



**Security Council**

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2681  
18 April 1986

ENGLISH

---

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED  
AND EIGHTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 18 April 1986, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. de KEMOULARIA

(France)

Members: Australia  
Bulgaria  
China  
Congo  
Denmark  
Ghana  
Madagascar  
Thailand  
Trinidad and Tobago  
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics  
United Arab Emirates  
United Kingdom of Great Britain and  
Northern Ireland  
United States of America  
Venezuela

Mr. WOOLCOTT  
Mr. GARVALOV  
Mr. LIANG Yufan  
Mr. BALE  
Mr. BIERRING  
Mr. DUMEVI  
Mr. RAKOTONDRAHMANA  
Mr. KASEMSRI  
Mr. ALLEYNE  
Mr. DUBININ  
Mr. AL-SHAALI  
  
Sir John THOMSON  
Mr. WALTERS  
Mr. AGUILAR

---

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 Security Council.

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

The meeting was called to order at 5.20 p.m.

**ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

The agenda was adopted.

**THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST**

**REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON  
(S/17965)**

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Lebanon in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice and with the consent of the Council, I propose to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Security Council will now begin consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them the report (S/17965) of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for the period 11 October 1985 to 9 April 1986. They have before them also the following documents: S/17968, letter dated 1 April 1986 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; and S/18019, containing the text of a draft resolution drawn up during consultations by the Security Council.

Mr. DUBININ (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Today the Security Council is again considering the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). Having set up the force more than eight years ago, after a large-scale Israeli invasion into Lebanon, the Security Council in resolution 425 (1978) gave it the task of confirming the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory, restoring international peace and security and assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area.

So far not one of those tasks has been accomplished. The fundamental reasons lie in the continuing, systematic encroachments by Israel on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. Acts of brigandage and aggression have been and continue to be the corner-stone of Israeli policy in Lebanon, as indeed in respect of other Arab States and peoples. Although, as a result of the liberation struggle of patriotic Lebanese forces, the aggressors were compelled to abandon the greater part of the lands they had seized, Israel still continues to hold on to the border areas of Lebanon, where, with the backing of the local mercenaries it set up, it has established an unlawful security zone.

Stubbornly disregarding the demands of the Security Council for the immediate, unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territory of Lebanon, Israel is trying to perpetuate the occupation of the southern region of that country, and to set up in the area a bridgehead from which to carry out new strikes deep within Lebanese territory and to destabilize the general situation in Lebanon.

Of course, in Tel Aviv UNIFIL has always been regarded as an impediment to the fulfilment of its expansionist designs, and it has persistently tried to get rid of the Force. Directly, or through its local mercenaries, Israel has systematically created, and continues to create, obstacles to the normal functioning of UNIFIL for the effective fulfilment of the tasks entrusted to it by the Council. Exhaustive

(Mr. Dubinin, USSR)

information on that matter is contained in the numerous reports of the Secretary-General - inter alia, in his most recent report, which is now before the Council.

The purpose of those provocative actions by Israel is not in doubt; it is, through armed provocation, to complicate the activities of UNIFIL and in the long run to drive it out of Lebanon. It is well known that a criminal always tries to get rid of undesirable witnesses.

The normalization of the situation in Lebanon, as in the Middle East as a whole, is also being impeded by the United States, whose policy of connivance with the Israeli aggressors runs counter to the basic interests of the Lebanese people and impedes the attainment of a just and comprehensive settlement in the region.

The Soviet Union has unwaveringly attached, and it continues to attach, prime significance to guaranteeing the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli occupation forces from Lebanese territory, as the Council's decisions clearly require. An important role in carrying out that task must be played by UNIFIL, in accordance with its mandate .

The Soviet Union shares the opinion of the Government of Lebanon about the need to retain, in present circumstances, the presence of UNIFIL in Lebanon. In so doing, our basic postulate is that such a presence acts as a decisive factor impeding the implementation of Israel's aggressive plans in respect of southern Lebanon.

The situation that has come about urgently requires the active co-operation of all who sincerely want a reliable defence of the sovereign rights of Lebanon against Israeli encroachments and who see the importance of the consolidation of international support for the cause of the liberation of Lebanon from Israeli occupation.

(Mr. Dubinin, USSR)

Guided by those considerations, and also taking into account the appropriate appeal from the Lebanese Government, the Soviet Union has decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution on the extension of UNIFIL's mandate in Lebanon, and declares its willingness henceforth to take part in the financing of that Force.

Of course, that decision should in no circumstances be regarded as having retroactive effect as recognition of "indebtedness" on our part for past years.

In so doing, the Soviet side proceeds from the premise that the presence in Lebanon of UNIFIL is very much a temporary measure, and should in no way be used as a means of freezing the situation in the interests of the Israeli aggressor.

The Soviet delegation again emphasizes that the Security Council must take realistic, urgent measures to secure the earliest implementation of its decisions calling for the prompt and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon and unwavering respect for that country's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): The Soviet statement we have just heard marks an important change in Soviet policy. I was delighted to hear the Soviet Ambassador base his case on resolution 425 (1978), on which, of course, the Soviet Union abstained. I take it that the Soviet Union is now fully in favour of resolution 425 (1978), and I hope that this can be confirmed.

If that is the case, I think it must follow that the Soviet Union has been in favour of 425 (1978) from the beginning, and I think that this must imply that the Soviet Union will now be willing not only to give the Force its full political backing and to meet its assessed share of its costs from now on, but also to meet the assessed shares from the past.

The United Nations Force in Lebanon is indeed a force for stability. My delegation is able to give full support to paragraph 50 of the Secretary-General's report. That paragraph states that he is convinced that the maintenance of international peace and security requires that the Force's mandate be extended. He points out that if it were to be withdrawn there would be an immediate escalation of fighting. We think this is probable, and we think this would lead to the undesirable consequences he mentions: "A further major crisis could easily result". The mandate given to UNIFIL, he says,

"remains fulfillable and ... deployment of the Force to the international frontier is the best available way of restoring international peace and security and of ensuring the return of the Government of Lebanon's effective authority in the area".

That is the position of my delegation. The Secretary-General continues:

"As long as that possibility exists, it would in my view be wrong for the Council to decide to withdraw the Force."

That too is the position of my delegation, and I hope I understood correctly that it is now the position of the Soviet delegation.

(Sir John Thomson,  
United Kingdom)

I have to recall the various debates we have had in this Council in the past. I recall, for example, in 1982 the extreme difficulty we had in persuading the Soviet delegation even to abstain on a resolution which provided for a three-month extension of the mandate of UNIPIL. My delegation was very much in favour of a six-month extension. But in the end, to accommodate the Soviet Union, we accepted three months.

I continue with paragraph 50 of the Secretary-General's report. He refers to the important humanitarian help that UNIPIL is able to give, and he concludes:

"For all these reasons, and taking into account the request submitted by the Government of Lebanon, I recommend that the Council extend the mandate of UNIPIL for a further period of six months".

That too my delegation can accept. He goes on to say, though, in paragraph 51:

"it is my duty to advise the Council that it will not be enough simply to renew the mandate of UNIPIL. If that decision is to have the desired result - namely, completion of the withdrawal of Israeli forces, the restoration of international peace and security and the return of the Government of Lebanon's effective authority in the area - it will be necessary for the Council and all its members to make a determined effort to fulfil a condition that was identified in 1978 as being essential for the Force to be effective."

I am delighted to hear that the Soviet Union has now discovered that despite its abstention in 1978 the resolution to which the Secretary-General refers is indeed the right course to take and is fully valid.

Paragraph 51 of the Secretary-General's report continues by stating that what is essential for the Force to be effective is that it have at all times the full confidence and backing of the Security Council. My delegation gives the Force that full confidence and backing, and I trust that we are now about - for the first time since UNIPIL was established - to have unanimous support for it in the Council.

(Sir John Thomson,  
United Kingdom)

The Secretary-General concludes paragraph 51 by stating:

"I therefore appeal again to all Member States to give the Force full political backing" -

and, as I have just observed, perhaps we are about to witness that -

"and to meet their assessed share of its costs".

I welcome the fact that the Soviet Union is now about to meet its assessed share of the costs, but I do not think that this absolves it from its obligation to meet its assessed shares from the past, which it has consistently refused to do.

I now say that if the Soviet Union will in fact meet its assessed shares from the past, this will be a still more notable improvement in its position and will really demonstrate support for UNIFIL and for the objectives of UNIFIL as set out in Security Council resolution 425 (1978).

I do welcome the statement we have just heard from the Soviet Union. As I have said, it is a notable step forward. But it is only still half a step, and it remains to be seen whether the Soviet Union puts its full backing behind the Force.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I take it that the Council is prepared to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. If I hear no objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote. Since that is the case, it is so decided.

I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the vote.

With the consent of the Council, I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of France.

The Security Council is meeting today to consider the request of the Lebanese Government for a renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for the nineteenth time since its establishment, which I recall took place on 19 March 1968 as a result of resolution 425 (1978).



(The President)

My delegation will of course vote in favour of the renewal of the UNIPIL mandate for a three-month period. This vote expresses France's commitment to UNIPIL, a commitment reflected in the presence in the field of the largest contingent of the Force. In fact, my country considers that in spite of the many obstacles in its way the action of the Force has definitely been useful, especially for the populations of southern Lebanon, which have suffered so much.

But France is increasingly concerned. It is concerned at the deterioration of the situation in the field, on which the Secretary-General has correctly reported in his reports. It is also concerned at the Force's inability to fulfil its complete mandate as defined by Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978).

I consider it appropriate at this time to recall its three objectives: to confirm the withdrawal of the Israeli forces, to restore international peace and security, to assist the Lebanese Government in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area.

Given this situation, France can no longer accept a virtually automatic renewal of the mandate of the Force for six months. We believe that the Security Council should see to it that all the countries concerned shoulder their responsibilities, and that is why we have proposed a shorter mandate, which we are agreeing should be extended by from two to three months. As has been the case in the past, this is in order to induce the countries concerned to reflect and to consider the situation, which is needed now more than ever before. In the same spirit, we would request that the Secretary-General report to the Council in two months.

(The President)

In the present difficult circumstances in Lebanon I take this occasion to reaffirm France's commitment to Lebanon's unity, territorial integrity and independence.

I shall conclude by expressing the hope that in three months the situation will have developed in a positive manner thanks to the efforts of the countries directly concerned and the friendly pressure of others.

I now resume my functions as President.

Mr. DUBININ (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The statement of the representative of the United Kingdom concentrated on an interpretation of the position of the Soviet Union, past and present. I wish to point out to all the members of the Council and to all those present, particularly in the light of the fact that the United Kingdom's statement contained many inaccuracies, to put it mildly, that the position of the Soviet Union, of course, is stated only by the Soviet Union. Anyone interested in that position can familiarize himself with it from the records of the Security Council for the entire period starting in 1982 and also from our statement at this meeting.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of the United Kingdom who has asked to speak, I believe, on a point of order.

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, am I to understand that the statement just made by the representative of the Soviet Union is an explanation of vote in addition to the statement he made earlier? I thought I understood, Mr. President, that you had begun the voting process. If you have begun the voting process, then a statement is out of order.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): When I called upon the representative of the Soviet Union, I understood that he was to speak in explanation of vote. I thought that I would be the last speaker before the

(The President)

vote, but out of courtesy to the representative of the Soviet Union, I called upon him.

I believe that this matter is now closed and we shall proceed to the vote. I put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/18019.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Australia, Bulgaria, China, Congo, Denmark, France, Ghana, Madagascar, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has therefore been adopted unanimously as resolution 583 (1986).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to speak after the vote.

Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): Peace-keeping is an important function of the United Nations in the discharge of its responsibility to maintain international peace and security. The word "peace-keeping" is not mentioned in the Charter; yet the peace-keeping role has evolved in response to the needs of a world still troubled by conflict. Peace-keeping enjoys widespread popular support. It shows the United Nations to be acting constructively rather than simply talking. It has provided a necessary buffer between contending sides. It is a matter of deep regret, as the Secretary-General's report on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) points out, that this crucial function of the United Nations has not had the support in the past of all United Nations Members. Australia has participated in United Nations peace-keeping activities, is currently a member of a

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

number of United Nations peace-keeping forces and is a strong supporter of United Nations peace-keeping activities, under appropriate conditions where the parties concerned support the United Nations operation.

If any prompting were needed, the informal consultations which, as is customary, preceded this meeting of the Council, have brought home to members the fact that this is no routine meeting to renew the mandate of UNIFIL. My delegation takes particular satisfaction in the fact that the mandate has on this occasion been renewed unanimously. The decisions which the Council takes in relation to the Force will have a direct impact on the situation in southern Lebanon. The situation in that region calls for sober and considered reflection and my delegation has been impressed by the seriousness with which all members of the Council have approached this particularly important matter.

The Secretary-General's report on UNIFIL is comprehensive and valuable and we welcome the detailed information it provides. The report testifies all too clearly to the operational and financial problems faced by UNIFIL. Of particular concern is the grave financial situation facing the Force. We note the Secretary-General's comment that the severe financial crisis could itself threaten the future of the Force. The accumulated arrears have a direct impact on the troop contributors, many of whom are in no position to carry such costs on behalf of the international community. The financial outlook is, if anything, becoming more adverse, and recent decisions may reduce even further the rate of reimbursement to troop contributors. Members will be aware of the hardship being borne by the contributors, especially the smaller States, which are carrying heavy burdens because of the financial shortfall. We note, for example, that Fiji is owed a substantial debt by the United Nations and will experience difficulties in

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

continuing its participation if the situation deteriorates further. The same is no doubt true of other smaller contributors which provide valuable support for peace-keeping operations.

Given the Secretary-General's particular concern over the financial position, my delegation believes it is timely to emphasize the need for all parties concerned to honour all their financial commitments in respect of the funding of UNIFIL. Australia abides by its obligations to meet its assessed contributions and calls on all Members to do likewise. Only by such commitments can the Force be placed on a secure footing. Only by honouring such commitments can peace-keeping in general be advanced in the future.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

UNIFIL's problems, however, are not confined simply to financial questions. The Secretary-General's report contains a sombre catalogue of particular operational difficulties which UNIFIL has faced over the past six months. In paragraph after paragraph, the Secretary-General sets out particular incidents in which members of the Force have been placed at risk. The deaths of three members of the Force by hostile gun-fire over the past six months testifies to the very real dangers faced by the Force. My delegation takes this opportunity to express its appreciation of the bravery and steadfastness displayed by members of the Force and by their Governments in serving the cause of peace-keeping in most difficult and dangerous circumstances.

The present situation of UNIFIL is a difficult one from both financial and operational points of view, as I have said. Clearly, the interests of regional peace would be better served by the deployment of UNIFIL in accordance with the mandate conferred on it by the Security Council. My delegation notes that the Secretary-General was contemplating recommending the withdrawal of UNIFIL but that ultimately he decided that a further renewal was warranted. We know that the Government of Lebanon had a strong preference for renewal of the mandate for a period of six months. Now we are discussing a United Nations Force in his country, in Lebanon, and therefore we take very seriously his views. But my delegation also acknowledges that the mandate should not be renewed automatically, and, moreover, the views of France as a major contributor must be given due weight. The observation of the Secretary-General in relation to the wishes of the local inhabitants of southern Lebanon concerning the future of the Force is also of considerable significance.

For all these reasons Australia supported the terms of the draft resolution before the Council to extend the mandate of the Force for a further three-month period. At the same time, however, my delegation hopes that this discussion in

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

the Council will serve to indicate to all concerned the need to put an end to the difficulties which have so complicated the task of UNIFIL. The problems must be addressed in a constructive and resolute way. If they are simply side-stepped, it would be more than understandable if troop contributors concluded that the support they required from the international community was not fully forthcoming. In these circumstances, the future of the Force would be placed in further jeopardy.

The operational and financial problems still confronting UNIFIL must be addressed. The Australian delegation stands ready to do what it can in any such discussions. It hopes that the same spirit will be displayed by other delegations and by all parties which have an interest in securing a peaceful future for the people of southern Lebanon.

Mr. BIERRING (Denmark) (interpretation from French): First of all, Sir, I should like to pay tribute to my successor as President of the Council. Indeed, while performing your functions this month, you have already given ample evidence of your professional and human qualities. My delegation is quite convinced of the success of your important mission.

(continued in English)

My delegation has carefully studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL).

The report clearly shows that there is an urgent need for determined efforts to make progress towards the full implementation of Security Council resolution 425 (1978).

It is an indisputable fact that the situation in southern Lebanon has deteriorated. The level of violence has increased and continues to do so.

The continuing occupation of parts of southern Lebanon by the Israeli Defence Forces (IDF) has inevitably provoked a reaction in the so-called security zone, but there have also been several rocket attacks against targets in northern Israel.

(Mr. Biering, Denmark)

The attacks have in turn led to strong counteraction by the IDF and its South Lebanon Army (SLA) allies in the zone.

Unless a solution is quickly found, this cycle of violence is likely to continue and even intensify to the detriment of all parties concerned.

Denmark fully understands Israel's legitimate concern over the security of its northern border, across which in the past it has been and still is subjected to attack. At the same time, however, it is my Government's firm belief that the present "security zone" is neither a legitimate nor an effective means of meeting Israel's security concerns.

The security zone not only contravenes resolution 425 (1978), but is also likely to build up further resentment against Israel among the local population and encourage use of the area as a base for attacks across its border.

We therefore fully share the Secretary-General's assessment that Israel's own interests would be advanced if it were to complete the withdrawal of its forces and allow deployment of UNIFIL to the international frontier.

The present situation of UNIFIL is clearly not acceptable, and we do indeed understand why the troop contributors have become increasingly worried. Not only have they experienced that the Force has been prevented from carrying out its mandate to the full, but their personnel has also been faced with increased security risks owing to the hostilities in the area. Furthermore, it is the troop contributors which have to bear the consequences of the financial crisis facing the Force owing to the failure of some Member States to pay their assessed contributions to UNIFIL.

We fully realize that renewal of UNIFIL's mandate cannot be understood to mean that UNIFIL will be allowed to become an open-ended commitment for the troop-contributing countries if the requisite conditions for the effective operation of the Force continue to be absent.



(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

Denmark therefore strongly urges the parties concerned to work expeditiously and constructively together with the Secretary-General in order to reach practical arrangements for the full implementation of Security Council resolution 425 (1978). We also join the Secretary-General in his appeal to all Member States to give the Force full political backing and to meet their assessed share of its costs.

When making his recommendation, the Secretary-General rightly pointed out that for a renewal of UNIFIL's mandate to have the desired results, the Force had to have the full confidence and backing of the Security Council. This was already identified in 1978 as an essential condition for the Force to be effective.

For its part, Denmark continues fully to support UNIFIL and my delegation interprets the unanimous decision, which we so happily just arrived at in the Council, to renew the mandate of the Force as a firm commitment by all its members to fulfil this condition. The fact that the mandate was renewed for only three months clearly indicates the urgency of finding a solution of the operational and financial problems of the Force.

In concluding, I should like to pay tribute to the Commander of UNIFIL and to his staff, as well as to the officers and men of UNIFIL who have performed their difficult tasks with exemplary dedication and courage. As General Callaghan will relinquish his command of UNIFIL soon, I should like to take this opportunity to express through you, Mr. President, our gratitude for the distinguished services he has rendered this United Nations peace-keeping operation.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Denmark for the very kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria): Today - if our calculations are correct - marks the nineteenth time since 1978 that the Security Council has been convened to extend the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIPIL). In spite of the explicit and categorical provisions of relevant Security Council resolutions that the UNIPIL mandate should be fully implemented, that objective has not yet been attained owing to the continued Israeli occupation of part of Lebanon.

The concern of the international community is quite justified. The situation in southern Lebanon continues to be extremely dangerous and tense. This is also confirmed by the Secretary-General's report on UNIPIL of 9 April 1986, which, inter alia, emphasizes that, in the period under review,

"The level of violence has increased and continues to do so." (S/17965, para. 41)

In addition to that, we have recently witnessed a dangerous escalation of tension which, in our opinion, could erupt into hostilities at any moment. The root cause of that state of affairs is the incessant acts of aggression and violence on the part of Israel and its puppets in southern Lebanon.

Under the pretext of establishing a security zone in the south of Lebanon, Israel continues to occupy a sizeable part of that country's territory. The encroachments upon the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon still persist. The so-called security zone is being used as a spring-board for aggression deep inside Lebanon. Alarming reports continue to filter through from the long-suffering country describing mass arrests and abuses of the local population, punitive raids under the pretense of pursuing so-called Palestinian terrorists and persistent shelling and bombing of civilian targets, including refugee camps.

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

It must be made clear once and for all that the problems of Lebanon cannot be resolved by arm twisting. There is only one road to peace for that country. It has been set forth clearly and unequivocally in Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which were unanimously adopted and which demand that Israel withdraw all its its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon.

My country, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, firmly believes that Israel should immediately discontinue its occupation of southern Lebanon and comply with the Security Council resolutions. Only then will it be possible for UNIFIL to implement its mandate unimpeded. Proceeding from the foregoing considerations, and in view of the explicit request of the Government of Lebanon, as well as of the recommendation of the Secretary-General, Bulgaria voted in favour of the resolution just adopted to extend UNIFIL's mandate.

I should also like to affirm Bulgaria's position that UNIFIL's presence on Lebanese soil is only of a temporary nature and shall not be used for the perpetuation of the occupation of southern Lebanon by Israel. It is also the duty of the Security Council to take urgent measures to ensure the implementation of its resolutions related to the mandate of UNIFIL.

Mr. DUMEVI (Ghana): I would like to place on record Ghana's profound appreciation, as a troop contributor, of the untiring efforts of the Secretary-General and his staff to keep the concept of peace-keeping alive. We have taken a close look at the report he has submitted. We find it very comprehensive and very revealing, and we also endorse his views set forth in paragraphs 50 and 51.

In particular, Ghana is of the view that, despite the numerous problems facing the Force, it would be ill advised at this time to do anything that would kill - so to speak - the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). We feel that the

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

concept is very noble. UNIPIL is not an offspring of the Charter, but has developed to meet the practical needs in the field of peace-keeping. Ghana has been associated with peace-keeping efforts since 1960, and I would like to say here that our support of this consensus document reflects the abiding commitment of my country to peace-keeping by the United Nations. We are happy, therefore, that the resolution extending the mandate of UNIPIL - resolution 583 (1986) - has, for the first time, been adopted unanimously as a consensus document. We interpret that consensus decision as a good omen, especially in that it will mean the full co-operation of every member of the Council to see that the problems of UNIPIL are removed and that the Force can improve its effectiveness in the field.

Having said that, let me turn to a very delicate matter. The problems of UNIPIL, as outlined in the document before us, are many. There are the problems of the so-called security zones and of the harassment of troops, which almost invariably result in heavy casualties. My country has been one of the victims of such harassment.

(Mr. Dumevi, Ghana)

But apart from this, there is also the nagging problem of funds to keep UNIFIL afloat. That is a very delicate problem which, I know, the Secretary-General and, of course, the President of the Council have been exerting their best endeavours to resolve. I do not think it is enough to give political backing to the Force; but what is important is to translate that political backing into continuing funding or permanent assessed contributions. That is the only way we can keep this concept alive.

I say this partly through enlightened self-interest, but it is certainly a fact that it would be sad to see third-world and small countries literally underwriting the commitments of the United Nations in the area of peace-keeping. I should like to interpret this afternoon's consensus decision as meaning that the way is now open, and that our colleagues who for certain political reasons have withheld funds from UNIFIL will now begin to think seriously, and will resume their full responsibilities by regularly paying their assessed contributions. The alternative, as already demonstrated, would be chaos and escalated violence in Lebanon.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): My Government is pleased to vote once more for an extension of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). We believe that UNIFIL makes an important contribution to efforts to bring stability to southern Lebanon, and that its disbandment now would be imprudent. We fully recognize the difficulties UNIFIL is facing. We congratulate the Governments contributing troops to the Force on the exemplary performance of their contingents. In particular, my Government wishes to express its thanks to the departing UNIFIL Commander, General Callaghan.

We note that UNIFIL is, by definition, an interim force, and we reiterate our long-standing belief that agreed-on security arrangements are the best means to bring stability to southern Lebanon, assure security along the Lebanese-Israeli

(Mr. Walters, United States)

border and allow the Government of Lebanon to re-establish its authority. We further believe that progress towards achieving security arrangements could be enhanced by continuing UNIFIL's mission.

Let me take this opportunity to express my country's and my delegation's horror over the recent news of the brutal murder of three hostages in Lebanon. Two of the victims have been identified as British; one has been tentatively identified as an American. This tragedy is not a matter of nationalities. The sanctity of life is not affected by geographical boundaries. Nothing can justify these acts of terrorism. I wish to convey my Government's sorrow and grief to the families of the victims.

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): The financial situation of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) is not, in the opinion of my Government, satisfactory. We regret that some members of this Council and of this Organization have failed to pay their assessed share. This failure to pay has caused severe damage to the United Nations, to the Force and to the troop contributors.

We welcome the improvement in the position in this respect of the Soviet Union, and we hope that applies to our allies. We believe that all arrears should also be paid. We take note of statements made by the United States Administration that it will continue to seek the necessary funding from Congress to enable it to pay its share in accordance with its policy of strong support for UNIFIL.

As regards the term of the extension of the mandate, my delegation was ready to support the request of the Lebanese Government for six months. However, we fully agree with the delegation of France that the extension of the mandate should not be automatic. After all, the object of the Force, as set out in Security Council resolution 425 (1978), is to change the situation in Lebanon in various specific ways. We cannot accept that the present unsatisfactory situation continue automatically.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

The territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries must be restored and respected.

Equally, however, we do not accept that the presence of the Force should be only temporary if that means that it might be withdrawn before its mandate has been successfully achieved.

My delegation was able to vote for the extension for three months, particularly in the light of the newly-found, and welcome, unanimity of the Council in support of the Force.

I wish to express my delegation's warm thanks and appreciation to the officers and men and the civilian staff serving with UNIPIL, as well as to their respective Governments, for the steadfastness with which they have continued to serve the cause of peace in the face of great adversity. I wish to thank especially the outgoing Commander of UNIPIL, Lieutenant-General William Callaghan, who has led the Force in the most distinguished manner since February 1981 in the long and honourable tradition of his country's dedication to United Nations peace-keeping.

Mr. President, a short while ago I raised a point of order. It is the understanding of my delegation that in response you ruled that the statement we queried was in fact an explanation of vote before the vote.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I had said that the incident was closed; let us leave it closed.

The representative of Lebanon has asked to make a statement. I call upon him now.

Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (interpretation from Arabic): It is my pleasure, Sir, to congratulate you on behalf of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I recall the very close

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

friendship which has linked our two countries, and reaffirm our confidence in your ability, efficiency and wisdom in guiding the work of the Council in the best possible way.

It is my pleasure also to convey to your predecessor, His Excellency the Permanent Representative of Denmark, our thanks and appreciation for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the work of the Council last month, displaying all the diplomatic experience, skill and objectivity we all acknowledge in him.

We have taken note of the report of the Secretary-General contained in document S/17965 of 9 April 1986. That report contains an objective, serious and intelligent assessment of the situation in southern Lebanon and, in particular, the situation concerning the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL).



(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

We pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for his report and express our appreciation to him. We agree with him that the situation is tense and that a speedy, radical solution is essential if the tension is not to worsen and spread to the entire Middle East region, threatening its peace and security.

We recall that the Secretary-General has supported Lebanon's request for a six-month extension of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) - that is, until 19 October 1986 - and the fact that for the first time the Council has been unanimous in extending the mandate.

On behalf of the Government and people of Lebanon I extend to the delegations of the Soviet Union and Bulgaria our gratitude for their countries' support for the present draft resolution. Their attitude has had a positive effect on support for UNIFIL and its mandate in southern Lebanon.

The oft-repeated request by the Lebanese Government over the past eight years for the renewal of UNIFIL's mandate has not been based on a desire to make that mandate permanent or to obtain a routine prolongation of it. Rather, it has been and remains based on vital, essential reasons.

First, the Force should be enabled to discharge the mandate given it by the Security Council under resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). Thus far, obstacles have been placed by Israel in the way of the fulfilment of the mandate. Israel has refused to withdraw from Lebanese territory unconditionally and to make possible deployment by the Force to the internationally recognized boundaries.

Secondly, the presence of the Force in southern Lebanon constitutes a commitment by the international community and the Security Council to Lebanon and its legitimate right to recover its sovereignty and authority over its entire territory.

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

Thirdly, the presence of the international Force in southern Lebanon is an essential factor for stabilization and the best available option for ensuring peace, stability and security, in the absence of the total implementation of Security Council resolution 425 (1978) and other relevant resolutions.

For eight years now, Lebanon has been awaiting the day when the Security Council will make it possible for the international Force to carry out its mandate. The coming of that day depends on removal of the obstacle preventing the implementation of the mandate, which, as the Council knows, is the intransigent attitude of Israel. Israel stubbornly refuses to withdraw and insists on maintaining its occupation of part of Lebanese territory, which it calls a "security zone", or a "security belt". It invokes the pretext of the need to protect Israel's northern regions. But, in fact, that "security zone" has never guaranteed Israel the protection to which it aspires, and it will never do so. On the contrary, it has heightened the wave of violence in the region and hence national resistance in Lebanon - resistance which is legitimate before the law.

The Secretary-General's report provides a detailed description of the events between 11 October 1985 and 9 April 1986. These are distressing and dangerous events, but they are limited to the international Force's deployment region. Letters addressed by me to the Secretary-General, which have been distributed as official documents of the Security Council and the General Assembly, detail Israel's arbitrary practices and attacks in the southern region as a whole. The Secretary-General's report describes the present "security zone" as follows:

"[It] is not a legitimate means of meeting Israel's security concerns; nor is it an effective one. It is not legitimate, because it contravenes Council resolution 425 (1978), which called for 'strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

internationally recognized boundaries' and called upon Israel 'immediately to cease its military action against Lebanese territorial integrity and withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory'. In addition, the 'security zone' is not effective in ensuring Israel's security because the continuing occupation by IDF of Lebanese territory and the often brutal behaviour of SLA build up resentment of Israel among the local population and encourage use of the area as a base for attacking Israel across the international frontier".

(S/17965, para. 44)

There could not be a more frank or precise description of the illegitimate occupation of Lebanese territory and of the effectiveness of that "security zone" and the explosive situation resulting from it.

In paragraph 45 of his report, the Secretary-General states that a complete Israeli withdrawal and the deployment of the Force to the internationally recognized frontiers would have a positive effect in terms of peace and security in southern Lebanon, in terms of sparing the Lebanese the kind of suffering they have been experiencing for the past decade, and in terms of enabling the Lebanese Government to begin consolidating its authority over the region, with the help of the international Force.

In paragraph 46 of his report, however, the Secretary-General recognizes with regret the failure so far to persuade Israel to withdraw and to enable UNIFIL to deploy to the internationally recognized frontiers. In paragraph 50, he expresses his willingness to continue his contacts and consultations during the period of the extension of the mandate, on the understanding that UNIFIL's deployment to the internationally recognized boundaries is the best way to restore international peace and security and to ensure the restoration of Lebanon's effective authority in the region.

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

The efforts of the Secretary-General and his assistants, within the framework of the resolutions adopted by the Council and on the basis of the Secretary-General's personal wish to make southern Lebanon a region of peace and security, are commendable. None the less, prime responsibility for the implementation of those resolutions rests on the Security Council. In paragraph 51 of his report the Secretary-General says that if the Council approves the renewal of UNIFIL's mandate it will be necessary for the Council and all its members to make a determined effort to fulfil a condition that was identified in 1978 as being essential for the Force to be effective. This was that it must have at all times the full confidence and backing of the Security Council. The Secretary-General adds that he regrets that that condition has not been fully met, and he therefore appeals again to all Member States to give the Force full political backing and to meet their assessed share of its costs.

The six-month mandate requested by the Lebanese Government is essential from that standpoint for the Council to be able to consider the necessary measures for the implementation of resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978) and the other relevant resolutions. That is why we insisted on a six-month extension, since the three-month period that the Council had agreed on is not sufficient, in the Lebanese Government's view. That is why my delegation would like to state for the record the official position of our Government in that respect.

In addition to the political deadlock and the impasse in the field faced by the Force, UNIFIL has also been experiencing a budgetary deficit. My delegation endorses what the Secretary-General has said and reiterates its appeal to all States to meet their financial commitments as Members of the United Nations. Membership of the United Nations imposes obligations in addition to giving rights. My delegation shares the concern of the troop-contributing States about the political situation with regard to Israel and the budgetary deficit. It also

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

shares the view that the Council has full responsibility for UNIFIL, and it must take the measures to enable UNIFIL to carry out its mandate completely. The Security Council's responsibility will be heavier still in the coming extension period, since the resolution extending the mandate in the present situation - a resolution that was adopted unanimously, for the first time in the eight years since the adoption of resolution 425 (1978) - should be regarded not as routine, but, rather, as an affirmation of a commitment to implement resolution 425 (1978) and the subsequent relevant resolutions and a determination to emerge from the political impasse and overcome the financial difficulties.

We repeat that the Council must act seriously and swiftly in the coming extension period, since UNIFIL's success will be to the benefit of the Council itself and of the peace-keeping efforts of which UNIFIL is a part, a part that requires special treatment commensurate with the mission assigned to it and the dangers in the region.

UNIFIL's failure would be a disaster for southern Lebanon and the region as a whole. It would have a negative impact on the Council and its peace-keeping operations.

On behalf of the Lebanese Government and people, I wish to thank all the friendly countries that have voluntarily taken part in UNIFIL, its constituent forces themselves and their commanders, officers, soldiers and staff. In particular, I thank Lieutenant-General William Callaghan, who has worked with such perseverance in difficult and often dangerous circumstances, for the sacrifices made in the face of many obstacles, the source of which is well known to the Council.

In conclusion, I wish to state that the fate of UNIFIL for the coming period is in the Council's hands. If the Council gives the Force full confidence and

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

collective political support, and if it makes it possible for the Force to carry out the mandate it has given it, the Council will have helped Lebanon to restore its sovereignty and authority over its territory and will have removed the nightmare of occupation and its practices that the region has experienced and aided the peace and security of the whole region. If the Council does not succeed in that, it will bear responsibility for the continuation of a tense situation. But the responsibility may be more serious yet, for a threat to international peace and security is at issue, peace and security the maintenance of which is the Council's responsibility under the Charter.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Lebanon for the kind words he addressed to me.

I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. DUBININ (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I consider it necessary to state that the Soviet Union spoke in support of the request of the Government of Lebanon for an extension of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for six months. We took the same position on the Secretary-General's recommendation in that regard.

I also take this opportunity to emphasize yet again that the Soviet Union considers it is the prime task of the Security Council to ensure the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli occupation forces from Lebanese territory and to ensure that Israel complies with the relevant Security Council resolutions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There are no further speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

(The President)

I should now like to say a few words as representative of France.

My delegation, repeating statements of my Government, expresses indignation at reports of the assassination in Lebanon of two British citizens and one American citizen. My Government wishes to convey to the British Government and the American Government, their two delegations and the families of the victims our deep sympathy.

The French Government wishes to reaffirm its feelings of solidarity with the United Kingdom and the United States in this hour of distress.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

Before adjourning this meeting, I wish to announce that the Security Council will resume its consideration of the question related to the request made by the Libyan Arab Jamahariya, Burkina Faso, the Syrian Arab Republic and Oman this evening at 7 o'clock.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.