DA INDIA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/42/704)

QUESTION OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE RELEVANT ORGANS OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/42/700)

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Hlophe, Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee, to present the reports of that Committee on agenda items 74, 76 and 79 to 81.

Mr. HLOPHE (Swaziland), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly for its consideration this afternoon five reports of the Special Political Committee.

The first report, which is before the Assembly in document A/42/777, relates to agenda item 74, entitled "Effects of atomic radiation". The Special Political Committee considered this item at four meetings and, after hearing 24 statements in the general debate, adopted a draft resolution without a vote. The draft resolution, which appears in paragraph 11 of the report, is therefore recommended to the General Assembly for adoption.

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

(Mr. Hlophe, Rapporteur, Special
Political Committee)

The second report (A/42/812 and Corr.1), which I have the honour to present this afternoon, relates to agenda item 76, entitled "International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space". The Special Political Committee devoted seven meetings to consideration of this item and, after having heard 36 speakers in the general debate, adopted without a vote, the draft resolution which appears in paragraph 11 of the report and which is recommended to the General Assembly for adoption.

The third report (A/42/780) relates to item 79 of the agenda, entitled "United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East". The Committee considered this item at seven meetings and heard 39 statements in the general debate. Eleven draft resolutions, which appear in paragraph 33 of the report, are therefore recommended to the General Assembly for adoption. Two of the draft resolutions were, however, adopted without a vote, and the rest by recorded votes.

The Assembly considered the Committee's report (A/42/704) on agenda item 80, entitled "Question of the Malagasy Islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India". For the reasons set out in paragraph 3 of the report, the Special Political Committee duly recommends that the General Assembly should include the item in the provisional agenda of its forty-third session in 1988.

Last but not least, I present the Committee's report (A/42/700) on agenda item 81, entitled "Question of the composition of the relevant organs of the United Nations". For the reasons set out in paragraph 3 of the report, the Special Political Committee further recommends that the General Assembly should include this item in the provisional agenda of its forty-third session.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall consider that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Special Political Committee.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Special Political Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

May I remind members that, in paragraph 7 of its decision 34/401, the General Assembly decided 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 plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee.

May I also remind members that, in accordance with decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

May I now invite members to turn their attention to the reports of the Special Political Committee.

We shall consider first the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 74, entitled "Effects of atomic radiation" (A/42/777).

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee in paragraph 11 of its report (A/42/777).

The draft resolution was adopted by the Committee without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 42/67).

The PRESIDENT: We have now concluded our consideration of agenda item 74.

I now invite Members to turn their attention to the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 76, entitled "International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space" (A/42/812 and Corr.1).

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee in paragraph 11 of its report (A/42/812 and Corr.1).

The draft resolution was adopted by the Special Political Committee without a vote.

May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 42/68).

Mr. NAHES (Brazil): My delegation would like to explain its position on the decision just taken. The Brazilian delegation joined consensus on the adoption of the draft resolution on item 76, as contained in the report of the Special Political Committee (A/42/812 and Corr.1). We would like, however, to put on record our disappointment in the fact that it was impossible once again in this session to arrive at an agreement on the subject of a new item for the agenda of the Legal Sub-Committee. Operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution the Assembly has just adopted is clear in that it requests the Legal Sub-Committee to finalize the choice of the new item.

The Brazilian delegation will, as usual, participate in the negotiating effort in a constructive manner. In the same vein, we will oppose further delays in the solution of this problem.

The PRESIDENT: We have concluded our consideration of agenda item 76.

The Assembly will now consider the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 79, entitled "United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East" (A/42/780).

(The President)

The Assembly will now take a decision on the 11 draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political Committee in paragraph 33 of its report (A/42/780).

I now put to the Assembly draft resolution A, entitled "Assistance to Palestine refugees".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Israel

Resolution A was adopted by 153 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 42/69 A).

The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution B is entitled "Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East".

The Special Political Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 42/69 B)

The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution C, entitled "Assistance to persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities", was also adopted without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution C was adopted (resolution 42/69 C)

The PRESIDENT: We turn next to draft resolution D, entitled "Offers by Member States of grants and scholarships for higher education, including vocational training, for Palestine refugees". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Israel

Draft resolution D was adopted by 154 votes to none, with one abstention (resolution 42/69 D).

The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution E is entitled "Palestine refugees in the Gaza Strip". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Costa Rica, Liberia, Zaire

Draft resolution E was adopted by 150 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions (resolution 42/69 E).

The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution F is entitled "Resumption of the ration distribution to Palestine refugees". 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, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, 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 Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Austria, Equatorial Guinea, Greece, Spain

Draft resolution F was adopted by 131 votes to 20, with 4 abstentions (resolution 42/69 F).

The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution G, entitled "Population and refugees displaced since 1967". 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, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, 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 Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire

Draft resolution G was adopted by 125 votes to 2, with 27 abstentions (resolution 42/69 G).

The PRESIDENT: We come next to draft resolution H, entitled "Revenues derived from Palestine refugee properties". 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, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, 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, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire

Draft resolution H was adopted by 123 votes to 2, with 28 abstentions (resolution 42/69 H).

The PRESIDENT: Next, we turn to draft resolution I, entitled "Protection of Palestine refugees".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, 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 Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire

Draft resolution I was adopted by 124 votes to 2, with 27 abstentions (resolution 42/69 I).*

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

The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution J is entitled "Palestine refugees in the West Bank". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Liberia, Zaire

Draft resolution J was adopted by 145 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions (resolution 42/69 J).

The PRESIDENT: Finally, we come to draft resolution K, entitled "University of Jerusalem 'Al Quds' for Palestine refugees". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Equatorial Guinea

Draft resolution K was adopted by 151 votes to 2, with 1 abstention (resolution 42/69 K).

The PRESIDENT: We have thus concluded our consideration of agenda item 79.

We shall now consider the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 80, entitled "Question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India" (A/42/704).

The Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee contained in paragraph 4 of its report.

The Committee recommends that the General Assembly should include the item entitled "Question of the Malagasy islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India" in the provisional agenda of its forty-third session.

If I hear no objection, I shall consider that the General Assembly adopts that recommendation.

It was so decided.

We have concluded our consideration of agenda item 80.

We turn now to the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 81, entitled "Question of the composition of the relevant organs of the United Nations" (A/42/700).

In paragraph 5 of its report the Special Political Committee recommends that the General Assembly should include in the provisional agenda of its forty-third session the item entitled "Question of the composition of the relevant organs of the United Nations".

In the absence of any objection, may I take it that the Assembly adopts that recommendation?

It was so decided.

We have concluded our consideration of agenda item 81.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.