

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING
held on Monday, 6 May 1968, at 3.35 p.m.

President:

H.I.H. Princess Ashraf PAHLAVI

Iran

RESPECT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (agenda item 12)
(A/CONF.32/22, A/CONF.32/27, A/CONF.32/29; A/CONF.32/L.19 and Corr.1, A/CONF.32/L.20)
(continued)

Mr. IVANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although the representative of Israel had painted an attractive picture of the condition of the populations in the occupied Arab territories, the rights of those populations were being violated, thousands of refugees had been driven from house and home, thousands of Arab villages had been destroyed and a regime of terror had been established by the occupying authorities. The facts were well-known, and the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Commission on Human Rights had condemned them. But Israel had remained deaf to all resolutions of the General Assembly; accordingly, the Conference should demand that Israel comply with the resolutions and cease immediately to violate in a flagrant manner human rights in the occupied territories. The United Nations could not remain indifferent to the fate of the Arab population in the territories occupied by Israel. In resolution 248, adopted on 24 March 1968, the Security Council had called upon Israel to desist from acts or activities in contravention of the Council's resolution 237 (1967). Nevertheless Israel had continued its policy of aggression against everybody and was seeking to annex the occupied territories, in that way acting like the Nazis in the territories which they had conquered during the Second World War and using the same methods as those used precisely by the Nazis who at the time had massacred millions of Jews. General Dayan had tried to justify the policy by stating that, from the economic point of view, Israel would be in a position to satisfy the needs of the Arab population in the occupied territories, but had no intention of doing so. In its telegram addressed to the Government of Israel, the Commission on Human Rights had expressed its distress on learning of the destruction of the homes of Arab civilians in the areas occupied by Israeli authorities and had called upon Israel to desist forthwith from such practices and to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms in the areas in question. Thousands of Arabs who had had to flee were deprived of their resources.

In the Note which he had submitted to the Conference (A/CONF.32/22), the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNWRA) indicated that in the space of twenty years the number of Palestine refugees unable to return home had risen from 750,000 to 1,300,000. That deplorable state of affairs was the consequence of the policy followed by Israel which constituted a form of genocide and was indistinguishable from that followed by the Nazis.

The issue before the Conference was of the utmost importance, and the Conference should call for action to put an immediate stop to the flagrant violation of the rights of the Arab population in the occupied territories. The USSR supported unreservedly the claims of the Arab countries and formally condemned Israel for its policy in the occupied Arab territories. The USSR fully endorsed the decisions of the Commission on Human Rights.

Mr. KHALAF (Iraq) said it was regrettable that at the 20th meeting the representative of Israel should have abused the Conference's indulgence by entering into matters unrelated to the item under discussion. The delegation of Iraq, for its part, would confine its remarks to the item, but it was bound to revert to the statement by the representative of Israel who had been encouraged by certain countries which, as was reflected in statements by their representatives, continued to support Israel's aggression.

The representative of Israel had traced the background of the Palestine question and accused the Arab countries of being responsible for the present state of affairs. Actually, it was not the Arab States which had invaded the territory of Israel, but rather Israel which had more than once invaded the territory of Arab countries and occupied 85 per cent of the territory of former Palestine. The representative of Israel had drawn an idyllic picture of the circumstances of the Arab population in occupied territories. The reality was quite different, however, and in that connexion the speaker cited extracts from an article in the Tehran Journal which referred to the harsh measures adopted by the Government of Israel with respect to the population on either side of the Jordan because the inhabitants had refused to co-operate with the Israeli authorities. He referred also to a despatch by Reuters dated 9 December 1967 concerning incidents in the district of Jericho.

With respect to the mission of Mr. Gussing, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, he referred to the difficulties under which Mr. Gussing had had to perform his mission in July 1967 and to the lack of co-operation on the part of the Government of Israel; he cited furthermore some extracts from the memoirs of the Swedish General van Horn, who described interviews with Mr. Comay himself.

He commented next on the draft resolution submitted by the Netherlands and Uruguay (A/CONF.32/L.20), which in his opinion was somewhat general. Surely, it was hardly necessary for the Conference to recognize the value of the general principles mentioned in the first operative paragraph or to recommend a thorough study of those principles that would probably take years during which the Palestine Arabs would continue to suffer in their plight. The Conference had not met to approve a

declaration of human rights; its purpose was to take action for ensuring the respect of those rights. For those reasons his delegation was unable to support the draft resolution and urged all delegations or countries which had experienced foreign occupation to look at the text more closely.

The draft resolution proposed by Saudi Arabia, Spain and Sudan (A/CONF.32/L.19 and Corr.1) was moderate but covered the entire problem. Nevertheless, the delegation of Iraq was planning to submit an amendment to that draft which would, first, replace operative paragraph 3 by a provision calling on the Government of Israel to desist forthwith from acts of destroying homes of Arab civilian population inhabiting areas occupied by Israel, and to respect and implement the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 in occupied territories; and which would, secondly, add a new paragraph 5 requesting the General Assembly to appoint a special committee to investigate violations of human rights in the territories occupied by Israel and to report thereon.

The existing operative paragraph 5 (which would become paragraph 6) would remain unchanged for it was normal that the Commission on Human Rights should keep the matter under constant review.

Mr. DAPHTARY (India) said that the reason why India supported draft resolution A/CONF.32/L.19 concerning one of the most important items on the agenda - in view of the constant violations of human rights in several parts of the world, particularly in Western Asia - was that India had at all times opposed the recognition of territorial gains achieved by force of arms. Recourse to arms impeded the peaceful settlement of the dispute and placed the civilian population of the territories affected in a difficult situation that led inevitably to the violation of human rights. The least the Conference could do, by reason of what was expected of it, was to adopt the draft resolution in question. The draft was a positive contribution to the restoration of peace and normal life for the inhabitants of the territories occupied by Israel. It took account of the circumstances of all the persons who had been stripped of their possessions and who were denied the right to return to lands which they and their ancestors had held from time immemorial.

The draft resolution was, in a way, the normal sequel of various resolutions adopted by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights, and in fact some of its passages were taken from those earlier texts. Those earlier resolutions and the telegram urging the Government of Israel to desist forthwith from the destruction of the homes of the Arab civilian inhabitants of the

areas occupied by Israel had been adopted unanimously, or almost unanimously, by the bodies in question. Accordingly he considered that the Conference should, with a like unanimity, adopt the draft resolution under discussion. With regard to the so-called benefits of occupation, to which a reference had been made in the 20th meeting, a quotation from the late Mr. Nehru would suffice to refute that contention. Mr. Nehru had said on several occasions that good government was no substitute for self-government.

Mr. FERNANDEZ ARTUCIO (Uruguay), introducing draft resolution A/CONF.32/L.20, said that one of the sponsors, the Netherlands, had been occupied throughout the Second World War and that the other, Uruguay, had during and after that war admitted thousands of refugees without distinction as to nationality, political opinion or philosophical ideals. That being so, it would be appreciated that the two sponsors considered the subject matter of item 12 sufficiently important to receive earnest consideration. Manifestly, the provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and other international instruments did not cover all new situations that were likely to jeopardize human rights in zones of military operations and in territories occupied in consequence of hostilities. Accordingly, the object of the draft resolution was to fill the gaps by recommending that consideration, study and clarification of the general principles applicable to the rights of civilians in areas of conflict and occupied territories be undertaken as soon as possible.

He said that he would not answer certain criticisms which had been addressed to the two sponsors of the draft resolution. He mentioned merely that Uruguay was one of the founder Members of the United Nations and that the principles laid down in the Charter and in the Declaration of Human Rights had inspired the constitution and legislation of Uruguay, whose democratic regime endeavoured at all times to respect and to ensure respect for human rights. Since the establishment of the United Nations, Uruguay, as a Member of the United Nations and of the international community, had never, on any occasion, failed to discharge its duties towards other States.

Mr. BRNCIC (Yugoslavia) said that the burning question of respect for human rights in occupied territories should be treated first and foremost from the human point of view; and in that regard he could only endorse what had been said by the representative of Iraq. He was sure that the participants in the Conference were aware that the thousands of victims of acts constituting violations of human rights in occupied territories, and particularly in Palestine, expected something more than

moral support from the present gathering and from the competent organs of the United Nations. A positive step would be to enjoin the forces of occupation to leave those territories once and for all.

From the viewpoint of a jurist, any act of aggression and the resulting territorial occupation were proscribed by international law. No return to peace was conceivable as long as occupation lasted, for by its very nature occupation involved not only the violation of human rights but acts recognized as being crimes against mankind which could only be avoided if resort to force in international relations was condemned. Such condemnation obviously implied the full restitution of the territories occupied as a result of aggression. The Yugoslav delegation thought that all peace-loving countries had the duty to convince Israel that it should go back to its old frontiers. That was a prerequisite for peaceful settlement of the Palestine problem which would make it possible to bring the sufferings of the refugees to an end. He hoped the Conference would take firm decisions in that matter, and that they would be put into effect at the earliest possible moment.

Mrs. MARZUKI SUDIRDJO (Indonesia) gave a brief historical sketch of the question of the Arab refugees from Palestine, which she maintained was one of the main reasons for the persistence of the conflict between the Arab States and Israel. She recalled that the first United Nations resolution on the subject was General Assembly resolution 194 (III), adopted on 11 December, 1948 and reaffirmed on 8 December, 1949 (resolution 30 C (IV)), which stated inter alia that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the lost or damaged property of those choosing not to return.

Following the recent events in the Middle East, the problem had been further aggravated by the fact that the number of Arab refugees had increased. The ideal solution would of course be to find a method of settling the question once and for all, but until that happened - and unfortunately the chances seemed remote - every effort should be made to alleviate the sufferings of the refugees. Hence the Indonesian delegation welcomed draft resolution A/CONF.32/L.19 and would support it. Like the Secretary-General of the United Nations, it considered that it would be disastrous to ignore the fundamental principle that there should be no territorial gain achieved by armed force. In that connexion, she reiterated her adherence to the terms of the resolutions adopted by the Fifth Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly referred to in the preamble to the above-mentioned draft resolution. She also supported the operative paragraphs of that resolution with the amendments submitted by the Arab States.

Mr. ABU GHAZALEH (Jordan) said he would like to reply point by point to the allegations made against Jordan by the representative of Israel in a preceding speech, which, incidentally, was outside the scope of the discussion.

Referring to the alleged occupation of the West Bank of the River Jordan by Jordan after 1948, he recalled that the Israel authorities had occupied numerous regions of Palestine which had not been allotted to them, had later occupied the new city of Jerusalem in contravention of the United Nations resolutions of 1947. The Palestine Arabs living on the West Bank of the Jordan had subsequently decided, of their own free will, to share the fate of the Arabs from the East Bank of the Jordan. Concerning the destruction of the Jewish quarter of the old city of Jerusalem, it would be remembered that the Israel army had used that quarter as a base of operations for occupying the old city. In the course of the battle for the defence of the old city, there had been some unavoidable destruction, but the Israel representative would recall that all the Israel soldiers taken prisoner had been well treated and had been handed over to the Israel authorities shortly afterwards. As for the statement that the Jews were forbidden access to the Wailing Wall in the old city of Jerusalem, the Israel authorities had only themselves to blame, since they had not implemented the United Nations resolutions on the partition of Palestine. It would be remembered that a truce had been concluded, but since the state of war persisted between the parties, security measures had had to be applied. He emphasized that Christians always had access to the Holy Places. Jordan was proud of having done everything in its power to protect the rights of the various Christian denominations and to settle the differences of opinion which frequently arose among them. In that connexion, he mentioned two important documents signed on 5 December 1963 and 24 December 1964 by the Greek, Latin and Armenian patriarchs, putting an end to all disputes concerning the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem. He maintained furthermore that, contrary to the allegations of the Israel representative, the Arabs of the West and East Banks of the Jordan were connected by links of genuine fraternity and were treated on an equal footing. Finally, any demonstrations which might have taken place in certain areas before the events of June 1967 had been due to the anxiety of the Arab population in the face of the illegal occupation of Arab territory by the Israelis and their attacks on Arab villages. Insofar as refugees were concerned, Jordan had done its best to facilitate their repatriation, but artificial barriers had prevented the success of its efforts. Anyone who had been to Jordan would agree that the country had made vast progress in the economic, social and industrial fields and that development was well under way.

Referring to the question under consideration, he cited the resolutions adopted by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights, as well as the telegram addressed by the latter to the Israel Government urging it to desist forthwith from destroying the homes of the civilian Arab population in the zones under its occupation. The Note submitted to the Conference by the Commissioner-General of UNRWA made it clear that two fundamental rights had been violated, namely the right of the displaced Arabs to return to their country, and the right of the Arabs to live in their country and not to be given notice to quit. As was well known, out of more than 400,000 Arabs who had had to abandon their homes, only just over 14,000 had been able to return. The Note also pointed out that since August 1967 there had been a constant movement of population fleeing from the occupied zones. Only artificial barriers and specious arguments prevented the Arab refugees from returning to their country, and if the exodus of the Arabs leaving the occupied territories was still going on, it was because their living conditions there were being made unbearable. He had already had occasion to cite examples of flagrant violation of human rights such as the expropriation of land taken from the owners, the destruction of a sector in the old city of Jerusalem, the eviction of Arab dignitaries like the Muslim Supreme Court Judge on the West Bank of the Jordan and the Mayor of the Arab city of Jerusalem, to say nothing of the destruction of scores of villages and the arrest of large numbers of Arabs in towns and villages. All the United Nations organs had expressed their concern about those violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and what was expected of the Conference was that it should act in the same spirit.

Mr. SABA (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organizations) (UNESCO) thought it might be useful to give a few particulars concerning the educational work undertaken jointly by UNRWA and UNESCO for the Palestine refugees, and particularly concerning the establishment of UNRWA-UNESCO schools in the territories currently occupied by Israel, as well as the principles governing UNESCO action in that project. He referred the members of the Committee to the Note submitted by the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, which described in detail the system of education put into effect for the refugee children in Jordan, Lebanon, the Gaza Strip and Syria. Since the project in question had always been integrated into the educational system of the Arab host countries, the school textbooks used in the UNRWA-UNESCO schools had been those of the host countries and the pupils of the UNRWA-UNESCO schools were able to continue their studies in the higher educational

centres in the Arab countries. Recent events and the occupation by Israel of the territories in which many UNRWA-UNESCO schools were situated had had considerable repercussions on the functioning of those schools.

The Israel authorities had raised with the UNRWA representatives the question of the textbooks used in the UNRWA-UNESCO schools in the territories under their authority. They considered that some of the textbooks contained passages distorting the events before and after the creation of Israel and tended to inculcate a hatred of Israel in the minds of the children using them, and the textbooks had been seized by the Israel authorities.

The new situation was not in keeping with the procedure and the conditions governing collaboration between UNESCO and UNRWA laid down in the agreement reached in 1952 and repeatedly renewed since then, so the Director-General of UNESCO had asked its Executive Board to issue a directive. At its seventy-seventh session, held in the autumn of 1967, the Executive Board of UNESCO had unanimously adopted a resolution prescribing the principles that should govern the organization's action in that field, in accordance with international law, the Universal Declaration, the Constitution of UNESCO and certain decisions of its General Conference. He then read out the text of the resolution. The resolution had been communicated immediately to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, with whom the Director-General of UNESCO had had conversations, as a result of which the latter had on 11 January 1967 addressed a note verbale to the permanent representative of each of the States concerned, namely Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Republic. The note verbale, which he read out, defined clearly the action to be taken in regard to education in the UNRWA-UNESCO teaching establishments and the means of enabling pupils to pursue their studies in the higher educational institutions belong to the system of which the schools they attended formed part or to a system having the same social, cultural, and particularly linguistic characteristics. As a result of the note verbale of 11 January, communications had been received from Israel, the United Arab Republic, Syria and Lebanon, and the replies received would be brought to the notice of the Executive Board of UNESCO, which at its next session, would have before it the report by the Director-General on the measures taken to implement the resolution adopted by the Council at its preceding session.

Mr. KASSE (Mali) said he would vote for draft resolution A/CONF.32/L.19, amended as proposed by the Arab States. His delegation considered that the

Conference could not ignore a human problem of such gravity and urgency and that the resolution was an important contribution to the initiative taken by the various United Nations bodies with a view to solving the problem of the Palestine refugees.

Mr. OULD EREBIH (Mauritania) said his country's only concern was that mankind should seek an equitable solution whenever human rights were flouted. Nevertheless, the Mauritanian delegation could not help but register some surprise when it heard the Israel representative say that in 1948 the Arab armies had retained military occupation of "certain areas of his country".

Mr. COMAY (Israel), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that he had not said "certain areas of his country", but "certain areas of the country".

Mr. OULD EREBIH (Mauritania) said he had listened to the French interpretation and felt sure he had heard the words "our country". The Israel representative had then spoken of the United Arab Republic Government's demand for the removal of the United Nations Emergency Force and its proclamation of the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba; one wondered what Israel's attitude would have been if that Government had been as powerful as the one which had ordered the blockade of Cuba.

The Mauritanian delegation hoped that the people of Israel would not allow themselves to be blinded by their military victory. They should realize that what had happened to the Arab States in 1967 might well happen to them some day, and allow the United Nations to help them to solve the problem of the Palestine refugees in a truly just manner, so that the 250,000 children currently being educated in the UNRWA-UNESCO schools would not be haunted as long as they lived by the spectre of war. If the Conference failed to consider that question, it would establish a precedent which could be disastrous for world peace.

Referring to article 31 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, which provided that "no physical or moral coercion shall be exercised against protected persons, in particular to obtain information from them or from third parties", he mentioned an incident reported recently in the Tehran Journal where a wounded Arab had been obliged by the Israel forces to board a helicopter and to point out the whereabouts of military bases. He also mentioned the military parade which, despite a Security Council decision, had recently taken place in the Arab quarter of Jerusalem.

The Mauritanian delegation sincerely hoped that the Conference would examine that serious question dispassionately and would succeed in inducing the Israel authorities to reconsider their position.

Mr. MEHDI BEN ABDELJALIL (Morocco) deplored the fact that, having exhausted every procedural device to prevent the new item from being included in the agenda, the Israel representative had seen fit to spend an hour and a half describing to the Conference facts which were entirely irrelevant to the subject. The very moderate tone of resolution A/CONF.32/L.19, which had been introduced in a most dignified manner by the chief of the Spanish delegation, gave reason to hope that it would be accepted, if not unanimously, at least by a large majority. It was tragic that a people which had only recently been the victims of persecution should turn into hangmen, but it would be even more tragic if the Conference closed its eyes to the situation; that would not only drive the people of Palestine to despair but would undermine the confidence and hope which mankind had placed in the United Nations.

Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands), replying to a remark by the representative of Iraq, pointed out that life in an occupied territory was always fraught with hardship and difficulties. Experience of living under Nazi occupation had proved that the international instruments designed to protect civilian populations in times of occupation were by no means completely satisfactory, and the Netherlands Government had therefore felt that the Conference on Human Rights was not only competent to try to improve them, but indeed had a duty to do so, without thereby encroaching on the competence of the Security Council. On the other hand, it was regrettable that it should run the risk of being paralysed by political disputes which were completely alien to its terms of reference.

Mr. GRADZIUK (Poland) said that the very nature of the item under consideration required that the records of the Conference should make explicit mention of the tragic fate of the Arab populations in the territories unlawfully occupied by Israel since its aggression in June 1967. Despite all efforts by the United Nations, Israel had since 1948 been pursuing an avowed policy of expansionism which was at the very root of all the trouble. Because of that revolting policy, nearly 2 million human beings were being deprived of their vital rights, terror reigned in the place of justice and those who were waging a legitimate struggle for freedom were branded as bandits and terrorists. The Israel Government had again recently rejected both the resolution adopted on 27 February 1968 by the Commission on Human Rights and the telegram sent to it by the Commission on 9 March. In the Press, innumerable reports bore witness to the crimes committed by a people which had itself long been the victims of Nazi atrocities. The only solution was to implement the United Nations resolution proclaiming the Arab refugees' right to return to their homeland, and to win respect

for the human rights to which Israel itself paid lip-service. The Conference would have achieved one of its goals if it succeeded at long last in persuading the Israel authorities to cease its constant and systematic violation of those rights in the territories it was illegally occupying.

Mr. COMAY (Israel), exercising his right of reply, pointed out that his delegation, representing a people 2.5 million strong, had to confront the representatives of 50 million Arabs, to whom the representative of 200 million Soviet citizens had seen fit to ally himself. Fortunately, truth and numbers were two quite different commodities. It should not be forgotten that the USSR bore a heavy share of responsibility for the current situation in the Middle East for since the lightning defeat of the Arab States it had undertaken to replenish their military equipment and to defend their cause in the United Nations. It was no doubt free to follow whatever policy it pleased, but it was hard to avoid the feeling that it would be serving the cause of peace better if it adopted a less biased attitude and cast its mind back to 1947-1948, when it had denounced the Arab aggression against the infant State of Israel, whose birth it had just before welcomed. Furthermore, was it not unseemly that its representative should try to defend human rights in other countries when it was common knowledge that they were flouted in the Soviet Union, particularly among the Jewish community? On 4 December 1966, Martin Luther King, to whose memory touching tributes had been paid during the Conference, had addressed the following statement to the Ad Hoc Commission on Human Rights:

"The attempt to liquidate spiritually the Jewish people in Soviet Russia is something that we must not allow. Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. Injustice to any people is a threat to justice to all people.

"I cannot stand idly by, even though I live in the United States and even though I happen to be an American Negro, and not be concerned about what happens to my brothers and sisters who happen to be Jews in Soviet Russia. For what happens to me them happens to me and to you, and we must be concerned.

"I am profoundly shocked by the treatment of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union. I should like to add my voice to the list of distinguished people of all faiths who have called the injustices perpetrated against the Jewish community in the Soviet Union to the attention of the world".

Mrs. SERGEEVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that the Israel representative's remarks had nothing to do with agenda item 12.

Mr. COMAY (Israel) resumed his reading of the statement by the Reverend Martin Luther King:

"The struggle of the Negro people for freedom is inextricably interwoven with the universal struggle of all peoples to be free from discrimination and

oppression. The Jewish people must be given their full rights as Soviet citizens, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the USSR itself.

"In the name of humanity, I urge that the Soviet Government end all the discriminatory measures against its Jewish community.

"I will not remain silent in the face of injustice".

He also wished to point out that the Communist parties of Italy, Australia, Canada and several other countries had protested against the policy adopted by the Soviet Union with respect to Israel and had criticized its support of what they termed the feudal regimes of the Arab States.

The PRESIDENT asked the Israel representative to confine himself to agenda item 12.

Mr. COMAY (Israel) pointed out that all he wished to do was exercise his right of reply.

With respect to the condemnation by the United Nations of "Israel aggression", which the USSR representative had seen fit to emphasize the truth was that all the draft resolutions condemning that alleged aggression had been rejected by a large majority. He mentioned in particular the results of voting on a draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly on 14 June 1967 by the USSR.

Mr. WAMBURA (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on a point of order, said that the Tanzanian delegation was quite willing to listen to the Israel representative when he exercised his right of reply, but not when he presumed to criticize the voting situation in the United Nations organs.

Mr. COMAY (Israel), replying to the representative of Iraq, said that he had no direct responsibility in the administration of the territories occupied by Israel. He would prefer to say nothing about the personality of General van Horn; he would merely recall that the general's activities had caused great embarrassment both to his own Government and to the Secretary-General and Mr. Bunche, both of whom had had the privilege of being the object of his attacks.

The Israel delegation reserved the right to exercise its right of reply whenever the course of the discussion made it necessary.

Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), exercising his right of reply, said that the Israel representative had wandered a long way off the subject and had seen fit to make a number of remarks which should not go into the record. In view of the late hour, he reserved the right to reply at the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.