



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 28th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 60: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER-GENERAL
- (b) REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST
- (c) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE
- (d) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

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

AGENDA ITEM 60: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued) (A/SPC/36/L.6, L.7, L.8, L.9, L.10, L.11, L.12, L.13, L.14, L.15)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER-GENERAL (A/36/13)
- (b) REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (A/36/615)
- (c) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE (A/36/529)
- (d) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/36/385 and Add.1 and 2, A/36/558, 559 and 593)

1. THE CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.14 on the financial situation of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and document A/SPC/36/L.15, which contained the statement submitted by the Secretary-General on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.10.

2. Mr. SHAMMA (Jordan) said that his delegation wished to amend its draft resolution (A/SPC/36/L.12) on the University of Jerusalem for Palestine Refugees, which it had submitted previously. The word "educational" should be inserted after the word "competent" in operative paragraph 2 and operative paragraph 4 should be deleted.

3. Mr. AL-ATTIYA (Qatar) introducing, on behalf of the Arab Group, draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.14 on the financial situation of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, said that the Arab Group had considered in an objective manner the question of covering the UNRWA budget deficit and had decided that the expected voluntary contributions would not be sufficient. It was particularly important to protect the rights of tens of thousands of young people to education. The draft resolution aimed at covering the estimated deficit on the budget of UNRWA for the year 1982 from the regular budget of the United Nations for the same year. The Arab Group also wished to give the Secretary-General sufficient time to carry out a detailed study of the possible inclusion of UNRWA's budget in the regular budget of the United Nations as of the year 1983.

4. The CHAIRMAN announced that Bangladesh, Cuba, Cyprus, India, Madagascar, Mali and Senegal had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.6. Bangladesh, Cuba, Cyprus, India, Madagascar, Mali, and Senegal had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.7. Cuba, India, Madagascar and Mali had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.8. Mali, Pakistan and Senegal had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.9. Mali, Pakistan and Trinidad and Tobago had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.10. Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Senegal had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.12. Bangladesh and Pakistan had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.13.

5. Mr. RAMIN (Israel) said that draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.8 was yet another manifestation of the misuse of the General Assembly for the goals of the Arab political

/...

(Mr. Ramin, Israel)

campaign against Israel. There was no logical or legal basis for taking the steps proposed in that draft resolution. Property rights within the borders of a sovereign State were exclusively subject to the domestic laws of that State. The right of the State to regulate and dispose of property within its territory was beyond question. The United Nations had no competence to intervene in the regulation of such property rights. That applied to the income from the property as much as to the property itself. The representatives of the Arab States and the sponsors of that draft resolution had not suggested at any time that similar steps should be taken by the United Nations with regard to confiscated Jewish property in Iraq, Syria, Jordan or any other Arab country. Approximately 800,000 Jewish refugees from Arab countries who had been resettled in Israel had left their property behind in the countries in which they had lived, and that property had been confiscated by the Governments of those countries. There could be no difference in law, justice or equity between the claims of Arab and Jewish property owners. It was quite wrong to suggest that Israel's sovereignty was limited or restricted by some provision which did not apply to other Member States, since Article 2 (1) of the Charter stated categorically that the Organization was based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members. Furthermore, the Israeli Government had spent vast sums of money rehabilitating and developing derelict lands and property. In financial terms, no profit had been made and there was no sense in giving the United Nations the role of rent collector. For those reasons, his delegation rejected draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.8.

6. Draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.12 claimed special rights and privileges for one group of refugees. The Palestinian Arabs, including the refugees, were among the most advanced in education in the Middle East. Although his delegation agreed that it was a good idea that young people everywhere should have a chance to receive higher education and vocational training, it felt that there was no justification for adopting that draft resolution and singling out the children of one group of refugees, already largely rehabilitated, for preferential international treatment over other young people, refugees and non-refugees, in other parts of the world. That was particularly so at a time when the international community was unable to respond to desperate pleas for emergency assistance throughout the world.

7. His delegation disagreed with paragraph 7 (a) of the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/36/593, which suggested that facilities for university studies were required for all those who completed a secondary school education. That could be the ideal goal throughout the world, but it was doubtful that any country possessed such facilities at that time. Jordan's proposal to establish in Jerusalem a university exclusively for Palestine Arab refugees had nothing to do with the true educational needs of the refugees. Jordan was well aware that there were several universities which had been established in the areas occupied from 1948 to 1967 west of the Jordan and that there was no need to establish yet another one. Furthermore, the Hebrew University in Jerusalem had hundreds of Arab students in its student body and was open to any Arab student that wished to be admitted. In Judaea and Samaria there were currently 13 institutions of higher learning. Everyone who wished to study in in such institutions and had suitable qualifications could find an appropriate place. His Government would continue to encourage and support the development of institutions of higher learning in Judaea and Samaria in spite of the malicious propaganda disseminated at the United Nations by Jordan. For those reasons, his delegation rejected draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.12.

/...

8. Mr. SHAMMA (Jordan) said that draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.8 only referred to land and property which had been left behind by the Palestinians, who had lived in Palestine for centuries before the arrival of the Jewish immigrants. General Assembly resolution 181 (III) had sought to partition Palestine into a Jewish State and an Arab State. If the inhabitants of the proposed Arab State had not been driven from their homes, they would have been able to enjoy the use of their property and land. No law, international or otherwise, deprived a refugee of the right to his property and land. It was only fair, therefore, that the Palestinian refugees, who were currently living at a subsistence level, should benefit from any income accruing from that property, from which the Israeli Government was profiting. His delegation, therefore, would vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.8 and hoped that it would be adopted.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he took it that the Committee had concluded its discussion of the draft resolution under consideration.

10. It was so decided.

11. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would be unable to vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/36/L.12 and L.14 at that meeting because there had not been sufficient time for the submission of the required financial statements. Furthermore, the Arab Group had requested that the Committee should defer the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.10. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/L.6, L.7, L.8, L.9, L.11 and L.13.

12. It was so decided.

13. The CHAIRMAN suggested that those delegations which wished to explain their votes should do so after the vote on all the draft resolutions in order to permit the Committee to carry out its work more expeditiously.

14. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.6

15. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC.36/L.6.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laó People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, 1/ Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines,

1/ See para. 17 below.

Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, ^{2/} United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Jamaica, Malawi.

16. Draft resolution A/SPC.36/L.6 was adopted by 119 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

17. Mr. WENSELL (Norway) requested that Norway should be recorded as having voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.6.

18. Mr. FORBANG (United Republic of Cameroon) requested that the United Republic of Cameroon should be recorded as having voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.6.

Draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.7

19. A recorded vote was requested on draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.7.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ehtiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yeman, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Malawi,

^{2/} See para. 18 below.

Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

20. Draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.7 was adopted by 105 votes to 3, with 18 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.8

21. At the request of the representative of the United Arab Emirates, a recorded vote was taken by roll call on draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.8.

22. The Philippines, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ehtiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

23. Draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.8 was adopted by 101 votes to 2, with 24 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.9

24. The draft resolution was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.10

25. The draft resolution was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.11

26. At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

27. The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.13

28. At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka,

Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Ghana, Israel.

29. The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

30. Mr. RAMIN (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote, said that Israel had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.6 because of the cynical approach which it reflected towards the refugees who lived in the Gaza Strip in calling upon Israel to stop providing them with housing. The Commissioner-General had stated in paragraph 105 of his report (A/36/13) that "there has been an improvement in the standard of living of refugees who have been able to pay for and move into housing projects developed by the Israeli authorities, or who have built their own homes on land they have purchased in these developments". The people concerned were themselves eager to move to a better and more decent environment. It was contrary to fundamental humanitarian ethics to demand that Israel refrain from providing the refugees with proper accommodation. Israel would continue to act with true concern for their needs, including the basic need for appropriate housing which was disregarded in the draft resolution. It was also worth noting that the refugees, in moving from the camps to the new housing schemes, would retain all the privileges inherent in the status of refugee. The draft resolution represented yet another manoeuvre in the propaganda campaign against Israel conducted by certain Arab countries.

31. Israel had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.7 on account of its absolute disregard for the hard facts of the matter. He himself had fully classified all the security and other considerations concerning the return of those persons displaced during the 1967 hostilities in his statement before the Committee at its 24th meeting. The Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations had also given details in that respect in a note verbale reproduced in document A/36/558. It would be recalled that more than 55,000 persons displaced during the 1967 hostilities had been allowed to return to their homes. The destructive intent behind the draft resolution was particularly evident in operative paragraph 2, which was aimed directly against the Middle East peace process.

32. Israel had been unable to support draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.11 on account of the divergence between the interpretation it gave of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) and Israel's own consistent interpretation of it. Moreover, since the adoption of resolution 194 (III), an exchange of population had taken place in the area and the solution to the problem of the Arab and Jewish refugees in the Middle East could only be envisaged within the framework of a population exchange. Moreover, Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) provided for a solution to the problem of both the Arab and the Jewish refugees on the basis of negotiation. Since their adoption, a

(Mr. Ramin, Israel)

further step towards a proper and agreed solution had been taken in the form of the Camp David agreements. Israel had therefore abstained on the draft resolution.

33. Finally, while its Government favoured the advancement of education and higher learning everywhere, Israel had abstained on draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.13 on account of certain political formulations that betrayed its true purpose, which was not to promote education per se, but to further Jordan's unrelenting propaganda campaign against Israel in the United Nations.

34. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria) said that the continued commitment of Austria to the important tasks of UNRWA was reflected in the positive vote of her delegation on most of the draft resolutions. Austria had abstained however on draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.8 because, although it shared and understood the concern which found expression therein, it considered that the question of the restitution of property or compensation could be successfully dealt with only within the framework of an over-all settlement of the Palestinian issue. That issue warranted careful study and consideration on the basis of well-founded documentation rather than hasty treatment which, far from achieving the desired results, might ultimately be counter-productive.

35. Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the 10 Member States of the European Community, said that although the Ten had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.6, they considered that nothing therein should be held to interfere with the freedom of the refugees to choose where they wished to live. The position of the Ten on draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.7 remained the same as on resolution 35/13 of 3 November 1980. In connexion with draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.8, the Ten wished to reaffirm their deep regret at the continued absence of any repatriation or compensation of the refugees as provided for in paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III). At the same time, the Ten considered that a solution to the problems of Palestinian property rights and the return of the refugees must be sought in the framework of a just, lasting and comprehensive Middle East peace settlement.

36. Mr. ORN (Sweden) said that his Government's support for UNRWA was well known. His delegation had once more voted in favour of most of the draft resolutions under the item but had, however, been unable to support two of them. While his Government upheld the right of those Palestinians displaced as a result of the 1967 war to return to their homes, the wording of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.7, which was practically identical to that of the corresponding resolution in the previous year, appeared to be open to the interpretation that no negotiations on the modalities of repatriation were permissible. Consequently, and regrettably, his delegation had not been in a position to support that draft resolution.

37. His delegation had also abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.8. Its object, the settlement of property claims by Palestinian refugees, was one that should, in the opinion of his Government, more appropriately be dealt with in the context of a comprehensive solution to the Middle East conflict.

38. Mr. LOISELLE (Canada) said that, given the unswerving support of his delegation for the work of UNRWA as a means of promoting stability and security in the Middle East upon which to build a lasting settlement, it was necessary to explain its vote on several of the resolutions before the Committee.

/...

(Mr. Loiselle, Canada)

39. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.6 in order to register its concern at the practice of demolishing refugee shelters on punitive grounds, which caused hardship not only to individuals charged with offences but to entire families.

40. His delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.7, as it had against similar resolutions in the past, not because it opposed the principle of the right of displaced persons to return to their homes, but because the draft resolution was critical of the existing peace process, which his delegation supported and which contained provisions for dealing with the subject of the resolution.

41. His delegation had abstained on draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.8, although sympathetic to its main thrust, because the kind of complex property and compensation questions raised by it would more appropriately be considered in the context of a comprehensive negotiated settlement.

42. Mr. GLEYSTEN (United States of America) said that his delegation had been pleased to vote in favour of those resolutions supporting UNRWA and its work and calling upon States to offer scholarships to Palestinian refugees. As before, it had joined in the consensus of the Committee to support assistance to the refugees of the 1967 conflict. The Committee had acted prudently in deciding to delay the vote on the controversial proposal to finance the 1982 UNRWA budget deficit out of the regular United Nations budget. Delegations would have time to consider the proposal, its financial implications and the results of the next pledging conference and to receive instructions from their Governments. His delegation had opposed the resolution on Palestine refugees in the Gaza Strip because it addressed Israel in a harsh and unfair manner. It had also opposed the resolutions on revenues derived from Palestine refugee properties and on population and refugees displaced since 1967 because of its long-standing position that while repatriation and compensation were measures deemed applicable at the earliest practicable date in the context of an agreement among the parties, the outcome should not be prejudiced by the General Assembly. The actions called for in the resolutions were premature, unworkable and one-sided.

43. Mr. WARD (New Zealand) said that his delegation had abstained in the votes on two of the resolutions. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.7, its position had remained unchanged since the thirty-fifth session. Concerning the new resolution, A/SPC/36/L.8, his delegation regretted the hasty manner in which the subject had been introduced and the ambiguous and vaguely worded provisions of its operative section. The provisions of those resolutions were as unlikely to result in the advancement of the rights of the Palestinian people of the occupied territories or the furtherance of peace as was the continued illegal occupation of those territories by Israel.

44. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan) said that he wished to thank all of the States which had supported the just cause of the Palestinian people and their inalienable right to return to their homes. He was deeply disappointed with those countries which had expressed reservations with regard to that right, which was tantamount to condoning the illegal occupation of the occupied territories; whenever refugees were displaced as a result of a conflict their right of return had always been acknowledged, but in the present case a double standard was adopted. Many of those countries which had just abstained

/...

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

or cast a negative vote on the return of displaced persons were involved in self-contradiction. With respect to refugees in other parts of the world their views might be different and it might be thought that they would advocate the right of return unconditionally. Some of those countries had always endorsed that right for Palestinian refugees displaced in 1948 while at the same time denying it to those displaced in 1967.

45. Mr. RAMIN (Israel), speaking on a point of order, said that he had understood that the Committee was dealing with explanations of vote. The representative of Jordan had no doubt been busy elsewhere with very important tasks, but his delegation had made ample use of the general debate. He was now engaged in explaining the votes of other delegations, and that did not come under the right to speak in explanation of vote. He was, in effect, making a new statement in the general debate. That was not allowable and the representative of Jordan should confine himself to the explanation of his delegation's vote.

46. The CHAIRMAN appealed to the representative of Jordan to confine his remarks to the explanation of his delegation's vote.

47. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan) said that he wished to reiterate that it was unprecedented that a people displaced as a result of armed conflict should be told in a United Nations forum that they were not entitled to return to their homes. That was surprising, coming as it did from those who preached the virtues of private enterprise and the sanctity of private property. It was puzzling that an individual who happened to be absent from home at the time of the occupation of 1967 should be denied the right to return there. That was not consonant with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles that all claimed to uphold.

48. The CHAIRMAN announced that the observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization had requested the floor in order to make a statement. If there was no objection, he would be allowed to do so.

49. It was so decided.

50. Mr. TERZI (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) expressed his appreciation and gratitude to those countries which had voted in favour of the resolutions before the Committee. That had been an expression of the great concern of the international community for the future of the Palestinian people and of its determination to find a definitive solution to the problem. The resolutions had shown great appreciation for the work of UNRWA and, in particular, for the role of the Commissioner-General.

51. It had been said that the refugees in the Gaza Strip were not being molested since the shelters which had been demolished had been replaced by beautiful houses equipped with air-conditioning. It was typical of the mentality of colonial Powers that they claimed to provide better accommodation than the huts of the colonized people.

52. The wording of the resolution dealing with the victims of the 1967 aggression was entirely in conformity with that of Security Council resolution 237 (1967), which had been adopted unanimously. Any attempt in the present context to claim that that

/...

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

resolution was an obstacle to the peace process would amount to a direct accusation against the Security Council.

53. Concerning the concept of the exchange of populations, it had indeed happened that Governments had sat down together in a spirit of peace and had decided on such an exchange. However, no country had ever before expelled an entire population and then asserted that that was a prerequisite for an exchange of populations.

54. It had been said in the debate that Israel favoured education. That was an insult to the Committee's intelligence. Everyone was aware of recent events at Bir Zeit University, which had been besieged and stormed by the Israeli army. That army was now requesting an order from the Israeli Court of "Justice" to close the university permanently. That was a clear attempt to deprive the territories under Israeli occupation of educational facilities. Professor Dani Amit of the Hebrew University and 60 of his colleagues had joined in solidarity with the faculty of Bir Zeit University as a sign of protest against the oppressive policies of the occupation authorities. Authentic evidence showed that the aim of the Israelis was to deny education to the Palestinians, to deny them the right to live in peace and to force them out of those territories.

55. He recalled the statement of a certain Mr. Koenig in the Galilee area, who had suggested that the non-Jewish population should be "thinned out", a term which had been used by Eichmann with reference to the Jewish population of Vienna. The ideology of those in Tel Aviv and of the Eichmann clique was the same.

56. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should consider agenda item 136 entitled "Israel's decision to build a canal linking the Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea" on the afternoon of 3 December and on 4 December. The target date for completion of the work of the Main Committees was 4 December but the General Assembly, having allocated an additional item to the Committee, might be flexible on that point. If he heard no objection, he would assume that the Committee agreed to consider agenda item 136 on those dates.

57. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.