

*United Nations*  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
FORTIETH SESSION  
*Official Records\**



COPY:  
DO NOT REMOVE  
FROM ROOM  
L-201 (VWRR)

UN LIBRARY

JAN 2 1986

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE  
46th meeting  
held on  
Friday, 5 December 1985  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 46th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KORHONEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 76: INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE  
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 78: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 81: ISRAEL'S DECISION TO BUILD A CANAL LINKING THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA  
TO THE DEAD SEA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

\*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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/SPC/40/SR.46  
16 December 1985  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 76: INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE  
(continued) (A/SPC/40/L.30)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.30 concerning international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee was prepared to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.
2. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.30 was adopted without a vote.
3. Mr. IMMERMANN (United States of America) said that, thanks to the patient efforts of many delegations, the Committee had just adopted without a vote a draft resolution which would govern the work programme of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its sub-committees for 1986. That work programme was in keeping with the Committee's original mandate, as set forth in General Assembly resolution 1348 (XIII), which provided that the Committee would be the only standing body of the General Assembly to consider international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space.
4. The attempts made by certain delegations to refer to or insert irrelevant proposals in the draft resolution had complicated the search for consensus. When they had realized that their proposals had little chance of support, they had withdrawn them. That perhaps indicated that those delegations were increasingly aware that most States members of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space were interested in adopting constructive measures rather than in propaganda.
5. His delegation was gratified that paragraph 14 of the draft resolution reflected the proposals introduced by the United States and other Western countries to revitalize the Committee, as set forth in annexes II and III of the Committee's report (A/40/20). That paragraph also took note of the information contained in document A/40/476 on the amount of contributions of certain Member States to the development activities of the United Nations system. Those facts contrasted with the misleading rhetoric of certain proposals for the establishment of costly and duplicative new organizational arrangements.
6. Lastly, he welcomed some new elements introduced in the draft resolution endorsed by the Group of 77; the Committee's work could thus be of more practical benefit to the developing countries. He expressed the hope that the delegations which had complicated the search for consensus would formulate similar proposals so that the Committee could continue to play an appropriate role.
7. Mr. KOLOSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), noting that the United States delegation had often cited General Assembly resolution 1348 (XIII), pointed out that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space had actually been unable to begin its work, at the time of its establishment, because such countries as the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and India had not participated in it, owing to the under-representation of socialist and developing countries. Subsequently, it had become clear that the work of the Committee had never been depoliticized. Until

(Mr. Kolosov, USSR)

1978, its reports had been considered by the First Committee. It was only in 1979 that the Special Political Committee had begun to consider them. A review of all the questions considered by the Special Political Committee would show that the General Assembly had never dissociated the question of international co-operation in that field from the political relations among States.

8. The important document submitted by the Soviet Union presented the main lines of co-operation which would be established under a new international arrangement. That document was undeniably political in nature because the establishment of an international arrangement was necessarily a political question. The Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space should consider the question of the establishment of such a new arrangement. That was his delegation's interpretation of the draft resolution which had just been adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 78: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued) (A/SPC/40/L.29/Rev.1)

9. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the two draft resolutions concerning questions relating to information contained in document A/SPC/40/L.29/Rev.1.

10. Mr. BAALI (Algeria) said that, despite arduous efforts and the favourable climate in which the negotiations had evolved, the Working Group had been unable to draft a text which could be supported by all delegations.

11. The negotiations had faltered on the question of the definition of the new world information and communication order, which had long pitted the Group of 77 against the Group of Western States. During the negotiations, the Group of 77 had submitted a constructive proposal which had been favourably received by the Group of Western States, because it was in line with what it had always hoped to obtain. That proposal, unfortunately, had not generated enough enthusiasm to surmount the logical problem posed by paragraph 1 of draft resolution A, in which the General Assembly approved the recommendation of the Committee on Information and urged its implementation. It was that problem which explained the failure of the negotiations. The Group of Western States, which had opposed a number of recommendations of the Committee on Information, had insisted that those recommendations should only be noted. The Group of 77, for its part, had no alternative but to request the implementation of the recommendations, which had been adopted in good and due form.

12. Despite the intelligent and sincere search for compromise solutions and the imaginative and tenacious attitude of all the negotiators, it had not been possible to overcome such an important problem linked to the work of the Committee on Information.

13. It should, however, be stressed for the benefit of those countries which might use the inability of the Committee to reach consensus on the questions under consideration as a pretext to cease participation in the work of the Committee on Information, that the definition of the new world information and communication order was no longer a major problem between the developing and the Western countries. The failure of the negotiations during the current session was due not

/...

(Mr. Baali, Algeria)

to a basic disagreement, but to a procedural problem which should have disappeared by the forty-first session, since apparently the next session of the Committee on Information would take place in a climate conducive to a consensus.

14. Mr. DIMITRIJEVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the two draft resolutions under consideration, introduced by his delegation at the 45th meeting, were the result of intensive negotiations within the Working Group. The Group of 77 had been extremely flexible regarding the most important issues relating to information and to the activities of UNESCO. Accordingly, significant changes had been made to the text of the two draft resolutions, in particular to paragraph 1 of draft resolution A. New paragraphs had been inserted. The second preambular paragraph of draft resolution B took note of the efforts made by UNESCO to contribute to the clarification, elaboration and application of the concept of a new world information and communication order and recalled resolutions 4/19, 3.1 and 3.1 adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its twenty-first, twenty-second and twenty-third sessions respectively. The Group of 77 had also proposed quoting the pertinent paragraphs of those UNESCO resolutions in the hope of reaching a consensus.

15. Although its efforts had not been successful, the desire of the Group of 77 to reach agreement on those two texts was clear. As had been stressed by all participants in the negotiations, an important step had been taken, which constituted a hopeful sign for the future work of the Committee on Information.

16. His delegation hoped that document A/SPC/40/L.29/Rev.1 would enjoy wide support.

17. The CHAIRMAN suggested that delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote should be permitted to do so either before or after the vote.

18. It was so decided.

19. Mr. HANSEN (Norway) said that the five Nordic countries, which had voted against some of the recommendations of the Committee on Information, would vote against the text under consideration. In particular, they could not support paragraph 1 of draft resolution A, as it did not take proper account of the views they had expressed in the Committee on Information. That omission tilted the draft resolution against fundamental constitutional and political principles in the Nordic countries.

20. In addition, in view of the need to co-ordinate the work of UNESCO and of the Committee on Information aimed at the establishment of a new world information and communication order, the text under consideration did not properly reflect the work programme of UNESCO, in which the new order was seen as "an evolving and continuous process". Those words had been mentioned in the resolutions adopted by the UNESCO General Conference in 1983 and in 1985. A spirit of co-operation had pervaded the work of the General Conference held in Sofia, and it was therefore all the more important to reflect faithfully, both in the decisions of the Committee on Information and in General Assembly resolutions, the language on which a consensus had been reached.

(Mr. Hansen, Norway)

21. Concerning the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A, which mentioned article 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Nordic countries reiterated the reservations which they had expressed, during the adoption of the Covenant, concerning paragraph 1 of that article.
22. The Nordic countries hoped that the Committee on Information would continue its work in the same constructive spirit which had prevailed in the informal consultations and would be able to adopt its recommendations by consensus.
23. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the two draft resolutions under consideration.
24. With regard to draft resolution A, his country attached particular importance to the second preambular paragraph, which recalled article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As underlined by his delegation during the general debate, freedom of opinion and expression was the cornerstone of all other freedoms. That was why his delegation had reservations about recommendation 34 of the Committee on Information, which was incompatible with the right of individuals to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers. That was also why the ninth preambular paragraph, which affirmed that the establishment of a new world information and communication order should be based on the free circulation and wider and better balanced dissemination of information, was particularly important.
25. However, the establishment of a new order had to take place progressively. It was therefore an evolving process, as had been recognized by all countries which had participated in the General Conference of UNESCO as well as by the Director-General of that organization in his report to the General Assembly. Inserting the tenth preambular paragraph had improved on the wording adopted at the previous session because that progression was tacitly admitted. The latest proposal submitted by the Group of 77 to the Working Group was on the same lines.
26. His delegation supported draft resolution B in accordance with its support for UNESCO's International Programme for the Development of Communication.
27. Mr. FALTZ (Luxembourg) said that the 10 member States of the European Community and Spain and Portugal would vote against the text under consideration for three reasons. First, account was not taken of the progress made by UNESCO in helping to define further the concept of a new world information and communication order by describing it as an evolving and continuous process. The single reference to resolutions 3.1 of 1983 and 3.1 of 1985 would not suffice in that regard. It was important to refer to the evolving and continuous process in order to reflect the agreement reached by all the States represented at the UNESCO General Conference at Sofia that the establishment of a new world information and communication order involved real co-operation between the Western countries, the Eastern European countries and the developing countries. That common goal was also reflected in the communication programmes adopted by UNESCO. The constructive attitude and spirit of co-operation which had made it possible to achieve a consensus at Sofia should also be demonstrated at the United Nations. Second, paragraph 1 of draft resolution A was unacceptable because it did not reflect the

/...

(Mr. Faltz, Luxembourg)

reservations expressed in the Committee on Information about certain recommendations. Third, paragraph 14 of draft resolution A was also unacceptable because it reiterated a recommendation that additional resources should be allocated to the Department of Public Information, even though economy measures had been advocated on many occasions. Instead of requesting additional resources, it would be advisable to demonstrate both restraint and imagination so that the Department of Public Information could achieve maximum efficiency in its work and ensure the wisest possible use of the considerable resources already at its disposal.

28. The flexibility demonstrated by many members of the Group of 77 was encouraging. Two new approaches had been tested in order to try to lessen the differences of opinion. That climate should be maintained so that a consensus could be achieved in future work on the questions relating to information.

29. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolutions A and B contained in document A/SPC/40/L.29/Rev.1.

30. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A contained in document A/SPC/40/L.29/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Greece, Ireland, New Zealand, Spain, Turkey.

31. Draft resolution A contained in document A/SPC/40/L.29/Rev.2 was adopted by 96 votes to 18, with 6 abstentions.

32. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution B contained in document A/SPC/40/L.29/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Spain, Turkey.

33. Draft resolution B contained in document A/SPC/40/L.29/Rev.1 was adopted by 96 votes to 15, with 9 abstentions.

34. Mr. IRTEMCELİK (Turkey), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the two draft resolutions. Although it was unfortunate that, owing to lack of time, it had not been possible to do more in order to overcome all the difficulties, he hoped that the spirit of co-operation in which the negotiations had been conducted would be demonstrated in the course of future work.

35. Mr. LAGARIO (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted without reservation in favour of the two draft resolutions and observed that a comparison of the results of the votes just taken with those of the votes on the resolutions adopted under that agenda item in 1984 could be misleading. Although the actual numbers might seem less positive, constructive efforts had none the less been made. While not adopted, the proposal made by the Group of 77 on 3 December in the Working Group to prepare the way for a consensus had been well received by the Western delegations. That constructive spirit should enable the Committee on Information to adopt a new approach in undertaking its programme of work in 1986. Argentina undertook to work towards a consensus.

36. Ms. GERVAIS (Canada) said that her delegation had voted with regret against the two draft resolutions contained in document A/SPC/40/L.29/Rev.1, given that it supported most of the provisions. Paragraphs 1 and 14 of draft resolution A had elicited reservations because they did not define the new world information and communication order as an evolving and continuous process, in accordance with the terms of the resolutions adopted by consensus at the twenty-third session of the General Conference of UNESCO. Canada had voted against draft resolution B, which did not reflect the important progress made at Sofia, precisely because it was determined to work untiringly to strengthen UNESCO.

37. The General Assembly had stated on several occasions that UNESCO had the main role in the establishment of a new world information and communication order, and Canada could not support attempts to reopen the debate on that subject when UNESCO had succeeded in laying the groundwork for a compromise. Canada had voted with regret against the texts proposed by the Group of 77, particularly in view of the efforts which had been made and the possibilities which had opened up toward the end of the negotiations of the Working Group. She hoped that an agreement could be reached on those basic issues. The General Assembly should strengthen the basis of the compromise established by UNESCO, so as to enable the Committee on Information to focus its work on the activities of the Department of Public Information.

38. Mr. MUTO (Japan) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolutions because they did not qualify the new world information and communication order with the words "seen as an evolving and continuous process", which was the phrase used in all UNESCO documents and resolutions adopted at the twenty-third session of the General Conference.

39. In addition, draft resolution A contained elements unacceptable to his delegation, particularly paragraph 1, in which the General Assembly urged the full implementation of recommendations against which many countries had voted in the Committee on Information, and paragraph 14 reiterating a recommendation that additional resources should be allocated to the Department of Public Information. Draft resolution B also had inappropriate provisions.

40. Japan would support, as it had always done, the activities of the Department of Public Information. In order to facilitate the Department's work, the Special Political Committee should co-operate with the Committee on Information with a view to achieving the adoption of decisions by consensus.

41. While it had not been possible to study the draft resolutions thoroughly because of a lack of time, it was to be hoped that the constructive spirit that had marked the final days of the negotiations would be maintained in future negotiations.

42. Mr. PAPUCIU (Albania) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the two draft resolutions because Albania subscribed to the principle of the sovereign equality of nations in the field of information and supported the efforts of the developing countries which hoped to have an information and communication system independent of the media of the two super-Powers and the imperialist States.



(Mr. Papuciu, Albania)

43. His delegation had reservations about the paragraphs which referred to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. For Albania, that Conference was a farce put on by the United States and the Soviet Union to ensure and strengthen their respective zones of influence in Europe and to legitimize and perpetuate their domination of that continent. Consequently, the Albanian Government did not consider itself bound by the documents or resolutions of the current session mentioning that Conference.
44. Miss BYRNE (United States of America) noted that no Western country had supported the two draft resolutions submitted by the Group of 77. The improvement or modernization of information and communication infrastructures in developing countries could not be accomplished without the financial and technical support of Western countries. No progress would be possible as long as one of the three major groups represented in the Special Political Committee was excluded from genuine negotiations. Her delegation had voted against the two draft resolutions because their wording was unacceptable. Neither mentioned the phrase "seen as an evolving and continuous process", although it was essential to an understanding of the concept of a new world information and communication order, which was not static and could not be codified. The Group of 77, well aware of the Western Group's commitment to that phrase, had in fact offered, at the final meeting of the Working Group, to include wording from three UNESCO resolutions. Although insufficient to lead to consensus, that proposal could serve as a basis for future negotiations.
45. With respect to draft resolution A, her delegation objected to paragraph 1, calling for the implementation of recommendations of the Committee on Information against which the United States had voted. It also had objections to paragraph 14. In addition, the United States believed that divisive political issues had no place in a resolution on information and could not therefore accept the paragraph on Palestine. As to draft resolution B, since the United States had withdrawn from UNESCO, it would be illogical for it to endorse a resolution which supported that organization.
46. Her delegation noted that the number of negative votes had increased considerably compared with the previous year. That indicated that, despite efforts by the Group of 77 to overcome differences, there had been no real accommodation of the main concerns of the Western countries. Her delegation hoped that in 1986 the work of the Committee on Information would be approved by consensus.
47. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria) said that his delegation would have wished there to be a consensus on the draft resolutions on information. It regretted very much that it had had to abstain on the two proposed texts, which contained encouraging elements, in particular, the tenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A and the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution B.
48. Austria could not, however, accept recommendation 34 of the Committee on Information, approved in paragraph 1 of text A. It also would have liked the words "evolving and continuous process", adopted by consensus at UNESCO, to be reflected in the draft resolution. Paragraphs 11 to 14 of text B contained certain formulations which seemed to call into question the consensus reached during the

(Mr. Freudenschuss, Austria)

twenty-third session of the General Conference of UNESCO, at Sofia, with regard to the treatment of communication questions in that organization.

49. Mr. POTTS (Australia) regretted that a consensus had not been reached on the definition of a new world information and communication order, and that the Committee on Information had had to take a vote to adopt its report to the General Assembly. Those differing positions, which contrasted with the spirit of compromise that had previously reigned in the Special Political Committee, explained the vote of his delegation.

50. He nevertheless found encouraging the conciliatory tone that had manifested itself in the Working Group on Information, where new positions had met with receptiveness. His delegation believed that that would enable the members of the Committee to take a fresh look at the issues in 1986. If that spirit persisted, the consensus that had existed until quite recently would be within grasp.

51. Mr. RUIZ-CABAÑAS (Mexico) said that his country, which was a sponsor of the draft resolutions just adopted, had not accepted, as it had specified at Sofia, the inclusion of the words "evolving and continuous process", solely for the purpose of facilitating a consensus.

52. Mr. SOUMANA (Niger) said that, if his delegation had been present during the vote, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.29/Rev.1.

AGENDA ITEM 81: ISRAEL'S DECISION TO BUILD A CANAL LINKING THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA TO THE DEAD SEA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/SPC/40/L.31)

53. The CHAIRMAN announced that Djibouti, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Syrian Arab Republic had become co-sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.31 and invited the Committee to vote on it.

54. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.31.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan,

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

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: None.

55. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.31 was adopted by 118 votes to 1.

56. Mr. BARROMI (Israel) said that Israel had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.31. In the first place, the first preambular paragraph recalled past resolutions which Israel had opposed. There was no valid reason for the United Nations to take a stand on a plan which was still at the stage of feasibility studies. Moreover, the resolutions adopted had deliberately maligned Israel and distorted the nature of a bona fide development blueprint; they were both unwarranted and unjust.

57. Secondly, Israel had stopped all work related to the canal on 11 June 1985 and an official notification to that effect had been given to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 1 July 1985. The work had not been resumed and the Committee should have taken note of Israel's communication and declared the matter closed. Instead of that, draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.31 took note of a report by the Secretary-General dealing with an irrelevant inquiry by United Nations experts after the termination of all work on the canal and requested the Secretary-General to monitor hypothetical future activities. Israel questioned the wisdom of putting such a purposeless strain on the already overburdened personnel and finances of the Secretariat.

58. However that might be, Israel considered that its territory and operations should not be the subject of any United Nations surveillance and objected to such monitoring as a matter of principle.

59. Mr. VIGLIENZONE (United States of America) said that his delegation's support for draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.31 did not in any way alter its opposition to previous resolutions on the subject. It nevertheless considered the current resolution a positive step towards solving a difficult problem.

60. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said that his delegation had voted for the two draft resolutions on information and deeply regretted that it had not been possible to reach a consensus which would have been particularly desirable in such a sensitive area as that of information. Unfortunately all possible efforts to reach a consensus had not been made.

61. Like many other delegations of Latin America and other States members of the Group of 77, his delegation fully agreed that reference should be made to the evolving process in connection with information as that concept had already been accepted in UNESCO and other forums. It also regretted that freedom of the press,

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

freedom of opinion and all the other aspects of the issue covered in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were not more clearly mentioned in the text. In addition, greater stress should have been laid on information than on issues which were under consideration in other forums of the United Nations system. Nevertheless, as the texts emphasized the general principles which his delegation supported, and referred to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to other points stressed by his delegation, it had voted in favour of the draft resolutions.

62. Mr. DAAER (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the two draft resolutions and associated itself with the agreement reached by the countries of the Group of 77 on the amendments submitted to the initial draft resolution in the hope of eliciting a positive reaction from certain States. As it had not been possible to reach agreement in the Working Group, his delegation had not opposed putting the amended drafts to the vote as it had expected a more positive result. The fact that the result had unfortunately been more negative than the result on the same issue at the thirty-ninth session indicated that certain States did not support the aspirations of the developing countries which were seeking international support for the establishment of a new world information and communication order. Consequently, his country could only appeal to those States to change their position in the future in the interest of the developing countries and to co-operate with them by showing the desirable flexibility and understanding.

63. The CHAIRMAN announced that, pursuant to rule 154 of the rules of procedure, a statement of the implications for the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987 of the draft resolutions adopted by the Special Political Committee at the fortieth session of the General Assembly was presented in document A/SPC/40/L.32.

#### CONCLUSION OF THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

64. Following an exchange of compliments and thanks in which Mr. IRTEMCELİK (Turkey), on behalf of the Group of Asian States, Mr. RAUSI (Italy), on behalf of the Western European and other States, Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica), on behalf of the Latin American States, Mr. SHIRAMBERE (Burundi), on behalf of the African States, and Mr. ALSHAWKANI (Yemen), on behalf of the Group of Arab States, took part, the CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had completed its work for the fortieth session.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.