

UN LIBRARY

AUG 26 1982



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

UN/DA COLLECTION



PROVISIONAL

A/ES-7/PV.31
24 August 1982

ENGLISH

Seventh emergency special session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 19 August 1982, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. KITTANI

(Iraq)

- Question of Palestine: draft resolutions A/ES-7/L.5 to A/ES-7/L.7/Rev.1
/5/ (continued)
- Temporary adjournment of the seventh emergency special session

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 delegations concerned, within one week, to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

82-61416/A

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 5 (continued)

QUESTION OF PALESTINE: DRAFT RESOLUTIONS A/ES-7/L.5 to A/ES-7/L.7/Rev.1

The PRESIDENT: This afternoon we shall hear the remaining explanations of vote before the vote and then proceed to vote on the three draft resolutions before the Assembly, namely, A/ES-7/L.5, L.6 and L.7/Rev.1.

I remind representatives that explanations of vote should not exceed 10 minutes and should be delivered from the speakers's seat.

Mr. TRUCCO (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The Chilean delegation will vote for draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5, since its general approach is consistent with the basic principle of my country's foreign policy, namely, that the use of force is inadmissible for the United Nations to accept as a legitimate means of settling international disputes. This time, the use of violence has tragically affected the Lebanese people whose suffering cannot leave any member of the international community unmoved. After years of savage fighting, owing basically to outside intervention, Lebanon today has been suffering new and painful episodes of warfare which have resulted in huge loss of life and enormous destruction of property. It is therefore urgent for the international community to act to end the violence and to seek means to ensure respect for Lebanon's territorial integrity for which a stop to all outside interference in the country is an essential prerequisite. We wish a speedy and successful conclusion to Ambassador Habib's arduous mediation efforts, but we know that the tragedy afflicting Lebanon today will not be finally ended until there is a comprehensive settlement of the problem of the Middle East.

In this respect I should now like to re-emphasize that Chile firmly believes that the basis for such a settlement is to be found in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which recognize the territorial integrity of all peoples in the area, including, of course, Israel, and their right to live within secure frontiers, which call for a halt to the occupation of territories and which recognize the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and

(Mr. Trucco, Chile)

national sovereignty. We believe that the inclusion of reference to those resolutions in draft resolution would have been a very positive step. While we will vote for it because it is consistent with the basic approach, to which I referred before, of prohibiting the use of force, I am bound, nevertheless, to express our reservations on certain preambular and operative paragraphs, which do not include all the components of the Palestinian people, which imply excessive condemnation and which call on the Security Council for actions which impinge prerogatives that lie within the exclusive competence of the Council.

Lebanon's tragic experience - and we assure its people of our affectionate solidarity - should now serve to encourage a sensible and realistic search for a way truly to resolve the problem of the Middle East once and for all so that that area can finally live in peace and progress.

My delegation would lastly like to state that we will vote for draft resolution A/ES-7/L.6, but will not take part in the vote on draft resolution A/ES-7/L.7/Rev.1 because we consider that even as amended it continues to establish a discriminatory precedent that is in no way consistent with the mediation efforts and the search for a peaceful settlement that is under way and which we should seek to encourage.

Mr. HELSKOV (Denmark): I would like to make a statement on the resolutions on behalf of the Ten member States of the European Community.

As regards draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5, the Ten agree with the general thrust of the resolution. In this connexion they recall the views expressed in their common statement in the general debate on 16 August which made clear their vigorous condemnation of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. However, the resolution before us does not reflect with the necessary balance that was set out in the common statement of the Ten all the principles on which, in the view of the Ten, a just and lasting peace settlement in the Middle East must be based.

On draft resolution A/ES-7/L.6 the Ten recall the position taken and the views and reservations expressed in their common statement at the adoption last year of the corresponding resolution A/36/120 C, in particular the reservations concerning the proposed basis of and preparations for the conference.

Finally, concerning draft resolution A/ES-7/L.7 the Ten have stated repeatedly their deep concern at the extent of the loss of life and suffering which have followed in the wake of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. They share the sorrow over all children who have fallen victim to this and other conflicts. They believe that the best way of remembering the children who have fallen victim in the conflict is the provision of humanitarian aid.

Mr. SALONEN (Finland): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5. In spite of many reservations to formulations of that draft, of which the members of this Assembly are well aware, Finland will cast a positive vote on the draft. The reasons for our stand are the following:

First, we see the draft resolution as an expression of the universal indignation at the Israeli military action in Lebanon, at the death and suffering it has caused, particularly among the innocent civilian population.

Secondly, the conflict in Lebanon is but the latest manifestation of the absence of peace in the Middle East. Peace in the region is not only in the interest of all the nations in the Middle East but in the general interest of the international community as a whole. We therefore consider that draft resolution a serious effort to call for a new and decisive United Nations effort to reach an agreement on the entire Middle East question, that is, not only a just solution of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

(Mr. Salonen, Finland)

Thirdly, the authority of the United Nations has been challenged in Lebanon. Its capacity to act as the main instrument of peace has been damaged. But this does not absolve the United Nations from its responsibility. That responsibility is given in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), aimed at establishing a just and lasting peace in the region. No formulations or omissions in the draft resolution before us can detract from the requirements that all the nations in the region, including Israel, have the right not only to exist but also to live within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force.

It is the considered opinion of my Government that those are the requirements of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It is our understanding that this is also the paramount purpose of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5. On these grounds we shall cast an affirmative vote for draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5.

Mr. ORTEZ COLINDREF (Honduras) (interpretation from Spanish): The Honduran delegation would like to place clearly on record its position concerning the three draft resolutions which have been distributed at this meeting, bearing in mind the fact some of these paragraphs are not sufficiently precise to prevent differing forms of interpretation from arising in the future which would be particularly awkward in an intrinsically difficult and complex matter which has resulted in countless decisions being adopted by the Security Council and this General Assembly.

Honduras considers that the problem arising here, the question of Palestine, cannot be resolved, ensuring an end to violence in the area, without involving the very essence of the issue, which is the Palestine question and the inalienable right of its people to live without outside interference and to become a State with secure frontiers which will guarantee its own full identity and sovereign jurisdiction. For Honduras this does not imply ignoring the right of the State of Israel to exist within its own clearly defined frontiers which will allow its people to be able to live in permanent peace with its neighbours, a matter which was the actual idea of the United Nations when it created Israel as a State.

(Mr. Ortez Colindref, Honduras)

Honduras considers, as one of the most valuable principles of international law and one which has become a norm in the inter-American system, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force, since the contrary would constitute not merely a denial of such a right, or such a law, but would also lead to the start of the collapse of the system of free and harmonious coexistence advocated by our very Organization's Charter.

Honduras therefore joins in the demand of the overwhelming majority of the international community that Israel unconditionally withdraw from the recently invaded Lebanese territories, and we express our fervent support of efforts to settle the problem of violence through civilized negotiations involving all parties concerned, the only way in which a comprehensive solution, a desirable one, guaranteeing peace in the Middle East can be reached. We consider, further, that the Lebanese people is fully entitled to exercise, without any outside interference, through democratic channels, its authority to choose its own government as a clear demonstration of its sovereign power.

Honduras also expresses its profound concern at the failure of Israel to fulfil resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly, since, if that were the conduct of all the other States Members of the United Nations, particularly those which possess atomic weapons, humanity would be adrift without any rules to halt violence and the overbearing conduct of certain Governments which occasionally emerge in the international community. Small countries with a relatively small defensive capacity, have, as a guiding principle for their conduct, only the rule of law as a valid means of ensuring peaceful and harmonious coexistence. Therefore, Honduras will vote for draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5.

(Mr. Ortez Colindref, Honduras)

On the other hand, we consider that all appropriate peaceful means likely to contribute to a durable peace in the Middle East should be explored, and, if the international conference on the question of Palestine is convened, this will be a further means of bringing about the desired objectives. Hence Honduras agrees and will support the holding of that conference in the form suggested, and our vote will be in favour of the contents of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.6 now before the Assembly.

Honduras shares the grief felt at the tragedy of children killed in war, the innocent victims of the political conflicts of our generation, which bodes ill for the future of mankind, but we do not consider that the pain and injustice thus suffered can be expressed by referring solely to the grief and tragedy surrounding the Palestinian and Lebanese children. Therefore, although we protest against these children's suffering, we shall abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/ES-7/L.7 in the form proposed.

Mr. SANZ de SANTAMARIA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish):

I should like to thank the President and my colleague the Ambassador of Spain for having kindly sought a change in the Spanish translation of the English text of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.7, which undoubtedly improves it.

My delegation considers that there is no more disturbing issue for any decent person than the subject of this draft resolution. We would have liked to vote for it. However, since it does not deal with the commemoration of an isolated fact but provides for the repetition of the commemoration each year, we shall have to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as it now stands, because it seems to us to be inadequate. The proposal should, we feel, cover all children who yesterday, today or tomorrow in any part of the world were, are or will be the innocent victims of any act of aggression.

Mr. BLUM (Israel): The three draft resolutions before the General Assembly illustrate clearly the Arab leaders' outlook on the United Nations and the manner in which Arab representatives apply this outlook in their tactics here.

The Arab leaders are beating what little has been left of the United Nations ploughshare into an Arab sword.

Every emergency session in these series, each set of additional counter-productive and propaganda-oriented resolutions rival, and indeed are intended to outdo, previous Arab exercises in the abuse of United Nations machinery against Israel. The purpose can only be abundantly to stoke the furnace of hatred.

In our statement of 17 August before this Assembly, we appealed to the Arab neighbours of Israel to forsake enmity and to engage with us in an honest dialogue, to bend their collective will to a search for peace and reconciliation. Instead, the draft resolutions before us bespeak a renewed Arab rejection, a resolve to meander ever deeper into the morass of belligerence.

There are three draft resolutions before us, A/ES-7/L.5, A/ES-7/L.6 and A/ES-7/L.7, as revised, and all of them characterize the confrontational course illustrative of perpetual Arab warmongering. But draft resolution A/ES-7/L.7 stands out in sharp relief even on that background. Draft resolution A/ES-7/L.7, as revised, purports to decree a Day of Innocent Children and in its original form would have provided also for the display at United Nations Headquarters of a plaque to commemorate Lebanese and Palestinian children. The Arab leaders would have the United Nations reach a new nadir in its sinking prestige, but even they and such well-known humanitarians as the representatives of the tropical gulag of Havana were apparently given to understand that they have gone too far, even by their own standards of vulgarity which they have imposed on this Organization.

The Israel Defence Forces did not go to Lebanon to kill children or any other civilians for that matter; the Israel Defence Forces went into Lebanon to break the back of the very organization that eulogizes the murderers of children in Israel and of Jewish children world-wide - at the school of Ma'alot, in the school bus of Avivim, in Nahariya, the toddlers of Kibbutz Misgav Am, Jewish schoolchildren in Antwerp, the youths of the Israeli Olympic Team in Munich. The Israel Defence Forces were often shot at by mere children pressed

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

into the employment of the PLO. Two hundred and sixty of those children were captured by Israel and have been returned to their parents through the Red Cross. The PLO shielded its "heroes" behind children and women in order to save their own petty lives. They cut off the fingers of many boys in Lebanese villages to prevent them from bearing arms against them.

In its pursuit of the PLO usurpers in Lebanon, the Israel Defence Forces did everything in their power to prevent civilian casualties, at great risk to their own soldiers. Every move was preceded by ample warnings to the civilian population, which was often forcibly prevented by the PLO from evacuating the vicinity of their positions. Thanks to the precautions taken by the Israel Defence Forces, the civilian casualties are fortunately considerably smaller than the deliberately inflated figures bandied about by Israel's enemies and their supporters. These are the facts that should be inscribed on any plaque.

If the logic of that perverted draft resolution had been followed to its conclusion, the United Nations building itself would be studded with plaques commemorating those regrettably numerous instances around the world in which, in contradistinction to Israel's operation in Lebanon, children have been the deliberate targets of premeditated murder and genocidal policies -- including not a few countries belonging to the sorry outfit that has co-sponsored this draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/ES-7/L.6 provides for an international conference on Palestine -- another act of narcissistic excess with a great deal of valuable money blown away on junkets by various PLO propagandists and their fellow-travellers. As is indicated in document A/ES-7/19 on the financial implications of this junket, it is going to cost the international taxpayers \$5.7 million. That is nothing short of an outright scandal. How many small mouths could those \$5.7 million go to feed in a world in which millions of children are on the verge of starvation, instead of pandering to the vanities of the insatiable desire of the PLO henchmen and all those gentlemen seized by an irresistible impulse to see the sights of Paris in 1983? The Orwellian year of 1982, as originally proposed for that conference, would have undoubtedly been much more appropriate.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

The draft resolution contained in document A/ES-7/L.5 represents yet another attempt by the enemies of peace in the Middle East to undermine the peace process in our region and its only agreed basis - Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). As I pointed out in my statement of 17 August, Security Council resolution 242 (1967) constitutes a balanced whole that cannot be tampered with in any form whatsoever without upsetting that balance. Any attempt to do so will therefore be resolutely resisted by my Government. As is customary on such occasions, the enemies of peace have seen fit again to use the automatic majority at their beck and call in this Assembly to tie together in this draft resolution a string of deliberate lies and false accusations against my country.

For these and many more reasons, the delegation of Israel will vote against these draft resolutions and would strongly urge the members of those delegations that do not consider themselves bound by the chains of the automatic majority to do likewise.

I request that a roll-call vote be taken on all three draft resolutions.

The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to the vote, I should like to inform representatives that the following additional countries have become sponsors of the draft resolutions: with respect to draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5, Benin, Cape Verde, Cyprus, Gambia, Maldives, Malta, Mozambique, Sri Lanka and Uganda; with respect to draft resolution A/ES-7/L.6, Benin, Cape Verde, Czechoslovakia, Gambia, Maldives, Niger, Romania, Sri Lanka and Uganda; with regard to draft resolution A/ES-7/L.7/Rev.1, Benin and Gambia.

Before the Assembly proceeds to the vote on draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5 as a whole, I shall put to the vote operative paragraph 2 of that draft, on which a separate recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Australia, Canada, Israel, Jamaica, United States of America

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Burma, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Swaziland, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5 was adopted by 107 votes to 5, with 26 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/ES-7/L.5 and Add.1. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Mali, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic,
France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland,
Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands,
New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of
Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 120 votes to 2, with 20
abstentions (resolution ES-7/6)

The PRESIDENT: We shall now turn to draft resolution A/ES-7/L.6. With regard to the required statement of financial implications in connexion with this draft resolution, I wish to draw the attention of the Assembly to the following. I am advised that the competent officers of the Secretariat have been in touch with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to discuss this matter. I also wish to recall that the basic decision concerning the holding of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine was taken by the General Assembly in its resolution 36/120C of 10 December 1981. At that time the Secretary-General informed the members that the financial implications attendant upon such a decision would be presented to the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. In the meantime the Secretariat has prepared the required statement of financial implications which is contained in document A/ES-7/19. In view of the emergency nature of this session and the fact that the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee were not able to meet, this document will be presented for examination and decision by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session. I have been informed that it will be the intention of the Secretary-General to consult urgently with the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to obtain authority to commit any additional funds that may be necessary before the thirty-seventh session to start the preparations for the Conference.

I now put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/ES-7/L.6 and Add.1. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Botswana, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic,

Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, 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 123 votes to 2, with 18 abstentions (resolution ES-7/7).

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/ES-7/L.7/Rev.1. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Benin, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

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

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Samoa, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire

The draft resolution was adopted by 102 votes to 2, with 34 abstentions (resolution ES-7/8).

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those delegations who have indicated their desire to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. CABELLO SARUBBI (Paraguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted for draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5 although we are not fully satisfied with that text. My country's position with regard to Palestine has always been perfectly clear. We believe in the necessity for a peaceful and comprehensive settlement, including full recognition of the existence of the State of Israel and of the right of the Palestinian people to their own country, a settlement that will also provide for effective machinery to ensure peaceful coexistence in the Middle East on the basis already laid down, and in particular Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

We also regret that the draft resolution that we have just adopted does not fully provide for the need to adopt measures effectively to alleviate the suffering of the noble people of Lebanon as well as to ensure its unity and guarantee its territorial integrity and independence.

Be that as it may, we supported that draft resolution because we believe that its implementation could contribute to restoring in the region full respect for the fundamental principles of international coexistence, such as the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States, non-use of indiscriminate warfare and the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence.

Mr. AZAR GOMEZ (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): Uruguay voted for draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5, since among other matters it does cover the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and calls for the free exercise by the Palestinian people of its right to self-determination. We feel that it is for the Palestinian people alone to appoint representatives in exercise of this right. Support should be given to the references to implementation of the Security Council resolutions relating to the question of Lebanon which are obligatory under the Charter, but the solution of the complex issues in the Middle East require strict fulfilment and implementation of all Security Council resolutions relevant in the matter, including resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), so that compromise formulas equitably and fairly cover

(Mr. Azar Gomez, Uruguay)

all the rights in question. At the same time it should be emphasized that, in supporting these or any other Security Council resolutions, the General Assembly cannot encroach on the competence of the Council by adopting measures that fall exclusively within the latter's purview.

As regards the General Assembly resolutions mentioned generically in operative paragraph 4, my delegation reserves its position in respect of those which it did not support at the time they were adopted. We feel that our concern over the serious events that have occurred in Lebanon starting on 4 June is implicit in our affirmative vote which expresses our solidarity with its noble people in its great suffering. In this connexion we reaffirm our support for Lebanese sovereignty throughout its territory and the integrity and independence of a united Lebanon. Thus we support measures aimed at bringing about the withdrawal of all foreign contingents which were not explicitly requested by the Lebanese Government, full respect for the civilian population, including humanitarian assistance, and the final cessation of hostilities. In this connexion my Government believes that this draft resolution should not involve any delay in achieving those objectives.

Mr. MIYAKAWA (Japan): Japan's basic position on the grave situation brought about by recent Israeli military actions in Lebanon and on the question of Palestine was explained in detail in my delegation's statement of 16 June at this resumed session.

As regards draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5 which has just been adopted, my delegation has some difficulty with the wording and contents of certain preambular and operative paragraphs, in particular operative paragraphs 2 and 11. In spite of these difficulties, my delegation decided to vote in favour of this draft resolution since it believes that the latest extreme Israeli military actions should by no means be condoned by the international community. However, in connexion with operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution, my delegation is of the view that reference should have been made to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), and I should like to make it clear that Japan's affirmative vote on this draft resolution in no way affects my Government's position on the question of Palestine.

Mr. WARD (New Zealand): On 26 June the New Zealand delegation expressed its concern at the appalling situation that had arisen in Lebanon as a result of the invasion by Israel's armed forces. New Zealanders are deeply concerned at the high civilian toll that Israel's intense shelling and bombing, particularly of Beirut, have caused. Israel has repeatedly expressed a desire to live in peace and security with its neighbours and people of the region. The current action in Lebanon will not contribute to the achievement of this goal.

New Zealand deeply regrets Israel's persistent defiance of the resolutions of the Security Council, particularly resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). Those who have allowed this situation to continue bear a heavy responsibility. There are many elements in the resolutions before us that New Zealand supports and we regret that we have not found it possible to express this support with an affirmative vote. There are many elements of the currently interrelated fates of the Lebanese and Palestinian people that these resolutions ignore. Some paragraphs make ambiguous proposals, when what is called for is clarity if they are to serve a useful purpose. Elsewhere there is a tendency for propaganda to replace provisions which would contribute constructively to the recognition and achievement of the rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to statehood.

It is for this reason that my delegation abstained on all three resolutions. The particular paragraphs which caused difficulty in the resolution contained in document A/ES-7/L.5 are operative paragraphs 2, 4, 6, 9 and 11.

Mr. ROWE (Australia): This session of the reconvened emergency special session on Palestine is taking place against a background of the tragic events in Lebanon arising out of the Israeli invasion of that country. That conflict has highlighted the need for a comprehensive Middle East settlement, including the creation of a homeland for the Palestinian people.

On 9 August the Australian Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, issued a statement setting out the views of the Australian Government on the conflict in Lebanon and on wider Middle East issues. That was circulated as a document of the Security Council, document S/15356. I do not propose here to canvas again the issues set out in that statement.

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

With reference to resolution A/ES-7/L.5 there were a number of specific aspects of the text which the Australian Government was unable to support, which has necessitated that my delegation should abstain on the resolution as a whole. I refer particularly to operative paragraph 2 and operative paragraph 4. Moreover, there were a number of aspects of the resolution which took no account of the stage reached in the negotiations for a settlement in Lebanon.

In conclusion, may I reiterate that the Australian Government believes that a comprehensive settlement to the Middle East dispute should, inter alia, include a recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to a homeland and a right to participate directly in decisions affecting their future.

Mr. GOTTLET VALDES (Bolivia): Draft resolution A/ES-7/L.7, which is worthy of respect in humanitarian terms, is discriminatory and unsatisfactory since it does not mention the thousands of children who are victims of war, terrorism and political genocide in other parts of the world, or other tragic events in history.

For this reason the Bolivian delegation abstained in the vote on that draft.

Mr. THANT (Burma): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-7/L.5 submitted by Qatar. We did so for obvious reasons, which I hope need no reiteration here today. However, to be consistent with our past stand on some specific aspects, my delegation found it necessary to abstain in the separate vote on operative paragraph 2. For the same reason my delegation would like to register its reservation on the wording and formulation of certain paragraphs, namely, preambular paragraphs 2 and 10 and operative paragraph 11.

My delegation also voted for the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-7/L.6. That was only in keeping with the stand we took on resolution 36/120 C of 10 December last. But we have some reservation on operative paragraph 3 in which a specific action at the national level is suggested.

We are certainly not in a position to commit our Government to a definitive measure of this nature.

We abstained in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-7/L.7/Rev.1, submitted by Kuwait. However, our abstention on this draft should in no way be construed or, rather, misconstrued as a lack of sympathy on the part of my country with the tragic plight in which the people of Lebanon, young and old alike, find themselves at present - far from it. We abstained, as we said we did on A/ES-7/L.7/Rev.1, partly because we are somewhat sceptical whether and how the action invited in this draft could in any way serve the cause of a just and lasting peace which we all have at heart, and lastly because we have not had the time to seek the necessary instructions.

Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic):

The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic voted for draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5 of 18 August 1982 and now wishes to state that it would have wished to find in that resolution a firm condemnation of Israel for its aggression against Lebanon and for its invasion of that country and for the barbaric acts committed by it against the cities, without discrimination and against the Palestinian people and against the refugee camps.

We also would have liked to include in that resolution a paragraph that the General Assembly has already adopted reiterating that Israel is not a peace-loving Member State and has not fulfilled its commitments in keeping with the United Nations Charter and General Assembly resolution 273 (III) of 11 May 1949 which admitted Israel as a Member State to the United Nations. Another resolution provided that its admission was subject to conditions concerning its attitude vis-à-vis the territories occupied since 1948 and the return of refugees to their homes and to their property.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

Israel has not complied with its commitments and requirements as a Member. Stress should be placed on this point by expelling it from this Organization. We would have liked the resolution to stipulate and confirm once again that a just peace is based on the total, immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967. We would also have liked to see a reiteration of the right of the Palestinian people to return to their homes and to establish their own independent State on their own national territory in keeping with United Nations resolutions.

Finally, that resolution should necessarily have called upon Israel to be a good neighbour to all countries of the region and it should have been reiterated that numerous Member States have indeed broken off - either completely or partially - their relations with Israel as a last resort. We should like to recall that the Republic of Nicaragua broke off all relations with Israel, and we thank Nicaragua for that noble and principled stand.

With regard to operative paragraph 11, we understand that the Palestinian people have the right to self-determination in their own independent national State after they have exercised their right to self-determination.

Mr. ELHOFARI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): The Libyan delegation voted for the draft resolution in document A/ES-7/L.5, although we were convinced that it did not reflect in detail the ideas expressed by delegations in their statements before the General Assembly during the resumed seventh emergency special session. The General Assembly ought to have taken effective action against the Zionist entity by expelling it from this international Organization for having ignored United Nations resolutions and for the Zionist acts of aggression it committed. Those recent acts were barbaric and again emphasized the expansionist Nazi policy practised by the Zionist entity. Quite clearly, it was condemned by all delegations for those acts of aggression. The gratuitous bombing of Arab territories and the carnage and genocide inflicted on the civilian populations were also condemned.

(Mr. Elhofari, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Similarly, that draft resolution ought to have contained a condemnation of the American Administration's policy which is designed to encourage the Zionist entity to continue its acts of aggression by providing it with all kinds of political, economic and human support.

My delegation voted for this draft resolution as a strict minimum, while emphasizing our position with respect to resolutions which are incompatible with the rights of the Palestinian people, especially Security Council resolution 242 (1967). With regard to that resolution, our position has been emphasized many times, and we have expressed our reservations on all those resolutions. The implementation of those resolutions would mean making the occupation of the Zionist entity permanent.

We should like to express our reservations also with regard to operative paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5. Our attitude is well known with respect to the call for an international conference and what we refer to as "peace conferences".

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): My country's delegation voted for draft resolution A/ES-7/L.5 and would like to emphasize that its vote is based on its understanding that operative paragraph 11 concerning "relevant resolutions" does not include resolution 242 (1967). Democratic Yemen does not recognize that resolution and does not consider it to be the basis for a just settlement of the cause of the Palestinian people enabling it to recover its inalienable rights to return, to self-determination and the establishment of its own independent national State on its own national territory - Palestine - under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine.

Mr. DORR (Ireland): The representative of Denmark spoke in the debate on behalf of the ten member States of the European Community. I want to add the following more explicit comments to explain Ireland's votes on the three draft resolutions just adopted.

At the outset, I should like to emphasize that Ireland tries at all times to approach the tangled questions of the Middle East honestly and objectively. We seek to approach each issue on its merits, **with concern** and with a full sense of the vital importance for all of us and for the world of a peaceful solution of the complex problems of the region.

This has been our approach in every statement we make and in every vote we cast - both in the Security Council during our current membership and in this Assembly.

We want to support and encourage in every way we can the concept of a dialogue leading to a negotiation which, in turn, will lead to a peace settlement. Such a settlement must be comprehensive, just and lasting; it must take full account of all aspects of a complex problem; it must do so in a balanced way; and it must involve all of the parties, including both Israel and the representatives of the Palestinian people.

The core of any such settlement must, in our view, be a reconciliation at last of two fundamental principles: the right of all States in the region to live in peace within secure, recognized and accepted boundaries - this must of course include Israel; and the right of every people in the region to justice and to respect for its fundamental rights as a people - this must include the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination within the framework of a peace settlement and their right to participate, through their representatives, in the negotiation of that settlement.

We know very well that it will be no easy task to reconcile these two principles. As a State outside the region, we do not presume to tell those involved in detail what eventual settlement they shall reach. But the international community as a whole is deeply affected and threatened by the continuing conflict. As a member of the international community, and particularly as a member of the Security Council at this moment, we do have the right and the duty to press continually for negotiation. We insist that dialogue between the main forces involved, and in particular between Israel and the representatives

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

of the Palestinian people, including the PLO, should replace confrontation. There should be an end to the blind refusal by each so far to accept the very right to existence of the other. We will also continue, as we must, to deplore and speak out in the strongest possible way against all actions, such as those of Israel recently in Lebanon, actions which lead to further loss of life, aggravate existing conflicts and set back even further all hope for a dialogue and a comprehensive peace settlement involving all parties.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

That is the background against which Ireland has approached the three resolutions on which the Assembly has just voted.

We abstained from voting on resolution A/ES-7/L.5. This detailed resolution on the question of Palestine addresses many aspects of that issue, as well as the present situation in Lebanon. We abstained with some regret because we support many points in the text.

Ireland's position on the events of recent months in Lebanon will be clear from our statements and votes in the Security Council. We deeply deplore the loss of life, the destruction and the tragic suffering which has occurred, and we call with insistence for the full implementation by Israel of Security Council resolutions on Lebanon, for all of which we voted in the Council.

However, a central point in that resolution is operative paragraph 2 which:

"Calls for the free exercise in Palestine of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination without external interference and to national independence".

Precisely because this issue of Palestinian rights is a core-issue in the complex Middle East problem, we felt it necessary to be clear and precise in our approach to it when we came to vote. Ireland supports the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and, as our Foreign Minister said some months ago in the Irish Parliament, we believe that their right to self-determination within the framework of a peace settlement could include the right to an independent State.

Our view so far is clear, but we did not feel that we could in honesty vote in favour of a draft resolution asserting one of the two principles which we consider basic to a peace settlement if it contained no reference to the other principle with which we believe that first principle must ultimately be reconciled: that, of course, is the principle of the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to live in peace. The present resolution contained no such balancing reference.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

We had reservations also on certain other paragraphs of the draft which deal with the Palestinian question and where we find the formulations not wholly satisfactory. However, we focus mainly on operative paragraph 2 and, for the reasons I mentioned, we found it necessary to abstain from voting on that paragraph and on the draft as a whole.

I turn now to resolution A/ES-7/L.6, which calls for an international conference on Palestine, to be held in Paris in August 1983. It may be that at the appropriate time an international conference under appropriate auspices should be convened with a view to resolving the Middle East problem and achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace settlement. Such a conference, of course, would have to involve all parties, including Israel and the recognized representatives of the Palestinian people, and it would have to address itself to all aspects of the problem.

In our view, the proposed conference, which was already envisaged in the General Assembly resolution of 10 December 1981 and which the present resolution now fixes for August of next year, would not meet those requirements. We abstained from voting on last year's resolution, and for similar reasons we felt it necessary to abstain from voting on the present one.

The third resolution (A/ES-7/L.7) established 4 June of each year as the International Day of Innocent Children Victims of Aggression. That date was obviously selected as the start of Israel's present and continuing actions in Lebanon. Ireland is appalled at the casualties and particularly the death and suffering caused to innocent children during this conflict. It has indeed been enormous. To us the life of every child and indeed every human being, lost through conflict is priceless - in the literal sense, beyond price. This includes Israeli, Lebanese, Palestinian and Syrian lives lost in the present conflict. We have stated this many times in the Security Council and elsewhere and we will continue to show the same concern at all loss of innocent life and also at every action which continues and aggravates existing conflicts.

(Mr. Dorr, Ireland)

We believe, too, that a major effort towards humanitarian relief in Lebanon will be required. In our view, however, this approach, rather than the approach taken in the **resolution**, which nominates the day of the Israeli attack as an international day of commemoration, would have been the best way to ensure that present sufferings in Lebanon are relieved and that similar tragedies are avoided for the future.

We therefore abstained from voting also on that text.

Mr. SIBAY (Turkey): Turkey voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-7/L.5. Turkey's firm support of the Arab-Palestinian cause and its position on the Middle East problem are well known. Turkey's voting record in this regard in the United Nations is also clear. It is in the light of Turkey's established policies and record on the situation in the Middle East that its present positive vote on L.5 should be understood, particularly given the fact that there exist certain elements in the resolution just adopted which, in our view, lack the required clarity in terms of their implications and consequences.

Turkey also voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-7/L.7.

We wish strongly to emphasize that the Turkish Government and people have been intensely grieved and shocked by the ongoing tragedy of Lebanon. Israeli aggression against and its invasion of the independent and sovereign State of Lebanon is in total contravention of international law.

We sympathize with all the innocent civilian victims of Israel's illegal aggression, whether they be men, women or children.

That is why we cast a positive vote in this unprecedented and unique **situation**.

Finally, we should like to put on record our earnest hope that the present agreement that appears to have been reached on the immediate situation in Beirut is successfully implemented so that the political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon can be fully restored without delay and without further bloodshed.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): The Albanian delegation voted for the three draft resolutions, pursuant to its well-known attitude of support for the just cause of the Palestinian and Arab peoples. However, we wish to say that we have certain reservations vis-à-vis the text in document A/ES-7/L.5.

That resolution refers to a certain number of resolutions adopted by the Security Council which, in our view, contain elements harmful to the just struggle of the Palestinian people. We deem particularly unjust all provisions that tend to put on an equal footing the aggressor and the victim of aggression. In operative paragraph 11 of that resolution reference is made to an international conference. In this regard, our delegation would like to repeat, as it has on many occasions in the past, that we are opposed to concepts, proposals or plans elaborated by the imperialist super-Powers to convene meetings and international conferences to deal with the situation in and the problem of the Middle East. We firmly stand by our position of principle.

Mr. LOUET (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation regrets that it was not able to vote for the three resolutions.

With regard to resolution A/ES-7/L.5, many of its paragraphs meet with our agreement, but several formulations could not be accepted - in particular, those which tended to impinge upon the competence of the Security Council. Moreover, that resolution in particular does not seem to us timely under present conditions. Although my delegation was not opposed in principle to the idea of the international conference referred to in resolution A/ES-7/L.6, we feel that the elements of a settlement must be found through a discussion among the existing States and political forces in the region, including the Palestinians, which implies the presence of the PLO in the negotiations. If after such a process a chance of success should arise, an international conference could then be useful, but at the present stage the idea seems premature.

(Mr. Louet, France)

However, that to us is not the principal problem: the essential point, in our view, is to restore peace to Lebanon - particularly to Beirut, a city whose unmitigated suffering has shocked us, as indeed we have also been shocked by the numerous tragic deaths of innocent, helpless unarmed civilians who were facing overwhelming violence.

Moreover, priority must be given to the efforts currently under way to promote a solution to the problem of Beirut. The humanitarian problems must be solved in the immediate future, be it a matter of aid to the victims or protection of the inhabitants of Beirut. It is also necessary to ensure the departure of the Palestinian fighters in conditions of security and dignity. All those elements are inextricably linked.

Basically, France's position on the essential issues is well known: it has many times condemned Israel's acts of aggression and has reaffirmed that Lebanon, a friendly country, must recover independence, territorial integrity and national sovereignty - which means the departure of all foreign forces from Lebanon.

(Mr. Louet, France)

In this spirit it is important in our opinion to respect Security Council resolutions and to apply the three principles recently recalled to us by the President of the French Republic: the right of the people of Israel to live in peace within the secure borders of a State that is recognized and respected by all; the right of the Palestinian people to have a homeland and to set up therein institutions of its choice; the right of the Lebanese people to regain its unity and independence which are flouted today.

After long and painful weeks we can finally see for Beirut the hope of a solution accepted by all the parties concerned.

Once that step has been taken, it will be necessary to focus our efforts on the political aspects of the present crisis. That is the purpose of the draft resolution introduced by France and Egypt in the Security Council both of our countries feel that it is still timely.

Mr. RAJAI-KHORASSANI (Iran): My delegation supported the three draft resolutions presented to us today. However, my delegation is not satisfied with the substance of these resolutions. It is our conviction that these resolutions could have been much stronger and therefore more constructive.

We believe that the people of Lebanon and the people of Palestine - of whom the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) is the sole representative - deserve more support from the international body. We also believe that the Zionist usurpers deserve strong condemnation and severe punishment, again by the same international body.

In the resolutions the right of the Palestinian people to statehood, which, to my delegation, simply means the re-establishment of the State of Palestine in the land of Palestine, and the payment of war reparations to the victims, the people of Lebanon and the Palestinians, by the Zionist usurpers and by the United States, as well as the right of the Syrian supporters, should have been considered and included in the resolutions, but unfortunately these requirements are not satisfied by the resolutions.

Those who signed or prepared the resolutions themselves realize that these resolutions are very weak and devoid of substance, but they decided to present such resolutions simply because they cannot expect anything more from this international body for the time being and this is very much regretted by all of us.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization who has asked to make a statement.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Again, at the close of yet another cycle of meetings of this emergency special session, we still see two prominent red lights - two obstructors of the smooth traffic towards peace in the Middle East. They are adamant in their obstruction. They have proved themselves to be the outcasts in this international community. Yet we take much pleasure and great satisfaction at seeing that the green, which reminds me of the olive trees in Palestine, which reminds me of the green leaves of the orange groves in Palestine, has dominated and we know that eventually it will be the only colour.

We are gratified and most grateful to the overwhelming majority - I should say to the unanimity - of the international community for its support for the cause of justice, for the cause of the Palestinian people freely to exercise their inalienable rights and, in particular, their right to self-determination without external interference and to national independence in their own country, in their own homeland.

At this stage I should like to recall what Mr. Kaddoumi, the head of our delegation and the head of the Political Department of the Palestine Liberation Organization, said in his statement earlier in this session.

"In its resolution 181 (II) the United Nations General Assembly recognized the right of the Palestinian people to independent statehood on its own national soil. Subsequently, in resolution 194 (III) the General Assembly recognized the right of that people to return to the land from which it had been forcibly displaced.

"... the demand that the Palestinian people be allowed to exercise its right to a dignified life of freedom in its own independent State, on the territory of its...homeland, has yet to be fulfilled."

(A/ES-7/PV.25, p.11)

There lies the keystone, the corner-stone, the keyword of peace and stability in the Middle East.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine Liberation
Organization)

We are very satisfied and very happy to know that the international community agrees with us that in order to attain that aim it is the responsibility of the United Nations to convene an international conference, the aim of which is to attain peace. But that conference should not be held on an abstract basis; that conference has to be held on the basis of the principles of the Charter and on the basis of the relevant resolutions of this Assembly.

It is our earnest hope and desire that the Security Council -- including some of its members who have proved to be irresponsible but I hope eventually they will wake up and that their consciences and duties will make them agree -- that eventually the principles of that Charter, which calls for peace, will permit the Security Council, as was envisaged in resolution 181 (II) of 1947, to assume its responsibility and be active -- and the only activity in this case would be that the Security Council should proceed along the same lines to recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination and even the right of that people, if that people wants it, to have its own independent State.

Somebody was lamenting the allocation of about \$6 million to an international conference aimed at preparing the road and the atmosphere and the international community for peace. I only wish that those same people who lamented the \$6 million would think of the \$100 million that Israel is paying -- and of course it is subsidized by the United States -- each day in its aggression against Lebanon and in its attempt to eliminate the Palestinian people.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

I wish they would think of the Jewish children who are being deprived of many necessities and of the Arab children in Israel who are suffering now from a 130-per cent inflation rate as a result of this war. I wish they would think of the tens of thousands who fell victims to the cluster and other bombs donated by the American taxpayer, of the tanks and of the F-15 and F-16 aircraft.

I also think that those who are money conscious could be penny-wise when it comes to millions and millions of dollars of the international taxpayers' money, of this Assembly's money, of United Nations money, as the United Nations has now embarked upon projects involving millions of dollars to help Lebanon rebuild and reconstruct; and the millions and millions of dollars that the United Nations is spending on the Interim Force in Lebanon to maintain some sort of presence in the area - as a result of the Israeli aggression.

The \$6 million would be spent for a good cause. On the other hand, it is the hundreds of millions of dollars invested in cold-blooded murder and crimes committed against humanity, including crimes of genocide, that are being wasted.

We have heard some comments about 4 June being declared the International Day of Innocent Children Victims of Aggression. We are really surprised that this General Assembly has never for a minute thought of taking a decision to place a large monument here in honour of the victims of Nazism, of the scores of millions in Europe - and I am not talking about some; I am talking about all the millions, between 40 and 45 million - who lost their lives fighting to eradicate Nazism. We would be more than happy to see a large monument in this building in honour of those people, the heroes of the Warsaw ghetto. Yes, we would like to see those things.

If we want to eradicate Nazism from our minds we should not permit the perpetuation of Nazism in the form of Zionism, which is being financed to perpetuate the criminal acts committed by Nazism.

Again, I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and through you the General Assembly for having exposed those two red lights that obstruct the path to peace in the Middle East.

TEMPORARY ADJOURNMENT OF THE SEVENTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

The PRESIDENT: The seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly is now adjourned in accordance with the terms of operative paragraph 12 of resolution ES-7/6 adopted at the present meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.