

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

FORTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records*



SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
34th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 25 November 1987
at 9 a.m.
York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 75: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 78: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 77: COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE WHOLE QUESTION OF PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS IN ALL THEIR ASPECTS: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS (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/42/SR.34
30 November 1987

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 75: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/SPC/42/L.23-29 and L.31)

1. Mr. SHAH (Pakistan) introduced draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.23, L.24 and L.25 on behalf of the sponsors and drew attention to their most important points. Israel had been occupying the Palestinian territories for 20 years, a period of great suffering and oppression for the Palestinian people, that had been denied the enjoyment of its most basic rights, including those guaranteed by the Geneva conventions of 1949. It was therefore to be hoped that Member States would support draft resolutions L.23, L.24 and L.25, which were aimed at overcoming Israeli intransigence and contributing towards a just, comprehensive and durable peace in the Middle East.

2. Mr. HANNAN (Bangladesh) introducing draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.26, L.27, L.28 and L.29 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the General Assembly had adopted similar resolutions in the past, but unfortunately, they had all failed to improve the condition of people in the occupied territories because of the negative attitude of the Israeli Government. It was therefore necessary to reiterate condemnation of the violations of human rights in the occupied territories by Israel and of the refusal by the Israeli Government to co-operate with the Special Committee. It was to be hoped that the adoption and implementation of draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.26, L.27, L.28 and L.29 would facilitate the work of the Special Committee and alleviate the suffering of the population of the occupied territories to some extent.

3. Mr. RAMIN (Israel) said that none of the draft resolutions was acceptable to the Government of Israel.

4. Mr. ALASSANE (Niger) said that he wished to join the sponsors of draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.23, L.24 and L.25.

5. Mrs. NAVCHAA (Mongolian People's Republic), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that her Government firmly condemned Israel's policy of annexation in the occupied Arab territories and did not recognize any changes in the physical character, demographic composition or legal status of those territories, including Jerusalem. Israel's expansionist policies and repressive practices were in flagrant violation of the fourth Geneva Convention. There could be no just and lasting solution to the problems of the Middle East without an unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all Palestinian and other Arab territories and recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Her Government supported the convening of a United Nations international conference on the Middle East, to be attended by all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Her delegation intended to vote in favour of the draft resolutions.

6. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.23.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire.

7. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.23 was adopted by 89 votes to 2, with 29 abstentions.

8. A separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.24.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, 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, Uganda, 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.

9. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.24 was adopted by 122 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

10. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.24 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, 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, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia, United States of America, Zaire.

11. Draft resolution A/SPC.42/L.24 as a whole was adopted by 116 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

12. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC. /2/L.25.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, 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, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia, United States of America, Zaire.

13. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.25 was adopted by 118 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

14. Mr. KATRA (Lebanon) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.23, L.24 and L.25.

15. Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the Arabic version of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.26 contained, in paragraphs 8 and 10, an erroneous rendering of the phrase "the Syrian Arab Golan", which appeared correctly in the English version.

16. A separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.26.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea,

Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Guatemala, Jamaica, Liberia, Panama, Philippines, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Venezuela, Zaïre.

17. Paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.26 was adopted by 78 votes to 21, with 23 abstentions.

18. A separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 22 of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.26.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Cameroon, Zaire.

19. Paragraph 22 of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.26 was adopted by 120 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

20. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.26 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Portugal, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire.

21. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.26 as a whole was adopted by 95 votes to 2, with 27 abstentions.

22. A separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.27.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia,

Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire.

23. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.27 was adopted by 96 votes to 2, with 25 abstentions.

24. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.27 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Swaziland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

25. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.27 as a whole was adopted by 108 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.

25. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.28.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, 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, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Cameroon, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia, United States of America, Zaire.

27. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.28 was adopted by 118 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

28. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.29.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic

Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, 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, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Honduras, Liberia, Panama, Uruguay, Zaïre.

29. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.29 was adopted by 111 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions.

30. Mr. RAMIN (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, although his delegation did not acknowledge the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 to the areas under Israeli administration, Israel in fact applied its principles to the inhabitants of those areas. His Government even granted to that population privileges not laid down in the Convention. The question of the applicability of the Convention in the case in question was a matter for legal interpretation. Israel's position on the matter was supported by acknowledged authorities in the field of international law. Accordingly, his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.24.

31. He had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.25, which purported to pronounce on the legal validity of measures and actions taken by Israel since 1967 in the areas concerned. The Special Political Committee was not competent to make any such pronouncements and the claim that Israel's actions constituted a serious obstacle to the efforts to achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting peace was particularly out of place. It was precisely resolutions of that type which obstructed prospects for lasting peace and harmony in the region. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.26 reproduced the various false allegations put forward by the Special Committee and at the same time completely disregarded the actual circumstances prevailing in the areas administered by Israel. That draft resolution took no account of the principle of international law that, in addition to ensuring the welfare of the local population, administering authorities had a clear duty to protect that population, together with its own, against terrorism. Furthermore, draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.26 renewed the mandate of the Special Committee, which had become a sinecure for its members.

(Mr. Ramin, Israel)

32. In May 1980, six Jewish worshipers had been killed and 16 wounded in an attack outside the Hadassah House in Hebron. The Israeli authorities had had to take a number of steps to prevent the recurrence of that kind of outrage, including the expulsion of the mayors of Hebron and Halhul and the Qadi of Hebron, who had been systematically inciting the local Arab population to acts of violence and subversion against Israel and Israelis alike. The situation facing Israel required his Government to attach the utmost importance to safeguarding public order and security. Accordingly, his delegation found draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.27 unacceptable and had voted against it.

33. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.28 was yet another manifestation of Syria's continual campaign of hostile and vicious propaganda against the State of Israel. The draft resolution was further evidence of Syria's stubborn refusal to contemplate, let alone enter into, negotiations with Israel on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). For years, Syria had repeatedly used the Golan Heights to launch attacks against Israel and Syrian gun emplacements had shelled the towns and villages in northern Israel.

34. Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of the Zionist entity was using his explanation of vote to attack the Syrian Arab Republic, which he had neglected to do during the general debate.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that delegations should confine their remarks to explanations of vote on the draft resolutions in question.

36. Mr. RAMIN (Israel) said that Syria was one of the major partners in organizing the combined military forces of several Arab countries against Israel. His delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.28 because that document was a weapon in the ongoing Syrian warfare waged against Israel and ignored the reasons for Israel's presence in the Golan.

37. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.29, he pointed out that before 1967 there had been no universities in Judea and Samaria. Under Israeli administration, however, rapid strides had been made in the field of education since 1967 and there were currently five universities in those areas. Taking advantage of Israel's liberal policies, terrorist organizations based in Arab countries had attempted to plant agents among the student bodies and recruit accomplices. Since 1979 there had been a number of student disturbances. Over the years numerous students and university staff had been actively involved in hostile activities on behalf of the terrorist PIO. Elections to the student councils at some universities were conducted on the basis of membership in terrorist organizations. Students from Bir Zeit University had incited high school pupils in Ramallah and elsewhere to conduct violent demonstrations. Acts of subversion had been instigated by students and faculty members. In the face of such violence, the Israeli authorities were duty bound to take appropriate measures.

38. The temporary closing of institutions of higher education must be viewed in the context of the norms of a democratic, law-abiding society. The issue was whether academic freedom and freedom of speech and belief could be exploited to

(Mr. Ramin, Israel)

mask incitement to violence, subversion and terrorist activities. Israel would continue to encourage the development of institutions of higher education in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District in conformity with the spirit of academic freedom and its liberal policies, which distinguished it from a number of other régimes in the Middle East. It would not interfere in the academic affairs of those institutions, but it expected such institutions to concentrate on higher education, not terrorist activities. For those reasons, his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.29. Israel had also voted against draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.23 in accordance with the views presented by his delegation during the general debate.

39. Mr. LAGORIO (Argentina) said that he had voted in favour of the seven draft resolutions in accordance with his Government's general policy. Nevertheless, Argentina reserved its position with regard to some of the terminology used, which did not relate to the substance of the questions addressed and might lead to equivocal interpretations that his delegation could not support.

40. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America) said that the Committee had once again adopted a series of ritualistic and one-sided resolutions dealing with the occupied territories. His Government had worked too long in the search for just and lasting peace in the region to support resolutions which, through inflammatory rhetoric and unjustified allegations, impeded efforts to achieve that goal. His delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.23. Although the United States opposed the practice of administrative detention, that draft resolution went beyond the question of administrative detention and gave the totally unacceptable appearance of condoning violence. His Government firmly supported the application of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967. For that reason, his delegation had requested a separate vote on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.24 and had voted in favour of it in order to underscore that position. He had abstained in the vote on the resolution as a whole, however, because it served no purpose other than to delay the solution of the very problems which it claimed to address. Furthermore, his country considered the phrase "Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem", which appeared in that draft resolution and other ones, as merely demographically and geographically descriptive, and not indicative of sovereignty.

41. The United States did not condone increased Israeli settlements in the occupied territories and felt that further settlement activity was in no way necessary for the security of Israel and only diminished the confidence of the Arabs that a final outcome could be fairly negotiated. Nevertheless, he had abstained in the vote on resolution A/SPC/42/L.25 because it diverted attention from the real task of promoting peace through direct negotiations. His delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.26, which could only inflame an already embittered situation. He noted with particular dismay such new charges as the "ill-treatment and torture of children and minors under detention". His Government also objected to the expense imposed by the Special Committee on the budget of the United Nations, especially at a time of budgetary constraint when scarce resources should not be wasted on pointless exercises.

(Mr. Stevenson, United States)

42. The United States believed that the deportations referred to in draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.27 were contrary to the fourth Geneva Convention and that the deportees should be allowed to return. His delegation, however, had abstained in the vote on that draft resolution because it presented an unbalanced picture, ignoring factors that had led to the deportation of the individuals in question. He had also abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.28 because Security Council resolution 497 (1981) remained the authoritative United Nations decision on that question and his delegation could not support any resolution that went beyond it. Nevertheless, the United States believed that the fourth Geneva Convention applied to the Golan Heights, which was occupied territory, and Israel, as the occupying Power, must meet its obligations under that Convention.

43. His delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.29, which indiscriminately condemned alleged Israeli actions in dealing with educational institutions and students in the occupied territories. No nation upheld more strongly the principle of academic freedom than the United States, and his Government had not hesitated to address criticisms, when justified, to the Israeli authorities. Nevertheless, his delegation was opposed to that inaccurate and inflammatory language, which could only undermine genuine efforts to resolve disputes. It was clear that just and lasting peace in the Middle East could not be achieved by adopting sterile and divisive draft resolutions. The only way to find a solution to the conflict and put an end to the occupation was through direct negotiations between the parties concerned on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

44. Mr. LIDEN (Sweden) said that his delegation had voted in favour of five of the seven draft resolutions under consideration. The situation in the territories occupied by Israel since 1967 was a matter of great concern to his Government, because of Israel's repeated violations of international law and the suffering inflicted on the population of those territories. Furthermore, that situation was also becoming a serious obstacle to prospects for peace in the region. Sweden believed that the fourth Geneva Convention was applicable to all the territories occupied by Israel since 1967. The measures taken by Israel to change the legal status of those territories were unequivocally illegal and incompatible with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

45. The Israeli settlement policy and the annexation of East Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan Heights were flagrant violations of international law. Halting that policy and dismantling the settlements in the occupied territories would substantially improve prospects for peace. His delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.23 mainly because of the sweeping formulation in paragraph 1, which might lead to dubious interpretations. Sweden had also abstained in the vote on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.26 and in the vote on that draft resolution as a whole. Although his delegation could support most of the provisions of that draft resolution, specifically the condemnation of various Israeli policies and practices in paragraphs 8 and 9, it was not convinced that all the formulations of those paragraphs were fully justified by facts. Furthermore, that draft resolution went beyond the competence of the General Assembly. Lastly, he pointed out that Sweden's support for draft resolution

(Mr. Liden, Sweden)

A/SPC/42/L.28 in no way altered his country's position on General Assembly resolution ES-9/1. Sweden had voted against that resolution in 1982.

46. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria) said that his country had abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.23 and L.26. Its rejection of Israeli practices in the occupied territories was well-known. Austria had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.23 because of its reservations about the wording of paragraph 1. Nevertheless, his Government was concerned about the continuing unjustified arrests of Arabs by the Israeli authorities. Although his Government supported the basic thrust of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.26, it had abstained in the vote on that draft resolution because of certain formulations which it contained. Nevertheless, Austria supported paragraph 22 of that draft resolution and hoped that contacts between the owner of the Catholic Medical Facility Hospice at Jerusalem and the Jordanian Government would be vigorously pursued in order to find a satisfactory solution which met the medical and social requirements of the Arab population.

47. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.24, L.25, L.27 and L.28 for strictly legal reasons, although it disagreed with certain political statements made in them. It had abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.23, L.26 and L.29 because they contained several formulations which did not contribute to efforts to restore peace to the region.

48. Mr. SADATIAN (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.24, L.25 and L.26 and had abstained in the votes on the remaining draft resolutions. His delegation's votes should in no way be construed to imply recognition of the Zionist occupation of the territories in question. All the Palestinian territories must be liberated, including those occupied in 1967.

49. Mr. JOHANSEN (Norway) said that, if his delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.24, it would have voted in favour of it.

50. Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) expressed gratitude to those delegations which had voted in favour of the draft resolutions under consideration, particularly draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.28, concerning the Syrian Arab Golan. The vote on that draft resolution had confirmed that the Golan was Syrian and Arab. Those delegations which believed that they could impose a solution and supported the Zionist entity were wrong. The day would come when they would have to change that position.

51. Mr. ORTIZ-GANDARILLAS (Bolivia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions under consideration, on the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. Bolivia was inalterably opposed to the occupation, conquest or annexation of territories belonging to other peoples, just as it opposed practices leading to the assimilation of such territories by the occupying Power. Just such a historical situation had occurred in 1879 when Chile, in a war of conquest, had occupied approximately 158,000 sq. km. of Bolivian territory, thus depriving Bolivia of its entire coastline.

52. Mr. DANUS (Chile) asked the Chairman to instruct the Bolivian delegation to keep to the subject at issue and refrain from discussing matters over which the Committee had no jurisdiction.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that the Bolivian delegation should indeed restrict his remarks to an explanation of vote on the draft resolutions under consideration.

54. Mr. ALASSANE (Niger) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolutions because the problems of the Palestinian people were a matter of international concern and they required a satisfactory settlement that would allow all the peoples in the region to live in peace and security.

55. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the votes just taken were yet another indication of international support for the just cause and the just struggle of the Palestinian people. Such support encouraged those in the occupied territories to continue trying to return to their homeland and recover their inalienable rights to self-determination and the establishment of an independent State under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

56. Those who had tried to reopen the debate on the issues had thereby demonstrated that they had not been successful in winning support for their position. Israel stood entirely alone in denying the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 to the occupied Palestinian territories. A Government that had been judged responsible by thousands of its own citizens for the Sabra and Shatila massacres should not accuse the PLO of terrorism. Those delegations seeking to dictate the capitulation of the Palestinian people would do well to review their policies and not remain isolated on the side of Israel.

57. The only way to settle the question of Palestine, which was the heart of the Middle East conflict, was to convene an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation, on an equal footing, of all interested parties, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, as well as the five permanent members of the Security Council.

58. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 75.

AGENDA ITEM 78: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued) (A/SPC/42/L.20 and Corr.1, L.21 and Corr.1)

59. Mrs. MIRANDA (Chile), speaking as Chairman of the Working Group on Questions relating to Information, said that the Working Group, proceeding in a constructive and realistic manner, had achieved a good measure of success, even though it had, unfortunately, not been able to reach a consensus on the draft resolutions to be submitted to the Committee. Consequently, the representative of the Group of 77 would introduce the two resolutions for consideration.

60. Mr. AGUILAR-HECHT (Guatemala), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, introduced draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.21 on questions relating to information.

(Mr. Aguilar-Hecht, Guatemala)

The 48 recommendations contained in paragraph 1, which followed closely those in General Assembly resolution 41/68 A, reflected the full range of items with which the United Nations dealt in the economic, social, humanitarian and political sphere, with particular reference to questions of information.

61. Introducing draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.21 on questions relating to information, he said that it was similar to that of the previous year and had simply been updated. The Group of 77 would like both draft resolutions to be adopted without a vote.

62. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20, said that the following information had been provided by the Programme Planning and Budgeting Division: under the terms of paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20, the General Assembly would, inter alia, urge the full implementation of certain recommendations of the Committee on Information, several of which related to the activities of the Department of Public Information (DPI). Under paragraph 2, the General Assembly would request that the recommendations relating to the activities of DPI should be implemented within existing resources. Accordingly, adoption of the draft resolution would not give rise to additional appropriations. With regard to the programme implications of the recommendations in paragraph 1, revised programme budget proposals for section 27 of the budget would be submitted to the General Assembly in 1988 through the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, the Secretary-General would be guided by the programme recommendations contained therein when formulating his revised proposals.

63. He informed the Committee that recorded votes had been requested on both draft resolutions on questions relating to information.

64. Mr. GORAJEWSKI (Poland), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolutions. The Group of Eastern European States attached great importance to the priorities outlined in the set of recommendations contained in draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20, which would increase the effectiveness of DPI. They also attached importance to co-operation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and particularly to the implementation of its International Programme for the Development of Communication, which sought to eliminate imbalances in the field of information.

65. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece,

Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

66. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20 was adopted by 109 votes to 1, with 15 abstentions.*

67. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.21.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, 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, Uganda, 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.

* See para. 86 below.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

68. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.21 was adopted by 111 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.*

69. Mr. JANUS (Netherlands), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained on both draft resolutions. It had a number of reservations regarding draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20. The text did not take into account the lengthy negotiations that had taken place during the summer session of the Committee on Information, which had almost resulted in consensus; his delegation's abstention should thus be viewed as an expression of support for the work of that Committee. Furthermore, his delegation objected to the dirigiste approach to questions relating to information in the first recommendation in paragraph 1 and to the references in recommendations 18 to 22 to documents and declarations containing appeals with which his Government did not wish to be associated. In general, the draft resolution should have limited the number of recommendations and should have more clearly set out the priorities for the work of DPI.

70. The Netherlands had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.21 because it saw no need for a separate resolution on UNESCO's work in the field of information, given the UNESCO consensus on the subject. Also, his delegation again objected to references to documents and declarations which it could not fully support and had reservations on the formulation of paragraphs 3 and 9 and on the inclusion of paragraph 6.

71. Mr. ISHIDA (Japan) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on both draft resolutions because some of their provisions were not consonant with Japan's position on questions relating to information. While it was not an easy task to reach agreement on the basic issues involved, his delegation had been encouraged by the good will demonstrated during the intensive negotiations in the Committee on Information and hoped that the same atmosphere of co-operation would prevail at that Committee's next session, leading to a consensus on the issue.

72. Ms. BAGGE (Denmark) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20 because paragraph 1 did not reflect the latest consensus resolution adopted by UNESCO; there should always be consistency between the work of the General Assembly and that of the relevant specialized agencies. Moreover, in dealing with DPI matters, the draft resolution included far too many items, which would neither help DPI in its current situation nor further the achievement of consensus in the Committee on Information. Since that Committee had come close to a consensus the previous summer and the negotiations in the Special

* See paras. 86, 91 and 93 below.

(Ms. Bagge, Denmark)

Political Committee during the current session had been encouraging, Denmark hoped that that signalled an end to futile discussions on questions of information.

73. Like draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20, draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.21 referred to a Harare conference appeal to the mass media to take note of their role in promoting peace, understanding and co-operation, as if a threat to world peace and security stemmed from, inter alia, zionism. Denmark could not accept any interference with the mass media or any appeal to them to act on a specific issue, and certainly not on the basis of a particular reference to the relevant Harare document. Denmark had made serious efforts to bring about a consensus on the important UNESCO draft resolution. Regrettably, its efforts had failed. She trusted that the spirit of the negotiations would prevail, so that the Committee would reach its common goal in the near future.

74. Ms. BERSTEIN (United States of America) said that, while her delegation would have liked to support a consensus omnibus resolution on questions relating to information, that had not been possible in 1987. There was no doubt that the resolution A/SPC/42/L.20 just adopted represented some improvement over General Assembly resolution 41/68 A. Elements remained, however, which her delegation found unacceptable, including the recommendation calling for the establishment of a new world information and communication order. Her delegation was committed to redressing imbalances in information infrastructure by practical means rather than theoretical or ideological approaches. Acquisition of sophisticated information and communication technology would not, in and of itself, enhance a free flow and a wider and better-balanced dissemination of information. As the United States in its earliest days had shown, no country was too poor or too undeveloped to afford freedom of the press. Those who called for a new order should realize that a single so-called objectivity must necessarily be contrived, whereas a multitude of subjectivities would let the observer judge for himself.

75. At a time of financial constraints throughout the United Nations system, the resolution just adopted asked DPI to make additional expenditures. The Under-Secretary-General for Public Information had recently presented a plan to revive DPI, which, if enacted, would help the United Nations to regain its place of pride within the world community. The members of the Committee must not hamstring DPI with programmes which they knew could not be implemented, nor should they single out a few contentious issues for special attention. It would not be possible for DPI to present a more accurate picture of the valuable contributions the United Nations was making through its specialized agencies as long as the Committee was occupied with attempts to direct the mass media and with a selective agenda of political questions.

76. Her delegation wondered what purpose was served by putting forward the resolution on UNESCO (A/SPC/42/L.21). Most of the preamble was untenable, while paragraphs 2, 6, 8 and 9 were contrary to the goal of UNESCO reform.

77. Mr. JOHANSEN (Norway) said that Norway had been gratified to note the progress made at the previous session of the General Assembly towards bridging the differences of opinion on issues relating to information. Particular importance

(Mr. Johansen, Norway)

had been attached to the process of harmonizing the UNESCO description of a new world information and communication order as an evolving and continuous process and the language adopted by the General Assembly. For several years, Norway had been an ardent supporter of the various information programmes and activities carried out within the framework of the United Nations. However, it had felt obliged to abstain in the vote on both draft resolutions relating to information. It regretted the introduction of a reference to the provisions of the Second Conference of Ministers of Information of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Harare in June 1987. The declaration issued by that Conference equated zionism with racism. Moreover, Norway could still not fully endorse the language contained in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20. It would appreciate further changes in the wording of both draft resolutions, particularly A/SPC/42/L.20.

78. Mr. SADHTIAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), referring to recommendations 8 and 16 contained in draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20 and any other resolutions on the same subject, said that Iran fully supported those recommendations only to the extent that their provisions and implications remained consistent with Islamic laws.

79. Mr. KARINEN (Finland) said that, while Finland had voted in favour of both draft resolutions, it wished to express its dissatisfaction that there had not been any major improvement on the resolutions of the previous session, particularly regarding the definition of a new world information and communication order. It had been his country's understanding that, in endorsing the consensus reached in UNESCO, it had given its best support to the Organization itself. Finland would have preferred the precise use of the consensus language of the General Conference in Sofia, in order to avoid a formulation lending itself to various interpretations. Had there been a separate vote on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20, it would have abstained.

80. He wished to express his delegation's well-known reservation regarding the principles contained in paragraph 1 (19) of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20 and in the second preambular paragraph and in paragraph 2 of resolution A/SPC/42/L.21. That reservation was based on the formulation equating zionism with racism.

81. Ms. MOSSBERG (Sweden) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20 in the light of its vote on that question in the past few years. If there had been a separate vote on paragraph 1, Sweden would have abstained. By voting in favour of the draft resolution, it expressed the hope that the Committee's work would be more fruitful in 1988. However, it felt obliged to express its disappointment that there had not been any major improvement on the resolutions since the previous General Assembly. Its vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.21 did not reflect any change in her Government's position regarding the various decisions referred to in the text.

82. Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said that his delegation acknowledged that draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.20 represented in some respects a modest improvement on previous relevant resolutions. However, it was disappointed that the sponsors had apparently not made any effort to amend or improve the set of recommendations contained in paragraph 1, despite the fact that an entire group of countries,

(Mr. Smith, United Kingdom)

including the United Kingdom, had recently been unable to support those recommendations in the Committee on Information. The United Kingdom was principally concerned about the following: the continued use of the word "establishment", rather than a word such as "development", in relation to a new world information and communication order; the implication that earlier UNESCO resolutions, other than the latest consensus text of 1985, were relevant to work in that field; the excessive number and the generally expansionist tone of the recommendations on DPI; and, the selective introduction into those recommendations of sensitive and contentious political issues.

83. It hoped that the Committee on Information would make a sincere effort in 1988 to arrive at a set of recommendations enjoying the support of all delegations. It continued to believe that the set of draft recommendations contained in document A/AC.198/L.37 would constitute an appropriate basis for further negotiations towards that goal.

84. Mr. HEINBERG (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.20 and A/SPC/42/L.21, because both texts, in referring to the question of a new world information and communication order, seen as an evolving and continuous process, again failed to reflect adequately and accurately the language which UNESCO had adopted by consensus. Moreover, both draft resolutions repeated the practice of recalling meetings in which his country had not taken part and of recalling declarations which were extraneous to questions relating to information. His delegation had repeatedly emphasized that the practice of "recalling" created difficulties, because some of the documents referred to in the relevant paragraphs of the two draft resolutions, particularly A/42/431, contained statements or appeals which his delegation was not prepared to see recalled.

85. His delegation regretted that document A/AC.198/L.37 had not been the basis of negotiations on the omnibus resolution and that that resolution instead repeated the recommendations of the Committee on Information, on which his delegation had abstained in the Committee. It also regretted that the text of the UNESCO resolution was basically the same as that of 1986, on which his delegation had abstained. Once again, the UNESCO resolution did not concentrate on the relevant issues.

86. Mr. ANAKY (Côte d'Ivoire) said that, owing to a technical difficulty, his delegation's vote had not been recorded. It had wished to vote in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.20 and A/SPC/42/L.21.

87. Mr. AGUILAR-HECHT (Guatemala), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that he deeply regretted that, once again, it had not been possible to reach agreements which would allow all Member States to adopt by consensus the recommendations which would serve as the basis for DPI activities. That was especially true inasmuch as the report of the Committee on Information (A/42/21) had been intended as the starting-point for negotiations aimed at preventing recommendations acceptable to all of the Member States.

/...

(Mr. Aguilar-Hecht, Guatemala)

88. The Group of 77 hoped that in 1988 it would be possible, on the basis of the resolutions just adopted, to find the way to a general agreement and to adopt the resolutions by consensus.

89. Mr. LAGORIO (Argentina) said that, judging exclusively by the results of the voting on draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.20 and A/SPC/42/L.21, he could only conclude that the Committee had taken a step backward from what it had achieved in 1986. His delegation wished, however, to offer a different interpretation, feeling that a larger share of attention should be paid to the process underlying the negotiations on the two resolutions, rather than to the texts themselves. Although the resolutions just adopted had been presented without the necessary co-sponsorship which might have secured broader support, his delegation felt that they represented one more step in the right direction. Proof of that was the inclusion of paragraph 16 in document A/SPC/42/L.20. That paragraph was also indisputable proof that the new world information and communication order was based on the principle of freedom of speech.

90. His delegation regretted that a large number of delegations had been unable to support the two draft resolutions, but was confident that such support would be possible in the near future.

91. Mr. RODRIGUEZ-MEDINA (Colombia) said that he wished to place on record that Colombia had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.21, although the vote had not been recorded. He regretted that the Committee had been unable to maintain the agreement achieved at the previous session, particularly because the draft resolutions virtually reproduced in letter and in spirit the relevant 1986 resolutions. The explicit reference to freedom of opinion and expression, which was clearly the basis of a new information order, was a sign of progress. He hoped that extreme positions would be avoided during the negotiations in the Committee on Information and that open discussions would take place on the basis of the new, constructive and realistic resolutions.

92. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) said that the patient work in search of agreement in 1986 had been about to yield expected results, because resolutions 41/68 A and B had commanded almost unanimous support. However, that spirit had disappeared in the Committee on Information. He had compared with special interest the recommendations of the Committee on Information and resolutions 41/68 A and B and did not see any significant difference in letter or spirit which should prevent the renewal of the almost unanimous support given by the General Assembly in 1986.

93. Mr. EL-KHATIB (Morocco) said that, for technical reasons, Morocco had been unable to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/41/L.21 but had wished to vote in favour of it.

94. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 78.

AGENDA ITEM 77: COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE WHOLE QUESTION OF PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS IN ALL THEIR ASPECTS (continued) (A/SPC/42/L.17 and L.30)

Consideration of draft resolutions

95. The CHAIRMAN said that he had been informed by the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.17 that they did not wish to put the draft resolution to the Committee for a decision.

96. Mr. FASEHUN (Nigeria) introduced draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.30. Any action promoting the mechanism for the maintenance and attainment of peace was welcome and should be supported by all peace-loving countries. The draft resolution set the stage for the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to resume its work. He hoped that the consensus which had emerged in favour of the resumption of the Special Committee's work would encourage it and lead to compromise when it resumed its work in 1988. Unanimous support for the draft resolution was needed in order to take advantage of the auspicious political environment of rapprochement between the super-Powers. He was pleased that Austria had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

97. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.30 was adopted without a vote.

98. Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation was pleased that the Committee had adopted document A/SPC/42/L.30 without a vote. Although his delegation had joined the consensus, it wished to recall the position which it had taken consistently, namely, that peace-keeping operations should not assume a permanent character and that the cost of funding of those operations must be borne by the aggressor in particular.

99. Mr. POULSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Economic Community, said that during the debate the Twelve had expressed the regret that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations had continued to find no basis for reactivating its work. The Twelve welcomed the wider international interest in United Nations peace-keeping operations which had made possible the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.30. The EEC countries took the opportunity to reiterate the importance they attached to the principle of collective responsibility for financing United Nations peace-keeping operations.

100. Mr. IRTEMCELİK (Turkey) said that his delegation was glad that the Committee in past weeks had had the opportunity to be reminded that each peace-keeping operation was unique in nature and scope and that procedures varied also, depending on the political realities of the underlying conflicts. He hoped that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations would make progress in 1988 in developing a set of universally accepted guidelines.

101. Mr. NWANEAMPEH (Ghana) said that he was glad that the resolution had been adopted by consensus. His delegation was disturbed by the acute financial situation facing the peace-keeping operations, which had made the troop-contributing countries bear the brunt of the costs. He hoped that those countries,

(Mr. Nwaneampek, Ghana)

especially the permanent members of the Security Council, would give their full support to the resolution and that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations would resume its meetings early in 1988 in order to submit a comprehensive report to the General Assembly at its forty-third session.

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

102. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to inform the members of the Committee that in previous years, pursuant to rule 154 of the Rules of Procedure, a summary of the programme budget implications resulting from draft resolutions adopted by the Special Political Committee had been issued by the Secretariat. At the current session, the Committee had received only one written statement of programme budget implications, which was contained in document A/SPC/42/L.31. Consequently, there would be no additional document issued at the current session. He also recalled that at the Committee's 15th meeting on 4 November and at the meeting in progress, he had transmitted to the Committee information provided by the Programme Planning and Budget Division in respect of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/SPC/42/L.7 and L.20, respectively.

103. After an exchange of courtesies, the Chairman declared that the Special Committee had completed its work for the forty-second session.

The meeting rose at 2 p.m.