



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/41/PV.79
22 November 1986

ENGLISH

Forty-first session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 20 November 1986, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey)
(Vice-President)

later: Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh)
(President)

- Question of Namibia: [36] (continued)

- (a) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia
- (b) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples
- (c) Report of the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia

/...

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

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

- (d) Report of the Secretary-General
- (e) Report of the Fourth Committee
- (f) Draft resolutions
- (g) Report of the Fifth Committee

In the absence of the President, Mr. Turkmen (Turkey), Vice-President, took the Chair.

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

AGENDA ITEM 36 (continued)

QUESTION OF NAMIBIA

- (a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA (A/41/24)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/41/23 (Part V), (Part IX and Corr.1), A/AC.109/870)
- (c) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR THE IMMEDIATE INDEPENDENCE OF NAMIBIA (A/CONF.138/11 and Add.1)
- (d) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/41/614)
- (e) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/41/761)
- (f) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/41/24 (Part II and Corr.1), chapter I)
- (g) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/41/854)

The PRESIDENT: I remind representatives that the debate on this item was concluded on Friday, 14 November.

The Assembly has before it five draft resolution recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia in its report circulated in Part II and Corr.1, chapter I, of document A/41/24.

I now call on the representatives who wish to introduce the draft resolutions.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): I have the honour to introduce for the consideration of the Assembly and for eventual adoption draft resolution B on the question of Namibia, entitled, "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)".

In 1978 the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) approving the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of a proposal for a settlement of the Namibian situation. The resolution called upon South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General in its implementation. Both South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), representing the Namibian people, accepted the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia contained in that resolution. Yet, to date efforts to implement this decision continue to be frustrated by the intransigence of the racist régime in Pretoria and by the policy of the United States of America of linking the implementation of the plan with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, an issue alien and irrelevant to the Namibian question.

Both the General Assembly and the Security Council have resolutely rejected the establishment of any linkage with the question of Namibia's independence or the placing of any pre-conditions on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). In the light of South Africa's demonstrated unwillingness to co-operate in the implementation of the said resolution, the demands for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa have grown in intensity over the years.

Thus, in this draft resolution the General Assembly would reaffirm, among other things, the direct responsibility of the United Nations over the international Territory of Namibia pending its achievement of self-determination and national independence. Once again the General Assembly would reiterate that Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), embodying the United

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, constitute the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem.

The draft resolution condemns South Africa for obstructing the implementation of United Nations resolutions on the question, for the installation of the so-called interim government in Namibia; it condemns the abuse of the veto by certain Western permanent members of the Security Council, which has prevented meaningful action by the international community against South Africa; it demands that South Africa urgently comply fully and unconditionally with the resolutions of the Security Council, in particular resolution 435 (1978) and subsequent resolutions of the Council relating to Namibia; it reiterates that comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter are the most effective peaceful measures to ensure the compliance of racist South Africa with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on the question of Namibia.

These condemnations, demands and requests are not new. They reflect the views of the overwhelming majority of the international community on the question of Namibia expressed on several occasions during past years when the Assembly has been seized of the question of Namibia. As long as this question continues unresolved, as long as certain Powers continue to introduce issues alien to the question of Namibia's independence, the Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence, will continue to recommend appropriate actions to be taken by this body and by the Security Council.

In the draft resolution in question the General Assembly would request the Security Council to meet urgently in order to exercise its authority with regard to Namibia and to undertake decisive action in fulfilment of the direct responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia, and to take appropriate steps to ensure that

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) are implemented without delay.

The United Nations Council for Namibia expresses sincere appreciation for the actions taken by certain States, institutions, non-governmental organizations and individuals in response to the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council calling for action to isolate racist South Africa politically, economically and culturally. The Council also expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his personal commitment to Namibia's independence and for his untiring efforts for the implementation of the resolutions and decisions of this Organization on the question of Namibia. Thus, by draft resolution B, the Assembly would request the Secretary-General to proceed with the implementation of the plan since all outstanding issues have been resolved.

So long as resolution 435 (1978) remains unimplemented, so long as South Africa persists in maintaining its policies of domination and exploitation of the people and the natural resources of Namibia, in contravention of numerous United Nations resolutions, the suffering of the Namibian people will continue. The Council sincerely hopes, once again, that draft resolution B will receive the broadest possible support of the Assembly.

I invite my colleagues to demonstrate once more to the struggling people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, our full and unconditional support by a unanimous "yes" to this draft resolution, which in the final analysis only reiterates the Assembly's often stated position in regard to the implementation of Security Council 435 (1978).

I thank the Assembly in advance for the support which will be given to this draft resolution.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): I am indeed honoured to present, on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, draft resolution A, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa". It is a rather long document, reflecting the decades-old history of the question of Namibia, the central role played by the United Nations in relation to this question and the many actions which the Council believes must be taken urgently in order to resolve it. Despite the length of the draft resolution, its fundamental purpose can be stated in just a few words: to bring an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia and to create conditions in which the Namibian people can freely exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

Over the course of the past year, the international community has devoted an extraordinary amount of time and energy to the task of hastening Namibia's accession to independence. The Council for Namibia, in keeping with the responsibilities conferred upon it by the General Assembly, has played something of a catalytic role in this process. In co-operation with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Council organized the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held in Vienna last July. Among other results, the Conference produced a Declaration and Programme of Action which clearly set forth the position of the international community on the question of Namibia, and the measures required to overcome the remaining obstacles to the Territory's attainment of independence.

These results, in turn, were reflected in the deliberations of the special session of the General Assembly held in September. The resolution issuing from that session, while it may not have incorporated all the elements sought by some participants, was adopted without a single negative vote and thus represents a true international consensus on one of the most pressing and difficult issues confronting our Organization.

In draft resolution A, the Council has sought, on the basis of activities and developments over the past year, to make a thorough assessment of the situation relating to Namibia and to set a positive agenda for the year to come. The text contains many elements which are so familiar that they might appear not to need repeating. Yet they must be reaffirmed year after year because they form the political and legal framework for United Nations action on the question of Namibia. Thus the draft resolution reaffirms the Namibian people's right to self-determination, freedom and national independence, and expresses support for their ongoing struggle to exercise their inalienable rights. It also invokes the

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

direct responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia; the mandate given to the Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence; and the role of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

The draft resolution recalls the numerous decisions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice declaring illegal South Africa's presence in Namibia. It deplores South Africa's continued refusal, 20 years after the termination of its mandate, to withdraw its illegal administration from the Territory. And finally, it reaffirms the importance of the United Nations independence plan for Namibia as the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem.

Against the backdrop of these basic principles, the draft resolution urges a number of specific measures which speak directly to the challenges we face today. The aim of these provisions is to secure South Africa's immediate withdrawal from Namibia, to restore peace and security to southern Africa, and to ensure protection of the Namibian people's interests in the period preceding independence.

Under the terms of the text before us, the General Assembly would call upon the Security Council to take appropriate measures for the immediate implementation of the United Nations plan. To that end, the Assembly would also urge that the veto power not be used to obstruct the adoption of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. These provisions reflect the firm conviction of the international community that action under Chapter VII of the Charter is a necessary and appropriate response to South Africa's brutal occupation of Namibia and its relentless campaign of violence and aggression in southern Africa.

The Assembly would also call upon the international community to refrain from according any recognition to the puppet régimes which Pretoria seeks periodically

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

impose on the Namibian people, most recently in June 1985. The creation of such fraudulent entities has been universally acknowledged as a patent attempt to perpetuate South Africa's colonial domination of Namibia.

The Assembly would call for abandonment of the policy linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues such as the presence of Cuban forces in Angola. This policy has delayed the decolonization process in Namibia and constitutes interference in the internal affairs of Angola.

The Assembly would strongly urge the international community to render increased assistance to the front-line States, whose support of the Namibian cause continues to be a factor of paramount importance in the efforts to bring genuine independence to the Territory. It would also call for increased assistance to SWAPO, which is leading the struggle for national liberation in Namibia, and to the thousands of refugees who have fled from South African repression in Namibia.

The Assembly would call on States, international organizations, non-governmental organizations and other institutions and individuals to exert intensified pressure on the Pretoria régime to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations relating to Namibia and South Africa.

The Assembly would demand an end to all military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, and would urge the Security Council to take measures ensuring strict compliance with the arms embargo on South Africa. In view of the dominant role played by military force in South Africa's occupation of Namibia and its destabilization of the front-line States, the importance of decisive action in this regard cannot be overstated.

The Assembly would demand that the foreign economic interests operating in Namibia withdraw immediately from the Territory and put an end to their co-operation with the illegal South Africa Administration. It would also request

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

all Member States to ensure full compliance with Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.

The Assembly would request all States to take legislative, administrative and other measures to isolate South Africa politically, economically, militarily and culturally. And finally, it would reiterate its urgent request to the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime.

These are among the major points raised in draft resolution A. In formulating this document, the Council for Namibia was guided first and foremost by its duty, and indeed its keen desire, to serve the vital interests of the people of Namibia. I would appeal to members to consider it in the same spirit and to give it their full and whole-hearted support.

Mr. DASGUPTA (India): I have the honour to introduce to this gathering draft resolution C as recommended by the Council for Namibia to the General Assembly. The draft resolution follows the pattern of previous years and aims at ensuring that the Council's integrity, as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, is upheld through its Programme of Work for the Namibian cause.

As members are very well aware, the Council's aspirations towards its goal of achieving independence for the people of Namibia have, over the years, been frustrated by manoeuvres of the South African régime that are too numerous to elaborate here. To counteract these ploys, the Council has had to make a systematic effort, through its Programme of Activities, to bring the plight of the Namibian people to the attention of the international community and to gain its support for the early independence of the Territory. The draft resolution before the Assembly provides the framework through which the mechanisms of this undertaking can be carried out.

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

The preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution reaffirm the basic principle laid down in previous recommendations regarding the Council's programme of work. Accordingly, it recalls the termination of South Africa's responsibility for Namibia and, while upholding the mandate given to the Council for the administration of the Territory, appropriately underlines the fact that 1987 will mark the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of that mandate.

The opening paragraphs of the operative section of the draft resolution commend the Council's efforts in carrying out its responsibilities and appeal for the continued co-operation of Member States with the Council in the execution of its activities.

The Council's efforts in promoting the Namibian cause demand increased assertion of its role as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence and intensification of its contacts with the international community. Thus, operative paragraph 5 decides that the Council will continue to ensure the rejection by all States of the racist régime's nefarious schemes, such as the installation of an entity in Namibia without free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, and to counter the attempts to link Namibia's independence to extraneous issues, such as the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

In operative paragraph 6 the Council is requested to co-ordinate its efforts with other Governments, through missions of consultation, towards implementation of United Nations resolutions on Namibia.

Cognizance is taken of the need for assistance by and co-operation with intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, Member States, the subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the specialized agencies and other organizations and institutions of the United Nations system in

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

order to provide the framework through which the Council can effectively carry out its mandate. An appeal to this end is contained in operative paragraphs 7 to 12 of the draft resolution.

The paragraphs that follow request the Council, in the further assertion of its right as the legal guardian of the Namibian people, to accede to international conventions and promote and secure the implementation of the Declaration and Programme of Action adopted at the International Conference held in Vienna in July of this year.

The close co-operation of the Council for Namibia with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) is indispensable for the achievement of self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia. The international community must add its efforts to that co-operation by refraining from all acts that would encourage the Pretoria régime to entrench its illegal occupation of Namibia either through the exploitation of the natural resources of the Territory or through any contact with Member States.

Therefore, in paragraphs 16 to 20 of the draft resolution the Council is asked to consult regularly with SWAPO and undertake measures, with the assistance of the international community, to safeguard the natural resources of Namibia through the effective implementation of Decree No. 1.

The year 1987 being the twentieth year since the Council was established, the Council is requested, in operative paragraph 21, to hold extraordinary plenary meetings in southern Africa in 1987 so as to assert its role as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia.

Provision is made in paragraph 22 for the Council to undertake educational activities whereby it will be enabled to prepare Namibians to take up responsibility in an independent Namibia.

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

The concluding paragraphs of the draft request the Secretary-General to provide the Council's personnel requirements to enable it to discharge effectively the tasks and functions arising out of its mandate.

The Council has been given a mandate the effective discharge of which necessitates intensified efforts by it through its programme of work. Those efforts are envisaged in the draft resolution that I now submit to the Assembly and which, I remain confident, will be accorded the maximum support.

Mr. KULOV (Bulgaria): I have the honour to present, on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, draft resolution D, entitled "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of the immediate independence of Namibia".

In view of the importance of intensifying publicity on all aspects of the question of Namibia as an instrument for furthering the mandate of the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory, the draft resolution, first and foremost, stresses the urgent need to disseminate information on Namibia and to mobilize international public opinion to assist effectively the people of Namibia to achieve self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namibia.

The draft resolution sets that important objective against the background of the total blackout on news on Namibia imposed by the illegal South African régime and the campaign of slander and disinformation which that régime continues to carry on against the United Nations and the liberation struggle of the Namibian people.

In pursuance of the international campaign in support of the Namibian people, the draft resolution requests the Council for Namibia, in consultation with the

(Mr. Kulov, Bulgaria)

South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, to continue considering ways and means of increasing the dissemination of information relating to Namibia, in order to intensify the international campaign in favour of Namibia's cause. In this regard, it requests the Council, among other things, to focus its activities on greater mobilization in Western Europe and North America; intensify the international campaign for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter; organize an international campaign to boycott products from Namibia and South Africa; and expose and denounce all collaboration with the racist South African régime.

The draft resolution also envisages a broad and varied information programme including, inter alia, the preparation and wide dissemination of publications on all aspects of the Namibian question, as well as radio and television programmes designed to draw the attention of world public opinion to the current situation in and around Namibia.

(Mr. Kulov, Bulgaria)

Furthermore, in view of the continued collaboration of certain States with the racist régime of South Africa, and in tandem with the request to focus the activities of the Council on greater mobilization in Western Europe and North America, the Assembly requests the Council to organize workshops for non-governmental organizations, parliamentarians, trade unionists, academics and media representatives at which the participants will consider their contribution to the implementation of the decisions of the United Nations relating to the dissemination of information on, and the mobilization of support for, Namibia.

Mobilization of international public opinion through the dissemination of information on Namibia represents an important aspect of the efforts of the United Nations to bring about the independence of Namibia. In spite of the upsurge of interest in the situation in southern Africa as a whole, the public at large does not yet have any access to information on Namibia. The media in certain countries either do not publicize information on Namibia or publicize information that is biased and distorted. As a result, the draft resolution requests the Council to organize media encounters, in co-operation with the Department of Public Information (DPI), on developments relating to Namibia.

It is imperative that the position of the United Nations with regard to Namibia be given appropriate publicity in order to educate and inform public opinion, especially in those countries where governmental policy is not in line with the international consensus on the question of Namibia. Dissemination of information on Namibia would be a means of bringing pressure on Pretoria and its allies to comply with the United Nations resolutions and decisions demanding the immediate and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Kulov, Bulgaria)

In conclusion, I should like to express my sincere hope that the Assembly will give its unanimous support to draft resolution D, "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of the immediate independence of Namibia".

Mr. CARNEVALI VILLEGAS (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution E, concerning the question of Namibia and entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia".

The Fund for Namibia was established in 1971 based on the consideration that, having terminated South Africa's Mandate to administer the Territory and having itself assumed direct responsibility for Namibia until independence, the United Nations had incurred a solemn obligation to assist the people of Namibia in their struggle for independence and, to that end, it should provide them with material assistance.

In the early years the scope of assistance activities under the Fund for Namibia was limited, but with the intensification of the liberation struggle the needs for assistance increased, and since the late 1970s the Fund has consisted of the following three accounts: the General Account, providing for educational, social and medical assistance to Namibians; the Nationhood Programme for Namibia Account, providing for a comprehensive, development-oriented programme of assistance covering the pre-independence period as well as the initial years after independence; and the Institute for Namibia Account, providing the financial basis for the training and research activities of the United Nations Institute for Namibia in Lusaka, Zambia. Accordingly, the magnitude and the scope of the assistance programmes under the Fund for Namibia have continued to expand over the years.

(Mr. Carnevali Villegas, Venezuela)

I am pleased to report that the implementation of the activities under all three accounts of the Fund is progressing well. During the first half of 1986 a total of more than 900 students were enrolled in various training programmes conducted under the General Account and the Nationhood Programme Account. At the same time, the Institute for Namibia had a student body of almost 600, thus bringing the total number of Namibians benefiting from training opportunities under the Fund to some 1,500.

During the past year significant progress has also been made in the field of research carried out under the assistance programmes. Most important, the comprehensive study on Namibia entitled "Namibia: Perspectives for National Reconstruction and Development" has been published. The study provides a thorough analysis of the socio-economic sectors of Namibia and makes general recommendations for the development of each sector. Hence it will undoubtedly prove to be a document most useful to the future Government of an independent Namibia. At the same time, it provides the required framework for developing a new phase of the assistance programmes of the Council for Namibia to intensify further the efforts of the international community to provide material assistance to the Namibian people. It is expected that preliminary discussions regarding the future direction of the programmes will be initiated in the near future.

The envisaged development of the programmes will obviously require additional financial resources. In this regard, it is encouraging to note that the financial

(Mr. Carnevali Villegas, Venezuela)

situation of the Fund for Namibia, the main source of financing for the assistance programmes, has improved significantly since last year. However, it is clear that the funding requirements for the financing of a new phase of the programmes will by far exceed resources at present available, and there is therefore a need for increased contributions to the Fund in 1987. Similarly, the Council for Namibia will continue to rely on the resources available under the indicative planning figure (IPF) for Namibia of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). In this respect, the present draft resolution calls upon UNDP not only to increase the IPF for Namibia but also to exercise maximum flexibility and understanding in financing projects funded from that source. It is important to bear in mind that assistance is being given to a country which is not yet independent and which is a unique responsibility of the United Nations, and it is therefore not possible to apply strictly the rules and regulations applicable to UNDP assistance to independent countries.

In conclusion, I stress the importance of preparing a new phase of the assistance programmes which will put the Council for Namibia in a better position to alleviate the plight of the tens of thousands of Namibians who have fled from the oppression of the apartheid régime and to help them prepare more effectively for the monumental task of rebuilding and administering their country after independence.

With that brief introduction, I recommend draft resolution E for unanimous adoption.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on any or all of the five draft resolutions contained in document A/41/24 (Part II).

(The President)

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

Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their votes after all the voting has taken place.

Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve member States of the European Community on the draft resolutions now before the General Assembly.

A number of familiar but controversial elements remain in the increasingly lengthy draft resolutions before us. In addition, some of these elements are of doubtful relevance to the matter at hand. The introduction of such elements, as we said in our statement on the resolutions during the special session in September, makes unanimous approval of the draft resolutions by the General Assembly impossible. Indeed, it risks accentuating divisions among the membership of the United Nations when there is, more than ever before, a need to mobilize the full support of the international community in pursuit of the common goal of internationally recognized independence for Namibia.

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

The Twelve cannot endorse calls for Member States to render increased military assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as a means of bringing Namibia to independence. Similarly we cannot agree to lend our support to armed struggle as a means to that end, in spite of the impatience and frustration felt by the Namibian people owing to South Africa's continuing occupation of their country. In the view of the Twelve the general and primary duty of the United Nations is to promote peaceful solutions in conformity with the Charter, thus avoiding any encouragement of the use of force.

The Twelve consider that under the provisions of the settlement plan the constitution of an independent Namibia must be worked out by a constituent assembly appointed as a result of elections in which all political groups are able to participate. None of those groups should therefore be designated in advance as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

The Twelve wish to reaffirm their commitment to the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations. We cannot accept that it should be called into question or that the autonomy of the international financial institutions should be compromised. The total isolation of South Africa would, in our view, only hinder efforts to secure the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan.

The Twelve reject any arbitrary and selective attack against States Members of the United Nations or against groups of countries. Our respect for the division of competence among the main bodies of the Organization remains unchanged. The Security Council alone is authorized to take decisions binding upon Member States.

I must also register our concern at the financial implications of some of the draft resolutions now before us. A more thorough scrutiny of the programme of work of the Council for Namibia would have enabled the financial implications to be

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

reduced, without endangering the goals we seek. As with any new expenditure in the current budgetary crisis the position will need to be carefully monitored in the light of the developing financial situation.

As we have already stated, we remain firmly and unequivocally committed to the independence of Namibia. The illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must be brought to an end. The only acceptable basis for a peaceful and lasting solution to the problem is the implementation, without pre-conditions or pretext, of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). The settlement plan endorsed by the second of those resolutions - which has been accepted by the Government of South Africa and by SWAPO - embodies the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence in a manner which is guaranteed to be free and fair. We wish to see the plan implemented without delay and in its entirety, so that the Namibian people can move forward to the internationally recognized independence which is their due.

Count YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation takes it that the position of the Federal Republic of Germany on the question of Namibia is well known. There has been no change in that position. As we have repeatedly stated - and as the representative of the United Kingdom has just stated - Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is and remains the one and only basis for Namibia's accession to internationally recognized independence.

Being a member of the contact group, the Federal Republic of Germany, as in recent years, will abstain on all draft resolutions concerning the question of Namibia. As has been pointed out by all members of the contact group on corresponding occasions in recent years, such abstention is motivated by procedural reasons. As a member of the contact group, the Federal Republic of Germany might be involved in negotiations on the implementation of the Western settlement plan

(Count York von Wartenburg,
Federal Republic of Germany)

adopted by the Security Council in 1978. In order not to prejudge the outcome of those negotiations in any way, the Federal Republic of Germany must refrain from associating itself with the draft resolutions before the General Assembly in either a positive or a negative manner.

Finally, let me express once again my delegation's strong opposition to singling out individual Member States as has been done in some draft resolutions before us. That is why my delegation will vote against the inclusion of certain States by name.

Mr. BROCHAND (France) (interpretation from French): It is well known that France has participated actively in the efforts of the international community to find a solution to the question of Namibia and to persuade South Africa to respect its obligations. France intends to continue to work for Namibia's accession to independence according to the modalities defined in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Those resolutions represent the only acceptable basis for a settlement and my country is committed to their speedy and unconditional implementation. That is why my Government has in the past denounced the installation by the South African authorities of an interim government in Namibia and has declared that it considers the effects of that decision to be null and void.

While all the outstanding questions with regard to the United Nations plan have now been resolved, there is still deadlock in the negotiations towards its implementation. France is ready to contribute to bringing about such implementation and intends to maintain a position that will enable it, at the appropriate time, to assist in the completion of the process of Namibia's accession to independence.

(Mr. Brochand, France)

That is why as a matter of principle my delegation will have to abstain in the votes on the five draft resolutions before the General Assembly.

Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): Ireland shares the reservations held in common by the Twelve member States of the European Community, as set out by the representative of the United Kingdom. I should like now to explain my delegation's voting positions on the draft resolutions before us.

Ireland's position with regard to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia has been clearly stated in the General Assembly on many occasions. My Government unreservedly condemns South Africa for its continued flouting of the expressed wishes of the international community with regard to Namibian independence. It is our firm conviction that the people of Namibia must be free to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Ireland therefore deplores any attempts to delay through pre-conditions or otherwise the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan.

South Africa's actions continue to demonstrate a desire to frustrate the goal of Namibian independence. The establishment in 1985 of an unrepresentative internal administration in Namibia, which has been condemned by the Security Council, appears to be yet another ploy in that direction.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

Ireland has always accepted that if South Africa remained intransigent, the process of negotiation might have to be supplemented by specific measures by the international community designed to bring South Africa to honour its clear obligation in international law as defined by the United Nations Security Council and by the International Court of Justice, that is to end its illegal occupation of Namibia. Ireland believes that these measures should include a set of mandatory sanctions against South Africa, properly imposed by the United Nations Security Council, and that in order to secure the effectiveness of those sanctions through their widest possible acceptance and implementation, they should be carefully chosen and selective.

It was against this background of our general approach to the issue of Namibia that we carefully examined the five draft resolutions before us. We decided to vote in favour of two of the draft resolutions and to abstain on three.

I turn first to draft resolution A on the situation in Namibia. My delegation can support many of the provisions contained in this draft resolution. Regrettably, however, the draft resolution also contains a number of formulations which we cannot accept. We are therefore obliged to abstain in the vote on this text. Operative paragraphs 5, 7 and 12 of the draft resolution give explicit support to armed struggle. We have made it clear in the past that we do not wish to see the Assembly endorse violence, even if we can understand the anger and sense of frustration which drives Namibians to take up arms to secure independence.

As regards the selective singling out for condemnation and criticism of certain countries and groups of countries in this and other draft resolutions we do not see how this can promote our common objective in the Assembly.

My delegation regrets that it will have to abstain also on draft resolution B on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). As I indicated earlier, Ireland strongly supports the United Nations settlement plan endorsed in

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and we firmly believe that its implementation should not be delayed. Ireland, however, continues to have doubts about the wisdom of calls for the imposition of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa at this juncture. We believe that the right policy for the international community is one of steady and graduated pressure for change through carefully chosen, selective mandatory sanctions to be properly imposed by the Security Council and fully implemented by all.

Ireland will vote in favour of draft resolution C on the Programme of Work of the United Nations Council for Namibia. We do so because we support in general the efforts of the Council to end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. As we have previously indicated, however, we have some reservations about the powers of the Council for Namibia in regard to certain issues. We also have some difficulties about certain recommendations of the Council.

Ireland will abstain on draft resolution D on the dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of the immediate independence of Namibia. We would have wanted to be able to vote in favour of this draft resolution. We believe that it is important for the United Nations Council for Namibia to consider ways and means of mobilizing public opinion in support of the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence. My delegation can therefore support many of the provisions of the draft resolution. Regrettably, however, the text also contains a number of formulations which we cannot accept. We are unable to support operative paragraph 11 (c) of this text, which appeals to non-governmental organizations, and so forth, to expose and campaign against the political and economic collaboration of certain Western Governments with the South African régime, as well as diplomatic visits to and from South Africa. We fail to see that such a campaign could be anything but harmful to the pursuit of our common objectives.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

As regards the references to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in this and other draft resolutions, I wish to reaffirm Ireland's appreciation of the leading role which SWAPO plays in seeking independence for Namibia. We note, of course, that when free and fair elections are held under United Nations auspices and supervision - a proposal which SWAPO has accepted and which Ireland strongly supports - the people of Namibia will then have the opportunity to choose their representatives freely and through a democratic process.

Finally, I wish to mention draft resolution E on the United Nations Fund for Namibia. My delegation will, as heretofore, vote in favour of this draft resolution. We continue to believe that this Fund performs a valuable function in providing assistance to Namibians who have suffered as a result of the illegal occupation of their land by South Africa.

Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho): My delegation did not take part in the general debate during the consideration of item 36, "Question of Namibia", as indeed we have addressed this Assembly on the matter on previous occasions. Our position remains the same and we did not think it worthwhile for us to reiterate it. Suffice it to add that, like all those who have addressed this issue, we too are equally frustrated by the fact that we seem to be at a standstill. There are no positive developments towards the emancipation, liberation and full independence of Namibia. On the contrary, we regret to note with dismay that the whole international community has been held at ransom and rendered powerless to usher Namibia to independence because of South Africa's intransigence. There is no light at the end of the tunnel, because South Africa seems determined to hold on illegally to this unfortunate Territory. Not only is the Territory being heavily militarized and its resources plundered mercilessly, but its inhabitants are being imprisoned and subjected to apartheid as prescribed in South Africa, and indeed

(Mr. Makeka, Lesotho)

Namibia is being used by our neighbour as a springboard for attacks on and destabilization of neighbouring countries.

We take this opportunity to appeal to South Africa and to those countries which have leverage and influence over South Africa to persuade South Africa to spare Namibia and our region as a whole from the present bloodbath and carnage that seem to be certain to engulf us all. It should be clear to all that no solution, short of implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), unconditionally and in toto, will be acceptable and, therefore, the Namibians, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) will be forced to continue to fight to free their motherland from foreign domination, oppression and occupation. Under these circumstances, my delegation will vote for all the resolutions contained in document A/41/24 (Part II), and we take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia, and its newly elected President, Ambassador Zuze, of Zambia, for a job well done. I must reiterate our position as regards those parts or paragraphs calling for the imposition of sanctions, namely, that Lesotho is not in a position to impose sanctions against South Africa and, therefore, registers its reservations thereto.

As for the question of name-calling, my delegation's position is also very clear, namely, that we are against unfair singling out of countries. When that is the case, my delegation will abstain if such a singling out is put to a vote. However, where the mentioning of certain countries or a country is not an unfair singling out, for example, where it states a true fact and does not interfere with the responsibilities of States as stipulated in the Charter, my delegation will vote accordingly. A clear example in this regard is the twenty-second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A, the first part of which clearly states that the United States of America is assisting South Africa, whereas the fact is that it is

(Mr. Makeka, Lesotho)

not. But the second part is correct, namely, that the other State does assist UNITA in Angola.

Mr. HENAR (Suriname): My delegation will today, as on many occasions in the past, cast a positive vote on all the draft resolutions submitted on the question of Namibia. We consider this question to be one of the darkest chapters in the history of decolonization. It is incomprehensible that at this point in history there still exists a régime, such as that of South Africa, that denies the people of Namibia its right to self-determination and independence, and even resorts to intimidation and violence, in order to maintain the current reign of terror and exploitation.

The Government of the Republic of Suriname has, as I have said before, always staunchly supported the Namibian people in their struggle for freedom and independence and will continue to do so until Namibia has taken its rightful place among the family of nations.

(Mr. Henar, Suriname)

We were therefore unpleasantly surprised when we noted an error in the report of the Council for Namibia on contacts between Member States and South Africa in document A/AC.131/226 of 6 November 1986. On page 5 of that report Suriname is erroneously mentioned as one of the States maintaining diplomatic and consular relations with South Africa in 1985, with the corresponding note that the interests of Suriname are taken care of by the Netherlands. Since that is in contravention of the facts, this mistake was brought to the attention of the Council and we are pleased to note that the Council has corrected the error by issuing a corrigendum (A/AC.131/226/Corr.1) dated 19 November 1986, which reads:

"Page 5, table 1, column 1, (country)

Delete the entry for Suriname and the corresponding footnote."

We express our thanks to the Council for Namibia for the speedy correction of the error and for setting the record straight.

Mr. POTTS (Australia): As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Australian delegation takes an active and ongoing interest in the question of Namibia. Given the universal acceptance - save by South Africa - of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), it believes that the resolutions which the Council presents to this Assembly (A/41/24 (Part II) and (Part II) Corr.1) should be capable of attracting the widest possible support. It is unfortunate, therefore, that that course of action has not been followed in this case and my delegation, regrettably, finds itself having to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A and B. It will, however, support the remaining draft resolutions, C, D and E.

Recommendations A and B of the Council are worded in language which in part is overpitched and rhetorical. Much of it is directed at particular States. Where that is warranted my delegation believes that a positive case can be made for such

(Mr. Potcs, Australia)

references. In some instances, however, individual States are singled out on flimsy or insubstantial grounds and my delegation objects to that practice.

My delegation must also express its misgivings over the wording in the recommendations by which the Assembly would endorse the legitimacy of armed struggle. We can well understand why Namibians feel the need to resort to violence and we will not condemn them for so doing, but we cannot condone actions which we believe are inconsistent with the Charter.

A central element of the plan for Namibia's independence as laid down in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is that elections should be held for a constituent assembly. My delegation naturally supports that approach but cannot accept the designation of a particular group as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

I would note also that my delegation supported the Council's work programme in the Fifth Committee and will support recommendation C in this Assembly. While there are individual items of expenditure which trouble us, we are satisfied generally with the greater level of financial restraint shown by the Council this year.

The Australian Government hopes that the Council for Namibia will be able to take a fresh look at and approach to the drafting of the resolutions under this item and under item 42. The present approach seems to us sterile and unproductive and we would wish to see a greater consensus in this Hall and a greater sense of balance. Our delegation would support any move in that direction, and would play a role accordingly in the work of the Council.*

*The President took the Chair.

Miss KGABI (Botswana): Although will vote in favour of draft resolutions A, B, C, D and E, we are compelled none the less to reserve our position on the implementation of the paragraphs in draft resolutions B and D which seek to commit us to the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa. We are not capable of imposing such sanctions but we will not stand in the way of those who have the capacity to do so. The latter must not use us as an excuse for their unwillingness or failure to impose sanctions against South Africa.

Miss DEVER (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The General Assembly at its forty-first session, has just had another debate on the question of Namibia. Following the international conference that was held last summer in Vienna and the special session of the General Assembly held here two months ago, our Organization is marking a very sad anniversary, that of resolution 2145 (XXI), under which the United Nations placed the Territory of Namibia under its direct responsibility.

The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom has just reminded the Assembly, on behalf of the European Community, of a certain number of long-standing principles that prompt its members to have reservations on the draft resolutions submitted to us. My delegation wishes to add to that statement some comments from Belgium's standpoint.

My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution C, on the Programme of Work of the Council for Namibia, recalling the reservations which caused us to abstain in the voting in the Fifth Committee.

My country will also vote in favour of draft resolution E, on the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

On draft resolution A, B and D, which relate to the situation in Namibia, the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the dissemination of information respectively, my delegation will abstain. The reasons for our

(Miss Dever, Belgium)

abstention are, unfortunately the same as those already expressed at previous sessions.

Regarding draft resolution A, my country cannot join in expressions of support for armed struggle or for the severance of all relations with South Africa, nor can it associate itself unreservedly with the declaration adopted in Vienna last July.

In accordance with its consistent opposition to references to individual States, my delegation will vote in favour of the deletion of such references. In that connection, it very much regrets the reference, in a negative context, to the European Economic Community. In view of the importance which the EEC has always attached to co-operation with all of Africa, it would have been more normal to try to resolve problems where they exist through conciliation rather than confrontation.

My country also maintains its position on the status of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), whose eminent role, which it has played for many years, we continue to acknowledge.

On draft resolution B, my delegation also regrets the individual condemnation of certain countries and the criticisms addressed to some western States, members of the Security Council. There must be strict respect for the specific competence of that body.

As for draft resolution D, on the dissemination of information, my delegation has doubts regarding the volume of the programme planned and the real objectives of many of the concepts that it advocates.

A campaign of mobilization in favour of the immediate independence of Namibia unfortunately remains an undeniable need. In spite of the situation prevailing in South Africa itself, the authorities of that country, through military occupation, stubbornly maintain their hold over Namibia. Nevertheless, eight years ago

(Miss Dever, Belgium)

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) presented to Pretoria a well balanced plan for a peaceful settlement of the decolonization situation. Continuation of the South African presence remains completely unacceptable. The South African Government would be well-advised to put an end to it, unconditionally and as soon as possible.

Mr. MANGWAZU (Malawi): First, I wish to state the position of Malawi with regard to the independence of Namibia. We strongly support, as we have indicated in many ways, independence for Namibia.

We should like to make it clear that today, if we vote in favour, we are doing so with certain reservations and without changing our position with regard to our strongly-held principles. Those principles mean that we are against violence, or finding solutions by violent means, and in favour of contact and dialogue; that we should like to see problems between States or within States resolved by negotiation. We shall also be maintaining our reservations on the ground that certain wording within the draft resolutions amounts to name-calling. We feel that this alienates what would otherwise have been support for the draft resolution concerned.

We are also against sanctions, and we feel that there must be better ways of resolving the problem of Namibia than by resorting to the application of sanctions.

Having said this, I must say that we support the granting of independence to Namibia and when we vote in favour it is that thrust in the draft resolution that we support.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolutions A to E in document A/41/24 (Part II) and Corr.1.

The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of the draft resolutions is to be found in document A/41/854.

Before proceeding to the voting on the draft resolutions, I wish to draw the attention of members to special rule F of annex III of the rules of procedure, whereby decisions of the General Assembly on questions relating to reports and petitions concerning Namibia shall be regarded as important questions within the meaning of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations.

(The President)

In this connection, I should like to recall that this question was most recently raised during the fourteenth special session. After a discussion of the matter, the Assembly proceeded to vote on the draft resolution on the basis that a two-thirds majority of representatives present and voting was required for adoption.

Unless the Assembly decides that the provisions of special rule F of annex III of the rules of procedure should henceforth not be applied, in my view those provisions obviously continue to apply to all proposals and amendments under this item.

The General Assembly will now begin the voting process and take a decision on draft resolution A, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa".

Separate votes have been requested on portions of the eleventh and the twenty-second preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 25, 26, 27, 28, 42 and 49 of draft resolution A. Is there any objection to those requests? There being none, I shall now put to the vote the portions of the eleventh preambular paragraph on which a separate vote has been requested. First, a separate, recorded vote has been requested on the phrase "of the United States Government" in lines 22 and 23.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Swaziland, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 53 in favour, 46 against and 44 abstentions.

The required two-thirds majority not having been obtained, the phrase "of the United States Government" was not retained.

The PRESIDENT: A separate, recorded vote has also been requested on the phrase "of the United States Administration" in the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh lines of the eleventh preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Haiti, Lebanon, Liberia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 57 votes in favour, 46 against and 40 abstentions.

The required two-thirds majority not having been obtained, the phrase "of the United States Administration" was not retained.

The PRESIDENT: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the phrase "by the United States of America", in the third line of the twenty-second preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Comoros, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Haiti, Jordan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 53 votes in favour, 47 against and 44 abstentions.

The required two-thirds majority not having been obtained, the phrase "by the United States of America" was not retained.

The PRESIDENT: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the phrase "the United States Administration and", in the first line of operative paragraph 25.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Lebanon, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Uruguay, Venezuela

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 69 votes in favour, 49 against and 30 abstentions.

The required two-thirds majority not having been obtained, the phrase "the United States Administration and" was not retained.

The PRESIDENT: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the phrase "pursued by the present United States Administration", in the second line of operative paragraph 26.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Central African Republic, Comoros, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Haiti, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 56 votes in favour, 51 against and 40 abstentions.

The required two-thirds majority not having been obtained, the phrase "pursued by the present United States Administration" was not retained.

The PRESIDENT: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the phrase "the United States and", in the second line of operative paragraph 27.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Comoros, Cyprus, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Lebanon, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 56 votes in favour, 52 against and 39 abstentions.

The required two-thirds majority not having been obtained, the phrase "the United States and" was not retained.

The PRESIDENT: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the phrase "and appeals to the United States Administration to desist from this policy", in the last line of operative paragraph 28.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Burma, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Lebanon, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Uruguay, Venezuela

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 64 votes in favour, 51 against and 32 abstentions.

The required two-thirds majority not having been obtained, the phrase "and appeals to the United States Administration to desist from this policy" was not retained.

The PRESIDENT: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the phrase "of the United States and of the United Kingdom", in the first line of operative paragraph 42.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Lesotho, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Paraguay, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Venezuela, Zaire

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 74 votes in favour, 43 against and 29 abstentions.

The required two-thirds majority not having been obtained, the phrase "of the United States and of the United Kingdom" was not retained.

The PRESIDENT: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the phrase "and Israel" in the second line of operative paragraph 49.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Abstaining: Argentina, Barbados, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Mexico, Nepal, Paraguay, Peru, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Swaziland, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 80 votes in favour, 47 against and 22 abstentions.

The required two-thirds majority not having been obtained, the phrase "and Israel" was not retained.

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution A, as a whole, as amended.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

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

Draft resolution A, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 26 abstentions (resolution 41/39 A).*

The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will next take a decision on draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)".

A separate vote has been requested on portions of operative paragraphs 9 and 10 of draft resolution B. As there is no objection to that request, I shall put them to the vote first.

A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the phrase "the United States Administration and" in the first and second lines of operative paragraph 9.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Subsequently the delegations of Fiji, Liberia and Turkey advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Cyprus, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Liberia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 51 votes in favour, 50 against and 40 abstentions.

The required two-thirds majority not having been obtained, the phrase "the United States Administration and" was not retained.

The PRESIDENT: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the phrase "pursued by the present United States Administration", in the second line of operative paragraph 10.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Comoros, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Haiti, Liberia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 54 votes in favour, 52 against and 38 abstentions.

The required two-thirds majority not having been obtained, the phrase "pursued by the present United States Administration" was not retained.

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution B, as a whole, as amended. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

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

Draft resolution B, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 25 abstentions (resolution 41/39 B).*

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

The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution C, entitled "Programme of Work of the United Nations Council for Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

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

Draft resolution C was adopted by 151 votes to none, with 7 abstentions

(resolution 41/39 C).*

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

The PRESIDENT: We turn next to draft resolution D, entitled "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of the immediate independence of Namibia". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

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

Draft resolution D was adopted by 135 votes to none, with 23 abstentions (resolution 41/39 D).*

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

The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution E, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia".

A recorded vote has been requested on this draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: None

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

Draft resolution E was adopted by 152 votes to none, with 6 abstentions

(resolution 41/39 E).*

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

The PRESIDENT: Several delegations have asked to be allowed to explain their votes, and I shall now call on them.

Mr. SVOBODA (Canada): I should like to repeat what we said so recently, at the fourteenth special session of the Assembly - namely, that the Canadian abstention on the Namibian draft resolutions is purely the result of Contact Group procedure. We have chosen once more to follow the Group's practice of not entering into the substance of Namibian debates in the Assembly. However, our abstention should not be taken to imply, in any way, how we might have voted if we were not a member of the Contact Group. Indeed, our position on a number of matters raised in the draft resolutions voted on today are well known.

While we have reservations in some areas, and oppose pejorative and gratuitous name-calling, there is also much in these resolutions with which Canada can agree. We are completely supportive of the speediest possible resolution of the Namibia question - that is, the immediate independence of Namibia under the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Bearing in mind, however, the intensive programme of activities devoted to the subject of Namibia this year, and especially in the light of the financial constraints facing this Organization, quite frankly we had expectations that requests for budgetary allocations for the future work programme would be more modest. We have registered our views more fully on this matter in the Fifth Committee.

South African intransigence on the question of Namibia, the creation of a so-called interim government and the setting of conditions for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) are in open defiance of the principles upon which this Organization was founded. South Africa, Namibia and apartheid have rightfully been given prominence at this year's sessions of the Assembly. We must of course recall that these topics have been on the United Nations agenda in one

(Mr. Svoboda, Canada)

way or another for several decades. While there has been some progress over the years, the glacial movement in granting the peoples of South Africa and Namibia their rights is simply unacceptable. We must all work in solidarity towards a speedy solution to the question of Namibia. Canada has joined with others in taking action to underline our determination for positive and peaceful change in southern Africa, and we shall continue to do so. South Africa without apartheid, and a free and independent Namibia, are goals we all share.

Mr. BARRERO STAHL (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The votes cast by the delegation of Mexico on the draft resolutions contained in document A/41/24 (Part II), chapter I, are in line with the position that we have taken in the United Nations Council for Namibia and at the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to Namibia. We reiterated - I stress: reiterated - that position on 20 September last and it is reproduced in document A/S-14/PV.7, on pages 43 to 46.

Mr. FISCHER (Austria): Austria is on record as having consistently supported the right of the Namibian people to self-determination. Consequently, my country is firmly committed to the immediate independence of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which remains to this day the only internationally accepted and satisfactory basis for a just settlement of the question of Namibia. Austria therefore regrets all the more that the intransigent attitude of the Government of South Africa has so far prevented the Namibia plan from being implemented.

Austria regards the question of Namibia as a matter of the highest priority and is therefore proud to have had the privilege, twice in 13 months, of acting as host to two important conferences on this issue which is of the greatest concern to the international community.

(Mr. Fischer, Austria)

While Austria strongly supported the main thrust of the texts submitted under this item, there were, regrettably, a number of provisions in the draft resolutions which Austria could not support. This year again, Austria was therefore not in a position to support all the draft resolutions.

In particular, I wish to recall the following.

Although we share the impatience and disappointment of the Namibian people at the endless delays in Namibia's transition to independence, Austria remains convinced that the endorsement of armed struggle and the calls for military assistance are in contradiction with the guiding principles of the Charter as well as with my country's firm conviction that conflicts should be resolved exclusively by peaceful means.

Owing to Austria's strict adherence to the foregoing principles and the provisions of the Charter, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations which prejudge the work of the Security Council. Furthermore, Austria cannot associate itself, as a matter of principle, with any form of the singling out of certain countries as being responsible for the policy pursued by South Africa. Finally, reference to the role of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) should not be read as prejudging the right of the Namibian people to choose its own representatives in a free Namibia, in free and fair elections under United Nations supervision.

For the reasons I have stated, Austria found itself obliged to abstain on draft resolutions A, B and D. On draft resolutions C and E we cast affirmative votes, thereby stressing Austria's firm commitment to a peaceful transition by Namibia to independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): As the United States has had occasion to state often in the General Assembly, and elsewhere, we believe that the only basis for a just and peaceful settlement in Namibia remains Security Council resolution 435 (1978). To that end the United States is engaged in extended negotiations with the parties involved with a view to expediting implementation of resolution 435 (1978) in a way that takes the interests of all into careful consideration.

Since the suspension of those diplomatic efforts, however, the war has intensified and peace has been forced to take a seat on the sidelines. The United States deplores the escalation of violence in the area. A military approach will solve nothing. On the contrary, it is leading to increased instability as well as greater suffering and hardship for all those who wish only to live in peace, security and independence. The lack of progress in this direction may be attributed directly and unmistakably to the Government in Luanda, which failed to use the opportunity offered by the proposed date of 1 August to commence implementation of resolution 435 (1978). As a result the risks have continued. Cross-border violence remains an ever-present reality. A solution in Namibia is stalemated. The war inside Angola rages on.

Many delegations present have criticized my Government for linking the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola to implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Yet we did not create that linkage. It arose naturally from the security situation created by the continuing presence of foreign troops in Angola and the concerns that that aroused in neighbouring States.

As my delegation noted during the September special session on Namibia, the Angolans themselves in their plataforma proposal contained in their November 1984 letter to the Secretary-General recognized implicitly that, in practice, Namibian

(Miss Byrne, United States)

independence could be achieved only in the context of a withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

Nevertheless the number of Cuban troops has continued to increase since independence. The major dilemmas facing the Angolan people are yet to be resolved. It is clear to all that neither of the two contending parties in Angola can achieve a decisive or lasting victory. Furthermore, it now appears that neither of them expects a military victory. We would like to see foreigners depart, Angolans left alone and Namibia attain independence.

The United States seeks the friendship of the Namibian people. My Government remains willing and ready to make active efforts to bring Namibia into the family of nations. Our common objective should be genuine negotiations that recognize the interests of both sides.

However, those who believe that a solution can be achieved on the basis of something other than consensus are deluding themselves. That very lack of consensus is responsible for delaying Namibia's independence despite what the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and others might say.

In the same context I would note that tying Cuban troop withdrawal to the extinction of apartheid in South Africa is linkage in its most unequivocal manifestation, a linkage that we reject. There is an urgent need for all parties to demonstrate that they are serious about reaching diplomatic solutions to the conflicts in the region. My Government has demonstrated at the highest levels its continuing commitment to a peaceful negotiated solution to the Namibian problem.

President Reagan has underscored on several occasions that this remains a major goal of his Administration. We hope that with the continued co-operation of our friends and partners both in the region and elsewhere this goal can be speedily achieved. The United States stands prepared to resume a serious dialogue with the parties.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

As my Government stated recently, it did all it could through diplomatic channels from 1981 to 1985 to bring about a solution. We found, however, that occasionally our diplomatic efforts were exploited by those who wished to buy time for military solutions. There are not going to be military solutions. Nor will the United States stand idly by while our diplomatic efforts are exploited by others in order to bring about a one-sided and unstable outcome that would not benefit the peoples of the region. That approach will not work. It will not get the forces disengaged. It will just lead to more fighting for an indefinite period.

Because of our membership in the Contact Group and the nature of our involvement and efforts towards a negotiated solution, we have traditionally abstained on Namibia resolutions. We have done so again this year despite the fact that the resolutions under consideration contain language with which we disagree and against which we have voted in other contexts. For example, the United States opposes mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Governments should remain free to adopt the policies they deem most appropriate as we pursue our common goal of achieving Namibian independence.

As we stated during the recent debate on apartheid we do not accept that the Security Council's power to impose conformity is the correct or appropriate means by which to harmonize our policies with those of others in pursuit of this goal.

Secondly, those resolutions reaffirm the so-called legitimacy of armed struggle. That is tantamount to affirming the legitimacy of war. The United States is opposed and will remain opposed to any policy that risks transforming southern Africa into an even greater zone of conflict.

Thirdly, those resolutions define SWAPO as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. We reject that judgement. Only the Namibian people, in the free elections called for in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), can decide who will represent them.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

Fourthly, those resolutions condemn constructive engagement. That misplaced obsession with terminology, a bugbear of the drafters of these resolutions, serves no purpose. Furthermore, the drafters know it. A crude focus on the destruction of South Africa's economic base and concomitant rejection of all dialogue with the perpetrators of the hateful apartheid system will redound to the detriment of South African blacks. We cannot support such a policy.

Lastly, those resolutions urge military support for SWAPO. For the same reasons that we are unable to affirm the legitimacy of the armed struggle, we must repudiate calls for the introduction of more arms into the region. In the view of my Government it is all too easy for those of us far removed from the conflict to call upon others to die. The more difficult, if nobler, task would have been to draft language calling on the militants to lay down their arms and talk.

Negotiations on the independence of Namibia had advanced to a point where a fair solution seemed within grasp. We regret deeply that that solution has so far eluded us. And we deeply regret that these resolutions which could have contributed to unlocking doors have simply given the key one more turn and made a peaceful solution that much more elusive.

Mr. BORG (Malta): As in the past, we have supported all the draft resolutions before the Assembly concerning Namibia because we are anxious to secure early independence for Namibia, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and because we sympathize with the sense of frustration created by South Africa's delaying tactics. This does not necessarily imply, however, that we are in full accord with every single provision contained in the draft resolutions, particularly draft resolutions A and B. On such an important issue, we feel that more efforts should be made in searching for resolutions that would command universal support.

Mr. HANSEN (Norway): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and Norway.

The Nordic countries regard South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia as a threat to international peace and security. We consider the establishment of the so-called interim government of Namibia to be null and void and categorically reject any unilateral action by South Africa outside the framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Nordic countries reject the linking of the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues.

The international community should increase its pressure on South Africa in order to speed up the implementation of the Namibia plan, and the Security Council should consider without further delay effective measures to this end, including comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

The Nordic countries agree with the main thrust of the resolutions just adopted, but we regret that we were not able to vote in favour of all of them. The reason for this is that they contain a number of elements that cause us difficulties of principle. I shall outline these well-known difficulties in general terms.

First, we cannot accept formulations that imply endorsement by the United Nations of the use of armed struggle or call for material or military assistance for such a struggle. One of the basic principles of the Organization enshrined in the Charter is the promotion of the peaceful settlement of conflicts.

Secondly, we deplore the selective and inappropriate singling out of individual countries or groups of countries as responsible for the policies pursued by South Africa.

Thirdly, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account that only the Security Council can adopt decisions

(Mr. Hansen, Norway)

binding upon Member States and that the permanent members of the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter, are entitled to exercise their right of veto.

Fourthly, we share the view that all parties enjoying support in Namibia should be allowed to take part in the political process leading to the independence of Namibia and to the establishment of a Government through free and fair elections. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), in our opinion, is to be regarded as such a party and it is fundamental that SWAPO be made part of any solution to the Namibian question. We have, however, reservations concerning formulations which could prejudice the outcome of the political process I have mentioned.

Finally, we want to emphasize that in the current financial crisis all United Nations activities, including those of the Council for Namibia, must be carefully scrutinized to secure effective and appropriate utilization of resources.

Mr. GREEN (New Zealand): The question of Namibia does not raise complicated issues. It is a straightforward decolonization matter. The people of Namibia are being denied their right to self-determination by the Government of South Africa, which occupies their country illegally. In so doing South Africa defies rulings of the World Court and resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. It has sought to prolong its occupation of Namibia by putting obstacles in the way of the negotiated settlement which the Secretary-General, the Western contact group, the Commissioner for Namibia and the front-line States have made strenuous efforts to achieve. It has attempted to install its own puppet régime in Namibia in defiance of the United Nations and the wishes of the Namibian people.

(Mr. Green, New Zealand)

New Zealand deplores South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and its obstinacy in the face of international calls for a peaceful settlement that will enable the people of Namibia to choose their own Government and to decide their own future without delay. We fully subscribe to Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 539 (1983), which provide the basis for such a settlement.

New Zealand would have liked to be able to support all the resolutions before us today. In so far as they reaffirm the rights of the Namibian people and the need for the South African Government to respect the clearly expressed wishes of the international community they have our unequivocal support. Regrettably, three of the draft resolutions contain elements which are unacceptable to New Zealand.

We have within this past week made known our position on the endorsement of armed struggle in General Assembly resolutions, on the singling out of individual countries or groups for criticism and on calls for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions - as opposed to selective and targeted sanctions - against South Africa.

Our abstention on draft resolutions A, B and D should be seen in this light. Notwithstanding reservations about the practicality of some aspects of draft resolution C, we have supported it, together with draft resolution E.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Zambia, who will speak in his capacity as President of the Council for Namibia.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: I wish to take this opportunity to thank all delegations which supported the draft resolutions on Namibia submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia. Their positive votes are tangible recognition of the high priority assigned by the United Nations to the urgent task of resolving the question of Namibia.

With the adoption of these resolutions the United Nations Council for Namibia has a fresh mandate to proceed with its activities in support of the Namibian

(Mr. Zuze, President, Council
for Namibia)

cause. It is our sincerest hope that, after 20 years as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, the Council will finally be relieved of its duties in the near future by the Territory's achievement of independence. In the meantime, members can rest assured that the Council will devote its utmost energy and commitment to the responsibilities entrusted to it by the Assembly.

In this connection, the Council wishes to note with appreciation the statement of the Secretary-General and the report of the Fifth Committee, as well as the oral report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) on the programme budget implications of the Council's recommendations in its report A/41/24 (Part II) and Corr.1. These reports indicate that all the programmes of the Council could be implemented by an additional appropriation of \$4,499,800 and by redeployment and absorption within existing resources.

I am gratified to note that the Assembly has approved the recommendations regarding provision of additional staff resources to the units servicing the Council, including the upgrading of a post in the Council secretariat from the P-3 to the P-4 level by redeployment and the temporary assistance sought by the Department of Public Information and the Department of Conference Services, which would be met from the existing resources of those Departments.

Regarding the Council's recommendation to upgrade the post of Secretary of the Council from the D-1 to the D-2 level, which is contained in chapter II, paragraph 39, of the report (A/41/24 (Part II) and Corr.1), we are happy to note that the ACABQ, in its oral report to the Fifth Committee, stated that, should the General Assembly accept the Council's proposal to implement this request, it should be effected through redeployment. Since the General Assembly has now approved the recommendations of the Council, in particular recommendation C, it is the hope of

JSM/gt

A/41/PV.79
80

(Mr. Zuze, President, Council
for Namibia)

the Council for Namibia that the Secretary-General will be able to identify a vacant D-2 post in the system to implement the decision of the Assembly.

Once again, I thank all delegations that have given their support to the draft resolutions on Namibia.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/152 of 20 December 1976, I call on the Observer of the South West Africa People's Organization.

Mr. GURIRAB (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)): I thank you, Mr. President, for calling upon me to speak. It gives me great pleasure to welcome you back in the Chair.

During the past two months the General Assembly has considered the question of Namibia on two separate occasions: the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to the question of Namibia, and the current debate in the General Assembly on the perennial item - this year it is item 36 - on the question of Namibia.

The delegation of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) had the opportunity to intervene on both occasions. Its strong views on the critical situation in and relating to Namibia are a matter of record. It is not my wish, therefore, to reopen the debate at this stage. Even as our country continues to burn, the suffering of our people going from bad to worse, Pretoria's military aggression and State-sponsored terrorism continue to inflict much hardship and wanton destruction in Namibia.

My intervention this time is, first of all, to thank the representatives who, on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, so ably introduced the draft resolutions and commended them for unanimous adoption by the Assembly, as a further reassurance to the oppressed but struggling Namibian people and their vanguard movement, SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, that the world community shares the anguish and yearning for freedom of the struggling people of Namibia.

The draft resolutions embodied two essential objectives. The first was to reaffirm the well-known position of the United Nations towards Namibia, the Territory being the direct responsibility of this Organization, and further to

(Mr. Gurirab, SWAPO)

galvanize the international community into rendering increased and sustained political support and all-round material assistance to SWAPO in order to enable our movement to intensify further the struggle in all the zones of combat, particularly the armed struggle, to bring about the total liberation of the motherland. That position reflects the well-established global consensus on the issue and inspires the demand for the immediate independence of Namibia.

The second objective was to identify the specific impediments which continue to obstruct Namibia's independence and to mention by name those States whose policies and actions are today directly responsible for the present impasse and which contribute negatively in perpetuating the untold sufferings of our people, whose freedom is held hostage by the current United States Administration, which continues to insist on its abominable and rejected policy of linking our independence to irrelevant extraneous issues, such as the withdrawal of Cuban internationalist forces from the People's Republic of Angola.

Those objectives, which are contained in the draft resolutions, truly reflect the sense of the overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations, and that is the correct attitude, which must be maintained as we seek to adopt effective ways and means of removing these unjustifiable impediments.

It goes without saying that unless and until these problems are attended to and resolved the much-heralded Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which we still uphold, cannot be implemented.

Who, then, is responsible for the impasse? Who, then, is responsible for blocking the implementation of resolution 435 (1978)? Who, then, is responsible for blocking progress in this matter? It is not the suffering people of Namibia or their friends who have supported the process of decolonization of Namibia. It is Pretoria, Washington and others.

(Mr. Gurirab, SWAPO)

At the conclusion of the special session of the General Assembly on Namibia I was compelled to intervene to contradict some statements made in the debate and during the explanations of vote by a number of States and their blatant distortions aimed at protecting the racist Pretoria régime and providing pretexts for the perpetuation of the status quo in Namibia. I am once again compelled to do so on this occasion.

I listened to the all-too familiar explanations and reservations from the very same countries that have been making them for many years. We are not convinced, and the kind of so-called consensus which they advocate is unhelpful and meaningless to us. They are Pretoria's friends and those who for selfish reasons would rather persist in their singular pursuit of the mineral rights and ready access to the raw materials of Namibia, which are being plundered by Western countries and their transnational corporations, to the detriment of present and future generations in Namibia. Contrary to their pretensions, they do not really care about the suffering of our people. They have not been known to us or to history for having ever cared about the struggles of peoples to end colonial domination and to free themselves. They have always been on the side of the oppressors, most of them being oppressors themselves. They are today part of the problem, not really part of our search for solutions to that problem. Excuses were made, armed struggle was decried, but nothing was said about the root causes that led the Namibian people to take up arms and launch the armed struggle on 26 August 1966. Nothing was said about the militarization of our country, the fact that Namibia has been transformed by the racists into a huge military barracks of the racist régime. Some of the statements were made by people -

The PRESIDENT: The 10-minute period allotted for this stage of our proceedings has expired. I therefore request the Observer of SWAPO to conclude his statement.

Mr. GURIRAS (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)): I am grateful to you, Sir. I am in process of concluding. Some of the statements were made by people who have been in the process of supplying arms to certain forces in Iran, yet they decry armed struggle. Designation of SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative was mentioned, but this is really building a straw man only to -

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry the 10 minutes allotted are over.

The Assembly has concluded its consideration of agenda item 36.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.