



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. NOWORYTA (Poland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 76: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 77: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (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 United Records Editing Section, room DC2-540, 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, unless otherwise indicated.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/SPC/43/SR.34  
7 December 1988  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

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

AGENDA ITEM 76: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued) (A/SPC/43/L.14, L.15, L.16, L.17, L.18/Rev.1, L.19, L.20, L.21, L.22/Rev.1 and L.23)

1. Mr. HUME (United States of America), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.14, affirmed his Government's interest in the human needs of the refugees and its support for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) and its humanitarian programmes. The United States had long sought a negotiated settlement that would bring a just and durable peace to the Middle East and remained committed to that goal. His Government was also concerned at the plight of the Palestinian refugees who had suffered as a result of the Middle East conflict. UNRWA played an essential role in providing educational and medical services to those refugees, which was why the United States had been a major contributor to UNRWA since its inception in 1949 - its total contributions exceeded \$US 3,000 million - and would continue its support. He called on the international community to contribute generously to that worthy cause and to adopt the draft resolution.
2. Mr. VON BARTHELD (Netherlands), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.15 on behalf of the sponsors, expressed the hope that the response of Member States to the many appeals of the Commissioner-General and the Working Group would enable UNRWA to overcome its financial problems, a goal which could be achieved only if the international community collectively assumed its responsibilities towards the Palestinian refugees. The Working Group should continue its commendable work. Accordingly, he expressed the hope that, as in previous years, the Committee would adopt the draft resolution without a vote and extend the mandate of the Working Group for a further period of one year.
3. Mr. STAFFANSSON (Sweden), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.16 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the draft resolution had the same objective as its predecessors since 1967, namely, to reaffirm the General Assembly's support for the efforts of UNRWA in providing assistance to persons who had become displaced and were in need of assistance as a result of the June 1967 war and subsequent hostilities. He expressed the hope that, as in previous years, the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.
4. Mr. HANNAN (Bangladesh), introducing draft resolutions A/SPC/43/L.17, L.20, L.21 and L.22 on behalf of the sponsors, outlined the major points of the draft resolutions and said that Bangladesh had repeatedly emphasized the importance of the work done by UNRWA since its establishment in providing education, health and relief services to Palestinian refugees, and had consistently expressed its concern at the prolongation of their desperate plight. The Israeli authorities must abandon their goal of removing and resettling refugees, who, as the legitimate owners of properties currently under occupation, had the right to receive revenues from them and to be compensated for any destruction of them. His delegation

/...

(Mr. Hannan, Bangladesh)

supported the establishment, under United Nations auspices, of the University of Jerusalem to meet the needs of Palestinian refugees in that area.

5. Mr. AYUB (Pakistan), introducing draft resolutions A/SPC/43/L.18 and Rev.1, L.19, L.22 and Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, drew attention to their major points. He expressed the hope that they would receive the strong support of the Committee, particularly at a time when UNRWA needed unequivocal and comprehensive assistance in alleviating the sufferings of the millions of Palestinian refugees.

6. Mr. GORDON (Israel) welcomed the humanitarian assistance extended to the Palestinian refugees by UNRWA, which Israel had supported for many years. Israel financed resettlement projects to enable refugees living in camps to make a new start, since they had the same rights as other Palestinians registered as refugees but not living in camps and as Palestinians who had never been registered as refugees. The policy of Arab leaders, endorsed by an automatic majority at the United Nations, to impose on refugees living in camps the duty to remain there and to perpetuate their suffering for generations was cruel and unjust. Since, according to the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA (A/43/13, p. 31), about three quarters of the Palestinians registered as refugees in Judea and Samaria did not live in camps, why impose on the other quarter the sacrifice of remaining in the camps? The same was true of the 55 per cent of refugees living in camps in the Gaza district. He reiterated what he had said in his statement on 15 November 1988, namely, that the Arab leadership was responsible for the creation of that problem and had perpetuated it in order to use the refugee camps to torpedo the very existence of Israel, or at least to damage Israel's image by blaming it for the suffering of the refugees. As an authority on the subject, Mr. Ralph Galloway, a former Director of UNRWA in Jordan, had stated in August 1958, "the Arab States do not want to solve the refugee problem. They want to keep it as an open sore, as an affront to the United Nations and as a weapon against Israel. Arab leaders don't give a damn whether the refugees live or die" (The Double Exodus, by the Hon. Terence Prittee, p. 16).

7. To demonstrate the cynical way in which the plight of the refugees was used by some Arab countries, he quoted a resolution adopted by the so-called "Refugee Conference" at Homs (Syria) on 15 July 1957, and endlessly repeated since then: "Any discussion aimed at the solution of the Palestinian problem, which will not be based on ensuring the refugees' right to annihilate Israel, will be regarded as a desecration of the Arab people and an act of treason". Just as Israel was committed to providing humanitarian aid to the Palestinian refugees, so it was opposed to the exploitation of the refugee problem and of UNRWA for political ends, a position which would be reflected in his delegation's votes on the draft resolutions.

8. Mr. HUME (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his country had consistently supported UNRWA and its humanitarian programmes, as evidenced by its sponsorship of the annual resolution on "Assistance to Palestine refugees" (A/SPC/43/L.14). It also joined in the consensus on draft resolutions A/SPC/43/L.15 and L.16.

/...

(Mr. Hume, United States)

9. However, his delegation considered it regrettable that, each year, many of the draft resolutions concerning UNRWA were politicized or financially unsound. They only exacerbated tensions, so that the United States would have to vote against them, except in the case of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.17, which adopted a practical approach to meeting the higher education needs of Palestinians. However, his delegation maintained its reservation on paragraph 5 concerning the Jerusalem University Al-Quds.

10. The United States could not support draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.18 because it spoke of the inalienable right of return, while making no reference to the negotiations to bring about a lasting peace among the parties concerned. Moreover, it requested the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the Commissioner-General, to resume issuing identity cards to Palestinian refugees and their descendants in the occupied Palestinian territories, which was an encroachment on the authority of the UNRWA Commissioner-General. Moreover, while the United States opposed such measures as the destruction of dwellings, it did not object to the voluntary relocation of refugees.

11. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.19, his country opposed that measure, believing that it entails interference with the Commissioner-General, who considered that there was no real need for general ration distribution and that its continuation would adversely affect the financing of other high-priority programmes.

12. His country objected to draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.20, because it mentioned the inalienable right of all displaced inhabitants to return, without reference to the necessary negotiations among the parties concerned.

13. His country opposed draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.21 because it prejudged the question of refugee compensation outside the context of a negotiated settlement. It also opposed draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.22/Rev.1, believing that it would exceed the Agency's mandate; the maintenance of security in the area was incumbent on Israel which, as the occupying Power, must carry out those obligations in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1949.

14. Although his country supported practical efforts to promote educational opportunities for Palestine refugees, it opposed draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.23 because its approach was unreasonable and unworkable; furthermore, his delegation believed that the General Assembly should not involve itself in a decision concerning the establishment of such an institution.

15. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.14.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

16. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.14 was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

17. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.15, informed the Committee that, according to the Programme Planning and Budget Division, the assistance necessary for the Working Group to carry out its task would involve the provision of services to 10 one-day meetings, with no additional costs. It was his understanding that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

18. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.15 was adopted without a vote.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that it was his understanding that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.16 without a vote.

20. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.16 was adopted without a vote.

21. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.17.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

22. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.17 was adopted by 123 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

23. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.18/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali,

/...

Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

24. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.18/Rev.1 was adopted by 121 votes to 2.

25. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.19.

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

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Greece, Spain.

26. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.19 was adopted by 100 votes to 20, with 4 abstentions.

27. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.20.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

28. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.20 was adopted by 99 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions.

29. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.21.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic,



Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

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

30. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.21 was adopted by 97 votes to 2, with 24 abstentions.

31. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.22/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

32. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.22/Rev.1 was adopted by 121 votes to 2.

33. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.23.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bahamas.

34. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.23 was adopted by 122 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

35. Mr. PAPAIOPOULOS (Greece), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the 12 members of the European Community, said that during the debate, the Twelve had expressed their support for UNRWA; the fact that, in a few cases, they had not been able to vote in favour of the resolutions did not detract from their stance.

36. The Twelve understood that the words "Palestinian territory" referred to in a number of resolutions signified the West Bank, East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip, and their support for any resolutions containing such language did not imply any change in the Twelve's view of those territories.

37. Concerning the financial situation of the Agency, the Twelve reiterated that the available funding was insufficient and the outlook uncertain; therefore, despite their support of UNRWA's humanitarian services, they questioned the advisability of placing unrealistic demands on the Commissioner-General.

38. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria), speaking in explanation of vote, said that Austria had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.18/Rev.1 on the

(Mr. Freudenschuss, Austria)

understanding that paragraphs 2 and 3 were meant to take into account the actual possibilities and the means available to the Agency.

39. Austria had also voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.22/Rev.1 and welcomed the rewording of paragraph 5 regarding arbitrarily detained Palestine refugees.

40. Mr. STAFFANSSON (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote, said that despite that country's continued political and financial support of UNRWA, it had been unable to support some of the resolutions, because the financial situation of the Agency made it necessary to respect strict priorities, starting with the educational and health care needs of the refugees and relief for the most needy. The resumption of the general ration distribution provided for in draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.19 would endanger those other vital activities, and Sweden would therefore vote against the proposal.

41. Although it upheld the right of those Palestinians who had been displaced since 1967 to return to their homes, Sweden had abstained in the vote on A/SPC/43/L.20, which seemed to rule out negotiations on the modalities of repatriation.

42. Concerning draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.21, Sweden agreed in principle with the sponsors that the Palestinians were entitled to their property or to compensation, but that issue should be dealt with in the context of a comprehensive solution to the Middle East conflict, and his delegation had therefore abstained.

43. Similarly, although Sweden had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.18/Rev.1, it interpreted the wording used in paragraph 1 as an affirmation of Israel's responsibility to refrain from transferring and resettling Palestinian refugees against their will.

44. Sweden had noted the positive change of the formulation of paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.22. It had voted in favour of that resolution for the third consecutive year.

45. Ms. GIBSON (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation understood that the words "occupied Palestinian territory" and "Palestinian territory occupied by Israel since 1967" in draft resolutions A/SPC/43/L.17 and A/SPC/43/L.18/Rev.1 referred in both cases to the West Bank, Gaza and East Jerusalem. Canada's vote in favour of those resolutions did not indicate any change in the view of her Government concerning the status of those territories. Her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.22/Rev.1 on the protection of Palestine refugees, because it contained commendable changes.

46. Mrs. LETTS (Australia), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had been able to vote in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/43/L.18/Rev.1 and A/SPC/43/L.22/Rev.1 following the amendments made to the original drafts. Her delegation wished to place on record, however, that with regard to the reference to

(Mrs. Letts, Australia)

"Palestinian territory occupied by Israel since 1967", those words, whether singular or plural, could refer only to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem.

47. Mr. OULD EL-GHAOUTH (Mauritania) said that although his delegation had been absent from the conference room at the time of the vote, his delegation supported draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.14.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had finished its consideration of agenda item 76.

AGENDA ITEM 77: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued) (A/SPC/43/L.26, L.27, L.28, L.29/Rev.1, L.30/Rev.1, L.31, L.32 and L.33)

49. The CHAIRMAN referred to the revised draft resolutions in documents A/SPC/43/L.29/Rev.1 and A/SPC/43/Rev.30/Rev.1 and to document A/SPC/43/L.33. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.26 did not entail programme budget implications. He announced that Burkina Faso had joined the sponsors of all the draft resolutions.

50. Mr. HANNAN (Bangladesh), introduced draft resolutions A/SPC/43/L.26, L.30/Rev.1, L.31 and L.32. His Government considered that the occupation of Arab and Palestinian lands by Israel was itself a grave violation of the human rights of the civilian population in the occupied territories; his delegation was distressed at the continued refusal by the Israeli Government to co-operate with the Special Committee and reaffirmed Bangladesh's support of the call for Israel's immediate withdrawal from all occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. Bangladesh had welcomed the declaration of an independent Palestine State by the Palestine National Council in Algiers at the beginning of the month and recognized the new State.

51. The speaker reviewed the most important paragraphs of the draft resolutions that he was introducing and read out the list of sponsors of each, which included Burkina Faso and the Comoros in all cases.

52. Mr. AYUB (Pakistan) introduced draft resolutions A/SPC/43/L.27, L.28 and L.29/Rev.1, whose list of sponsors had been joined by the Comoros. He briefly explained the contents of each draft resolution and reviewed the events that had transpired since the forty-second session, focusing on the blatant disregard by Israel for the human rights of the population of the occupied territories and on the political realism of the Palestinian leadership, the expression of which was the declaration of an independent Palestine State. The Palestinian acceptance of all United Nations resolutions relevant to the Palestinian question gave Israel the opportunity to desist from its policies of repression in the occupied territories and to reach a peaceful settlement of the problem.

53. Mr. GORDON (Israel) emphasized that the United Nations had become a platform for anti-Israeli propaganda and that the Arab countries and their allies were not interested in knowing the truth about what was going on in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District.

54. His country had stated time and again that it wished to negotiate with the Arab States concerned and with representatives of the Palestinians residing in the area who had renounced violence, with the goal of reaching a peaceful settlement through which the status of the territories would be determined. However, that offer had consistently been rejected by extremist Arab leaders. Instead, they had waged a war of relentless terrorism on innocent civilians in Israel and overseas, hijacking airplanes, and killing their passengers, attacking pilgrims to the Holy Land in airports all over the world, and murdering passengers on yachts and cruise ships, Israeli athletes at the Olympic Games and foreign diplomats in Khartoum. They had systematically murdered Palestinians who dared to exercise their freedom of speech when that displeased the terrorist warlords.

55. Their goal to liquidate Israel would never be attained. The "vendetta" was more important than the fate of the inhabitants of the territories. To complement the campaign of terror designed to arouse fear, they had used women and children to arouse the sympathy of other countries and had adopted a posture of apparent moderation and pragmatism. Those appearances vanished when the representatives of many countries spoke of destroying Israel and building a Palestinian State on the whole territory of Palestine under the mandate. Some representatives rejoiced that Israel was isolated vis-à-vis the rest of the world, without realizing that such statements were not new, as was shown by the verses of the Jewish Arab poet Al-Samwal Ben Adaya, which he read out in the original Arabic and then translated into English. It was a pity that the Arab leaders and their allies in the United Nations passed a multitude of one-sided resolutions with unrealistic demands instead of trying to negotiate directly with Israel to reach peace. The views of his delegation had been outlined in his statement in the Committee on 22 November 1988, and he announced that his delegation would vote against each of the draft resolutions submitted.

56. Mr. HUME (United States of America), explaining his vote before the vote, said that his country had a strong interest in the human rights situation in the occupied territories and maintained a dialogue with the Government of Israel on the subject. Where his country disagreed with Israeli policies and practices, it made those views known clearly to the Government of Israel and would continue to do so. His Government could not support measures that made no contribution to safeguarding the human rights of the Palestinians in the occupied territories or to advancing the search for a just and lasting peace in the region. The language of the draft resolutions only served to divide the parties further and make a negotiated settlement more elusive. His delegation once again called on the Members of the United Nations to desist from such sterile rhetoric and adopt a more constructive approach, focusing on the real need for reconciliation and dialogue between the parties.

(Mr. Hume, United States)

57. His country strongly objected to the text of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.26, particularly its condemnation of a long list of Israeli practices, including the reference to the "torture of children and minors" and the characterization of breaches of the Geneva Convention as "war crimes and an affront to humanity". Nor could it support the request to the Security Council to consider measures to secure "international protection" for the Palestinian inhabitants of the occupied territories, since that was impractical and did not address the underlying problems. Additionally, his delegation reiterated its objection to the expense the Special Committee imposed on the United Nations budget, particularly at a time when the Organization's financial resources were so scarce.

58. It was well known that his country supported the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilians in Time of War (1949) to the territories occupied since 1967, and his delegation had therefore requested a separate vote on paragraph 1 - which it supported - of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.27. However, it would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, because the text did nothing to resolve the problems it sought to address. His delegation reiterated that the phrase "Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem" was merely descriptive and not indicative of sovereignty.

59. His country had clearly stated its opposition to further Israeli settlement activity in the occupied territories, since it considered such activity an obstacle to peace. However, it would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.28 since it believed that debate on the legalities of the issue only diverted attention from the real task of promoting peace through direct negotiations.

60. The United States had consistently opposed the practice of administrative detention; however, because draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.29/Rev.1 went beyond that question and called for the release of all those detained and imprisoned for "resistance against occupation in order to attain self-determination", his delegation would have to vote against it. Similarly, his country had repeatedly stated that it considered Israel's deportation of Palestinian residents of the occupied territories to be inconsistent with the Fourth Geneva Convention and that those deported should be permitted to return. It was nevertheless obligated to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.30/Rev.1, because that text provided no realistic means of addressing the problem.

61. Security Council resolution 497 (1981) had declared "the Israeli decision to impose its law, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights ... null and void and without international legal effect". The United States opposed any unilateral action to determine the status of the occupied territories and considered that to be an issue for negotiation in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). His country's position was that the Golan was occupied territory and that the Fourth Geneva Convention applied therein. However, it would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.31, in view of the harsh and unbalanced rhetoric it contained.

(Mr. Hume, United States)

62. In spite of his country's strong concern over the current situation with respect to education in the occupied territories, it objected to draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.32, because it believed that its sweeping condemnations of Israeli policies and practices were unjustified and counterproductive.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that a recorded vote would be taken on the draft resolutions.

64. A separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.26.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Liberia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Samoa, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela.

65. Paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.26 was adopted by 71 votes to 20, with 29 abstentions.

66. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.26 as a whole.

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

Against: Israel, United States of America.

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

67. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.26 was adopted by 89 votes to 2, with 32 abstentions.

68. A separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.27.

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



Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: None.

69. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.27 was adopted by 122 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

70. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.27 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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: Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia, United States of America, Zaire.

71. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.27 was adopted by 121 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

72. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.28.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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: Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia, United States of America, Zaire.

73. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.28 was adopted by 119 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

74. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.29/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand,

Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, 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, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Côte d'Ivoire, Uruguay.

75. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.29/Rev.1 was adopted by 118 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

76. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.30/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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: Côte d'Ivoire, United States of America, Zaire.

77. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.30/Rev.1 was adopted by 121 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

78. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.31.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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.

79. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.31 was adopted by 118 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

80. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.32.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay,

/...

Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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, United States of America.

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia, Zaire.

81. Draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.32 was adopted by 116 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

82. Mr. PAPADOPOULOS (Greece), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Economic Community, said that the Twelve attached the greatest importance to the rights of the population of the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967 and therefore had voted in favour of all but one of the draft resolutions submitted. Although the Twelve agreed with the thrust of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.26, they had abstained because of the sweeping generalizations in some of its paragraphs. Furthermore, paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.29 was not drafted in all its parts in an appropriate way. The Twelve stressed once more the need for a peaceful negotiated solution and condemned violence from whatever quarter it came. Concerning paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.30, the Twelve recalled that they had not supported all the resolutions referred to in it or others referred to in other draft resolutions.

83. Mr. WATT (United Kingdom) said that a number of the draft resolutions just adopted contained a reference to "occupied Palestinian territories" or to "Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967". His delegation understood the language concerned to signify the West Bank, East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip. In supporting any resolution containing such language, his delegation did not imply any change in its view of the status of those territories.

84. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria) said that his country's rejection of Israeli practices in the occupied territories was well known and, in line with that position, Austria had supported all the draft resolutions before the Committee except draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.26. Although his country supported the basic thrust of that draft resolution, it found certain formulations unacceptable and had had to abstain. Austria had been able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.29/Rev.1 instead of abstaining because of the changes made in paragraph 2, although it would have preferred even clearer wording in order to prevent misunderstandings.

85. Mr. OKUDA (Japan) said that his country had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.29/Rev.1 to express its concern at the arbitrary detention of Palestinians in the occupied territories. Nevertheless, his delegation wished to

/...

(Mr. Okuda, Japan)

put on record its reservations about paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. Furthermore, it had voted in favour of paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.30/Rev.1 to reaffirm its commitment in particular to Security Council resolutions 605 (1987), 607 (1988), and 608 (1988). However, he pointed out that Japan did not support some of the General Assembly resolutions referred to in that paragraph.

86. Mrs. KALKKU (Finland) said that her delegation had voted for the first time in favour of the draft resolution on the detention of Palestinians (A/SPC/43/L.29/Rev.1), because of the positive changes made in the text. However, she wished to put on record her reservations concerning the wording of paragraph 2, which, in her opinion, still allowed too far-reaching interpretations. Although, as in previous years, her delegation had also voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.30/Rev.1 on the deportation of Palestinians, it pointed out the problems in connection with paragraph 1, which referred to resolutions of the General Assembly without any further explanation.

87. Mr. STAFFANSSON (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote, said that during the year his delegation had decided to vote in favour of six of the seven draft resolutions concerning Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the population of the occupied territories. The situation in the territories was a matter of great concern to his Government. Since the Committee's consideration of the item the year before, the Palestinian uprising had focused world attention on the difficult situation of the Palestinian population in the occupied territories. The suffering inflicted by Israel and its repeated violations of international law were not an internal matter of that country but an issue which concerned many peoples and Governments all over the world, since it had become an increasingly serious obstacle to the prospects for peace in the region. His Government's firm position was that the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War was applicable to all the territories occupied by Israel since 1967. The measures taken by Israel with the aim of changing the legal status of the territories were totally illegal and were incompatible with the provisions of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Moreover the annexation of East Jerusalem and of the Golan Heights, as well as the settlements policy, constituted flagrant violations of international law.

88. His delegation had on previous occasions abstained on draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.29, mainly due to the sweeping formulation of operative paragraph 2, which was open to dubious interpretations. As that paragraph had been somewhat changed in the amended version of the draft resolution (A/SPC/43/L.29/Rev.1), his delegation had decided to vote in favour. Nevertheless, his delegation still felt that the paragraph could have been formulated in some other way so as to avoid misinterpretations and ambiguous conclusions.

89. As had been the case during previous debates in the Committee on the item, his delegation had not been able to support draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.26, having abstained owing to operative paragraph 6. Sweden supported most of the content: specifically, the condemnation of various Israeli policies and practices expressed

(Mr. Staffansson, Sweden)

in operative paragraphs 8 and 9. However, his delegation was not convinced that the formulation of those paragraphs was fully justified by proven facts. Similarly, paragraphs 12 and 13 of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.26 went beyond the competence of the General Assembly.

90. Lastly, he wished to point out that his delegation's support for draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.31 in no way altered Sweden's stand on resolution ES-9/1, recalled in the preamble. Sweden had voted against that resolution on its adoption in 1982.

91. Mrs. LETTS (Australia), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation's vote in favour, in order to signify its support for the release of persons unjustly detained or imprisoned by the Israeli authorities, should not be interpreted as condoning acts of violence, or as meaning that such acts should not be subject to the due process of law. Had there been a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.30/Rev.1, her delegation would have abstained, since it referred to various General Assembly resolutions which Australia had not supported. Further, lest the reference to "the occupied Palestinian territory" and to "the Palestinian ... territories occupied by Israel since 1967" in any resolution adopted concerning item 77 were taken as implying some significant change, her delegation wished to make clear its view that those phrases could refer only to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem.

92. Mr. AGORIO (Argentina), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, despite having voted in favour of the draft resolutions relating to item 77, his delegation expressly reserved its position with regard to terms having no direct link with the aim of the draft resolutions and open to ambiguous interpretations that his delegation did not support.

93. Mr. ARMSTRONG (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, despite having voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.29/Rev.1, his delegation had reservations in respect of operative paragraph 2. New Zealand's vote should not be viewed as inconsistent with its reservations concerning the use of violence. The paragraph in question could have been better formulated so as to avoid ambiguity. Further, he noted that his Government interpreted the reference to occupied Palestinian territories, used in several resolutions adopted that day, to refer to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967.

94. Mr. GISLASON (Iceland), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, in the view of his delegation, the word "relevant" in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.30/Rev.1 was fundamental.

95. Mrs. RAWN (Norway), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, despite having voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.29/Rev.1, her delegation would have preferred a different wording of operative paragraph 2. Her delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.30/Rev.1 did not imply any change in its position on those resolutions on the situation in the Middle East adopted by the General Assembly in respect of which it had abstained or voted against.

/...

96. Mrs. GIBSON (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.29/Rev.1 to indicate its concern over persons arbitrarily detained. Nevertheless, Canada wished to state its reservations concerning the wording of operative paragraph 2, which in its view, was ambiguous. Canada's support for the resolution as a whole should not be interpreted as condoning acts of violence. The expression "the occupied Palestinian territory" used in draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.30/Rev.1 referred to the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem. Her delegation's vote in favour did not represent any change in her Government's view of the status of those territories. Further, Canada did not support some of the resolutions referred to in operative paragraph 1.

97. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the results of the votes which had just taken place demonstrated unquestionable international support for the valiant rebellion of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories and, in a general sense, for the struggle of the Palestinian people, as well as for the historic decisions adopted by the Palestine National Council at Algiers.

98. He added that one representative had stated quite openly said that he was isolated, and that that representative had sought to convince the Committee that being alone was not so bad, citing - out of context - an Arab poet. In his opinion, isolation within the international community was no cause for pride, rather the contrary. Accordingly, he did not believe that the representative of Israel was speaking the truth in making those assertions.

99. Another representative had proffered an exaggerated interpretation of the draft resolutions by asserting that the abstentions and negative votes indicated an intent not to leave Israel isolated. Further, it could not be said that the assertions that the Israelis tortured Palestinian children were exaggerated, and the Committee could not overlook the 50,000 casualties - wounded and dead - caused during the 11 months of the uprising, 6,000 of them extremely serious. Those who claimed to have a real interest in peace should demonstrate the fact; but exaggerated, partial and distorted interpretations, such as that on which he had just commented did not indicate any such interest; neither did the refusal to grant a visa to the Chairman of the PLO, which prevented a response by the General Assembly to the recent PLO peace initiative. Those who preached the need to establish a climate propitious to peace should put their words into practice.

100. The PLO had contributed to the peace process by proposing the convening, under United Nations auspices, of an international peace conference, with the participation of all interested parties to the conflict, including Israel and the five permanent members of the Security Council. That reflected the wish of the international community.

101. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure, the Secretariat had issued a summary of the programme budget implications of the draft resolutions adopted by the Special Political Committee. At the current session, the Committee had received only two written statements of programme budget



(The Chairman)

implications, contained in documents A/SPC/43/L.25 and L.33, and that, accordingly, no further documents on the matter would be issued.

102. Mr. AGORIO (Argentina), speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, congratulated the Chairman for the manifest progress made in the work of the Special Political Committee.

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

103. After an exchange of courtesies, the CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee had concluded its work for the current session.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.