

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

*Official Records**



SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
29th meeting
held on
Monday, 12 November 1984
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 29th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. JANNUZZI (Italy)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 75: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 74: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION (continued)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (c) REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (continued)
- (d) REPORT OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT AND COMMENTS THEREON (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 75: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued) (A/SPC/39/L.7-L.19)

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded members of the Committee that the draft resolutions contained in documents A/SPC/38/L.7 to L.17 had been introduced at the Committee's 23rd meeting and that documents A/SPC/39/L.18 and L.19 contained the programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/SPC/39/L.17 and L.8, respectively. He then invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolutions.
2. Mr. FARRELL (Ireland), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community, said that the Ten fully supported draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.7, since they believed that all Member States should contribute to the financing of UNRWA. Similarly, they supported draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.8 and fully endorsed the conclusions contained in the report of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.9, the Ten were convinced of the need to support the persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities and, accordingly, supported the draft resolution.
3. The member States of the European Community supported draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.10 concerning the educational needs of the Palestine refugees. While they also supported draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.11, nothing in that draft resolution should interfere with the refugees' freedom to choose where they wished to live, and the Ten noted from the report of the Secretary-General on that matter that no demolition of refugee shelters on punitive grounds had taken place during 1984.
4. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.14, the Ten regretted the fact that there had still not been any repatriation or compensation of the refugees but considered that a solution to that problem must be sought in the context of a just, lasting and comprehensive Middle East peace settlement.
5. In connection with draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.15, the Ten wished to stress the need to ensure the effective protection of all Palestine refugees, but they had doubts about the appropriateness of some of the wording, for example in paragraph 2. Moreover, in relation to paragraph 1, it was important not to detract in any way from the fundamental responsibility incumbent on Israel, as the occupying Power, for the protection of the civilian population.
6. While the Ten would support draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.16 on the Palestine refugees in the West Bank, they considered that the fifth preambular paragraph and paragraph 1 perhaps did not accurately describe the status of the "plans" to which they referred. Lastly, the Ten would support draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.17.

7. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.7.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, 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, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

8. Draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.7 was adopted by 109 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

9. Draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.8 was adopted without a vote.

10. Draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.9 was adopted without a vote.

11. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.10.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan,

/...

Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

12. Draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.10 was adopted by 115 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

13. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.11.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

14. Draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.11 was adopted by 117 votes to 2.

15. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.12.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Grenada, Guatemala, Portugal, Spain, Zaire.

16. Draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.12 was adopted by 94 votes to 19, with 6 abstentions.

17. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.13.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic,

Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

18. Draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.13 was adopted by 100 votes to 2, with 18 abstentions.

19. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.14.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

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

20. Draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.14 was adopted by 99 votes to 2, with 20 abstentions.

21. A separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.15.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

22. Paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.15 was adopted by 98 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions.

23. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.15 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

24. Draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.15 as a whole was adopted by 105 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions.

25. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.16.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic,

Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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.

26. Draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.16 was adopted by 123 votes to 2.

27. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.17.

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, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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.

28. Draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.17 was adopted by 126 votes to 2.

29. Mr. CLARK (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, pointed out that his delegation's votes on the draft resolutions reflected his Government's desire for UNRWA to pursue its humanitarian work, while efforts continued with a view to finding a definitive solution to problems in Near East. However, his delegation saw no point in favouring resolutions which had no chance of producing any useful results and served merely to aggravate existing friction, prejudge issues and actually prevent certain measures from being taken for the benefit of the Palestine refugees themselves.

30. While his delegation favoured the draft resolution concerning grants and scholarship (A/SPC/39/L.10), it did not support that part of the draft dealing with the University of Jerusalem (para. 5) or the separate resolution on that subject (A/SPC/39/L.17). His delegation had voted against draft resolutions which were unrealistic or totally one-sided and which singled out Israel, while ignoring the action taken against UNRWA and the refugees by other Governments and parties in the area. Moreover, draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.11 would oppose any effort by Israel to take action to improve the fate of certain refugees, and draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.14 concerned the issue of revenues derived from Palestine refugee properties which should be dealt with in the overall negotiations on a peace settlement.

31. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that UNRWA would be able to continue its effective humanitarian efforts, with increased support from the international community, and that it would not be diverted from its task by political issues which should be dealt with in another context.

32. Mr. DAFGARD (Sweden) said that his Government's political and financial support for UNRWA had been amply demonstrated. In view of the Agency's financial situation, his delegation supported the Commissioner-General's decision to give top priority to the refugees' educational and health care needs and to relief for the neediest refugees. However, without sufficient financial resources, the resumption of the general ration distribution requested in draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.12 would endanger those vital activities, and the draft resolution was formulated in such a categorical way as to leave the Commissioner-General no leeway to exercise his discretion and maintain the necessary priorities. His delegation had therefore voted against that draft resolution.

33. While his Government upheld the right of the Palestinians displaced as a result of the 1967 war to return to their homes, the formulation of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.13 seemed to rule out negotiations on the modalities of repatriation, and his delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on that draft resolution. His delegation agreed in principle that the Palestine refugees were entitled either to their property or to compensation for it but felt that the settlement of property claims should be dealt with in the context of a

(Mr. Dafgard, Sweden)

comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict. His delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.14.

34. While his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.15 because of its deep concern for the security and the legal and human rights of the Palestine refugees, the Secretary-General should not be given responsibility for guaranteeing their safety when that was impossible and when responsibility clearly rested with the occupying Power. His delegation supported the appeal to the Secretary-General to do everything possible in order to further the objectives set forth in paragraph 1 and, in voting for the draft resolution, had interpreted the paragraph in that light. However, his delegation would have preferred it if paragraph 2 had affirmed in less ambiguous terms the legal obligation incumbent on the occupying Power to ensure the security of the refugees.

35. Lastly, while his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.16, it interpreted the wording of paragraph 1 as an affirmation of Israel's responsibility to refrain from resettling Palestine refugees against their will.

36. Mr. HALINEN (Finland) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.15 in order to demonstrate its deep concern for the security of the Palestine refugees. However, the Secretary-General should not be given responsibility in that regard, and his delegation had doubts about the effectiveness of paragraphs 1 and 8 of the draft resolution.

37. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions as a reflection of its humanitarian concern and its support for common principles. However, some of the provisions were not well-balanced - for example, paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.15 - although his delegation supported the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Moreover, his country believed that the principles of self-determination and non-interference in the internal affairs of States should be observed without any discrimination.

38. Mr. AL-SUDANI (Iraq) said that, if his delegation had been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/39/L.7, L.10, L.11, L.12, L.13 and L.14.

39. Mr. AL-HAMADI (Qatar) said that, if his delegation had been present, it would have voted in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/39/L.7 and L.10.

40. Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that, although his delegation supported all the draft resolutions, it had reservations about any reference which implied any readiness on the part of his country to recognize the Israeli entity.

41. Miss WILLBERG (New Zealand) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.15 because of its concern for the welfare of the Palestine refugees and because it felt that the role played by UNRWA deserved full support. However, her delegation had reservations about paragraph 1, since the Secretary-General had indicated in document A/39/538 that it was impossible for him

/...

(Miss Willberg, New Zealand)

to carry out the measures requested in connection with the protection of refugees, a fact which the draft resolution did not take into account. Moreover, paragraph 5 should have called upon Israel to allow the full resumption of the services mentioned.

42. Mr. MAHAMIDOU (Niger) said that the position of his country, as an African and Muslim State was well known with regard to the Palestinian people in the occupied territories and, if his delegation had been present, it would have voted in favour of all the draft resolutions.

43. Mr. HASSAN (Djibouti) said that, if his delegation had been present, it would have voted in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/39/L.7, L.10, L.11 and L.12.

44. Mr. ADJOYI (Togo) said that, if his delegation had been present, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.7.

45. Mr. ABDULLATIF (Oman) said that, if his delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/39/L.7, L.10 and L.11, it would have voted in favour of them.

46. Mr. PHIRI (Malawi) said that, if his delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/39/L.7 and L.10 to L.14, it would have voted in favour of them.

47. Mr. NYAMUDAHONDO (Zimbabwe) said that, if his delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/39/L.7 and L.10 to L.13, it would have voted in favour of them.

48. Mr. TRUONG TRIEU DUONG (Viet Nam) said that, if his delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/39/L.7 and L.10, it would have voted in favour of them.

49. Mr. EKAR (Ghana) said that, if his delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/39/L.7 to L.16, it would have voted in favour of them.

50. Mrs. CARRASCO (Bolivia) said that, if her delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/39/L.7 and L.10, it would have voted in favour of them.

51. Mr. BOLD (Mongolia) said that, if his delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/39/L.7 and L.10 to L.17, it would have voted in favour of them.

52. Mr. OKI (Japan) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.16, that vote had not been recorded.

53. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) said that, if his delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.7, it would have voted in favour of it. His delegation also wished to express reservations with regard to paragraph 1 of draft

/...

(Mr. Lasarte, Uruguay)

resolution A/SPC/39/L.15 because the measures referred to in that paragraph should be undertaken by the occupying Power in accordance with the Geneva Convention of 1949.

54. Mrs. LEGWAILA (Botswana) said that, if her delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.7, it would have voted in favour of it.

55. Miss JACOB (Guyana) said that, if her delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/39/L.7 to L.17, it would have voted in favour of them.

AGENDA ITEM 74: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued) (A/SPC/39/L.20)

(a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION (continued) (A/39/21)

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/39/479)

(c) REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO) (continued) (A/39/497)

(d) REPORT OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT, AND COMMENTS THEREON (continued) (A/39/239, Add.1 and Corr.1, and Add.2, A/39/602)

56. Mr. ALIOU (Benin) stressed the need to correct the imbalance in the flow of information and overcome the growing disparity between developed and developing countries in that regard through the establishment a new world information and communication order based on equality and respect for the cultural diversity and sovereignty of States. Under current conditions, the world had been informed of the invasion of an Asian country by foreign troops, while the continued occupation of Angolan territory by South African troops had been ignored. In view of that situation, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries stressed the need to democratize information and communications in order to strengthen international peace and understanding on the basis of a broader and better balanced dissemination of information.

57. UNESCO played a vital role in promoting the establishment of a new world information and communication order. His delegation expressed satisfaction with the activities carried out by UNESCO under the International Programme for the Development of Communication, and by the Department of Public Information (DPI) in order to promote the establishment of a new information order. The co-operation of DPI with UNESCO, the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies and the Pan African News Agency and its future co-operation with the Union of National Radio and Television Organizations of Africa (URTNA) were very positive initiatives.

58. The role of the United Nations information centres should be strengthened in order to further the democratization of information and enhance the role of the Organization. His Government would continue to support efforts to promote a greater awareness of the achievements of the United Nations. In order to help attain those goals, his Government had proposed the opening of a United Nations

/...

(Mr. Aliou, Benin)

information centre in Cotonou, which was reflected in recommendation 37 contained in the report of the Committee on Information (A/39/21). It was hoped that the members of the Special Political Committee would support that initiative.

59. Lastly, he reiterated his Government's position favouring the acquisition by the United Nations of its own communications satellite and stressed the need to ensure equitable geographic and linguistic distribution within DPI.

60. Mrs. CARRASCO (Bolivia) welcomed the activities carried out by the Department of Public Information and by UNESCO under the International Programme for the Development of Communication. The co-operation between DPI and UNESCO and between those two organizations and the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies demonstrated the possibility of co-ordinating efforts to establish a new world information and communication order.

61. Bolivia was undergoing a dynamic period in its struggle to achieve overall development. Efforts were being made to overcome dependence on foreign sources of information and strengthen democracy in all sectors guaranteeing participation by all. It was the obligation of the Government to guarantee citizens their right to inform and be informed and to safeguard the interests of communities through national social communication policies. Legislation would be enacted in order to lay down guidelines for communications in promoting the development of the individual and society as a whole. Such legislation would clearly define the rights and duties of the media and the functions of the Government in that regard.

62. Greater attention should be given to the economic and social problems of developing countries. In recent decades information and communications had become an important factor in promoting development. There should also be a greater awareness of both the efforts and the achievements of developing countries in that field. A new world information and communication order was urgently necessary in view of the dangerous imbalance in the flow of information between industrialized countries and developing countries. Greater attention was often given to sensationalist news reports rather than to such urgent topics as famine in the third world.

63. Her delegation fully supported the activities of DPI in promoting a greater awareness of the activities and ideals of the Organization. The activities of the Department and the United Nations information centres should be strengthened through the allocation of necessary resources. Lastly, she stressed that the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee on Information would promote stable international relations at a time of heightened tension due to natural disasters and the threat of nuclear destruction.

64. Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that, while his delegation supported all the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee on Information, it deeply regretted that they ignored the request made to the Department of Public Information in paragraph 15 of General Assembly resolution 38/82 B to cover adequately policies and practices which violated the principles of international law relative to belligerent occupation wherever they occurred, especially those

/...

(Mr. Fartas, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

policies and practices which frustrated the attainment and exercise of the inalienable and national legitimate rights of the Palestinian people in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

65. His delegation reiterated its call for the correction of the situation with respect to the equitable geographical distribution of posts in DPI. It associated itself with the other Arab delegations which had demanded the strengthening and expansion of the Middle East/Arabic Unit of the Radio Service. The coverage provided by the Unit's programmes was less comprehensive and less in keeping with the needs of the region concerned than was that provided by other Units in other languages.

66. DPI should adopt a balanced approach to news concerning the question of Palestine and should expose Zionist racist practices against the innocent civilian population in Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories. It was no exaggeration to say that information lost its value when it failed to expose tyranny, oppression and the denial of human rights, and when it showed indulgence towards racist and expansionist tendencies.

67. His delegation expressed its appreciation to UNESCO for its sincere efforts for the establishment of a new world information and communication order and supported that organization against all the unjustified pressures and threats to which it was exposed. It had the full confidence of his country and there was no reason to cast doubt on its impartiality or its services to education, science and culture.

68. His country supported all the efforts aimed at establishing a new world information and communication order marked by justice and equality, reflecting the aspirations of mankind for progress, security and prosperity, and contributing to the strengthening of peace and international understanding. It welcomed the efforts made for the convening of a round table in 1985 on a new world information and communication order and had been encouraged by the progress made at the first Round Table, held at Innsbruck in 1983.

69. Since the developing countries believed in the importance of communications for the strengthening of international relations, they were making a great effort to catch up with the countries that were ahead of them in that field. Although they did not wish to place any obstacles in the way of the flow of information between developing and developed countries, they nevertheless feared the negative effects of that process since, because of the enormous technological disparity between them that flow remained one-sided. Only one point of view was making itself heard and there was no reason to suppose that it always presented the issues objectively.

70. The demands of the developing countries for the elaboration of principles, derived from the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law, to provide a basis for the proper regulation of the flow of information were legitimate demands and only aimed at linking freedom with responsibility. The free flow of information lost its value when it became restricted to a small number of

/...

(Mr. Fartas, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

developed countries. The shortcomings of the international media must be re-examined with a view to achieving balance, justice and equality. For that reason, the international community had endeavoured to devise a new world information and communication order which would satisfy the aspirations of nations and peoples and which would reflect the needs of all countries on an equal footing. As a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, his country supported the Declaration of the Conference of Ministers of Information of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Jakarta, particularly its observations with respect to the hostile propaganda put out by certain developed countries against a number of non-aligned countries and against the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries as a whole. His own country continued to be the target of unfair and tendentious propaganda campaigns assiduously carried out by the information media of the Western countries because of its support for liberation movements in the world at large.

71. Mrs. SHAKEEL (Pakistan) emphasized the need to correct the imbalance in the flow of information between developed and developing countries. That situation produced a lack of objectivity in the dissemination of news and information concerning developing countries, whose history, political systems, culture and social values were ignored.

72. The developing countries wanted to exercise their sovereign right to inform the public about their achievements within the context of their own conditions, whereas the information organizations of the developed countries, which were not familiar with the cultural background of developing countries, disseminated sketchy and often biased reports. Her country had been a victim of such biased reporting when propaganda campaigns had been launched against its nuclear energy programme which was designed solely to cater for the requirements of its developing industries. Her delegation therefore strongly advocated the establishment of the new world information and communication order, whose objectives were in no way negative.

73. The Pakistan delegation welcomed the new programmes started by DPI to bring together the journalists of Member countries and the training programme for young journalists and broadcasters from the developing countries. It hoped that despite its limited resources, the Department would continue and expand such programmes.

74. It was also important that adequate attention should be devoted to correcting the image of the United Nations in developed countries. The Department should improve the working of its film and photographic units which were useful in projecting United Nations activities.

75. Although some progress had been reported in the equitable geographical representation of staff in the Department, the Asia and Pacific region, with a large share of world population, was still inadequately represented. She hoped that that imbalance would be corrected, especially at the senior staff level.

(Mrs. Shakeel, Pakistan)

76. Her delegation fully supported the report of the Committee on Information (A/39/21), and hoped that its recommendations which, although not providing a perfect solution, did reconcile competing interests, would serve as the basis for a consensus.

77. The Department should increase co-operation with bodies such as the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of the Islamic Conference which not only identified the problems of countries of different regions, but had also helped to bring them closer together. As the Information Minister of Pakistan had said at the Jakarta Conference of Information Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, misinformation was the greatest danger to mankind's aspirations for peace and economic well-being.

78. Mr. MITRA (India) welcomed the complementarity in the activities of DPI and UNESCO. The unilateral flow of information monopolized by a few developed countries must be replaced by a multidirectional flow. Freedom of information was an important pillar of democracy, but there was no freedom without responsibility. There was a moral obligation on the press to be objective and distinguish between fact and fiction. At its various conferences, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries had repeatedly drawn attention to the biased nature of information about developing countries disseminated by the transnational information agencies and were strengthening their co-operation within the framework of the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies on the basis of self-reliance and mutual assistance. However, agencies in the United Nations system must also participate actively in that endeavour in order to ensure that the existing disparities were not widened by the fast developing communication technology. The International Programme for Development of Communication must assume an important role in ensuring a smooth transition to the new information order.

79. It was gratifying to learn that DPI had continued to strengthen its co-operation with the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies and the regional news agencies of the developing countries whose aspirations and cultures should not be transmitted to foreign audiences through distorted alien perceptions. The current development in high technology communication increased the need for genuine partnership and mutual respect between developed and developing countries so that international understanding would become a reality. That could be achieved only through a whole-hearted commitment to a new world information and communication order. The structure of existing global communications systems and the traditional monopoly of powerful media over the dissemination of information was such that information was often distorted, leading to misconceptions and distrust, and often resulting in violence. The use of information media for reporting deliberately intended to misrepresent or create conflict must be stopped.

80. His delegation was therefore disturbed by recent trends in some sections of the Western media to publicize statements by unrepresentative extremists who openly preached hatred and violence. It was strongly in favour of the free presentation of differing opinions, but nothing could justify the presentation of such propaganda.

/...

(Mr. Mitra, India)

81. Even the General Manager of Reuters news agency had said that many complaints by the developing countries were well-founded. All should therefore co-operate in the establishment of a new world information and communication order based, inter alia, on free access to varied sources of information, responsible reporting and, in particular, a change in the dependent status of the developing countries. Mere transfer of technology would not solve the problems. The real need was to develop a world-wide communication network composed of many different systems characteristic of each society, in which the most advanced technologies would be flexibly geared to the needs of all human communities.

82. Mr. ADJOYI (Togo) said that although the first session of the General Assembly had proclaimed freedom of information as a fundamental human right, the measures adopted to ensure that freedom had not always taken into account world developments since 1946 and especially the emergence of so many new independent States.

83. His country considered that the establishment of a new information order based on justice and equity could enable everyone to enjoy their human rights and promote understanding among peoples. The rapid development of communications technology had made it essential to place information in its global, historical context. All countries must possess appropriate information media, whereas currently world news was controlled by a minute number of agencies with headquarters in an equally small number of countries. That monopoly and the tendency towards sensationalism had led to the generalization of stereotypes and prejudices at a time when developments in communications technology could promote a constructive dialogue between peoples. The international community must therefore co-operate fully to establish the new world information and communication order.

84. The United Nations information centres were the most appropriate tool for making the public aware of the ideals and activities of the Organization. They should therefore maintain the best possible relations with the information media in the host country. His delegation welcomed the conclusions of the Secretary-General's report (A/39/479) and especially those concerned with the establishment of new centres. Although it was recognized that the members of such a centre should not be national of the host country in order to preserve their independence, it was equally necessary for them to co-operate with members of the local media. The establishment of new centres was particularly important in regions where the United Nations should increase its efforts to awake public opinion to the fight against colonialism, racism, apartheid and the arms race.

85. The United Nations should possess the means to react appropriately to campaigns waged against it. Its radio programmes should explain the truth about the United Nations. His delegation appreciated the DPI's role in publicizing United Nations activities and welcomed its permanent co-operation with the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies, especially the Pan-African News Agency, as well as with other international and regional information bodies. It also commended the way UNESCO performed its essential task, namely to encourage understanding between nations with different cultures.

(Mr. Adjoyi, Togo)

86. His delegation did not share the Secretariat's optimism about progress made in redressing the imbalance in the geographical distribution of the staff of DPI, especially because the system of percentages used was imprecise and liable to misinterpretation. It would particularly welcome an increase in the number of French-speaking staff and an improvement in the French-language information services.

87. Mrs. BETHEL-DALY (Bahamas) acknowledged the continued efforts of the Department of Public Information (DPI) in fulfilling its important task as the vital communication link between the United Nations system and the public it represented and served.

88. The people of the Bahamas were kept informed of local issues and matters of global concern such as disarmament and apartheid by the programmes of the Caribbean Unit of United Nations Radio. She joined with the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) in expressing appreciation for those services.

89. Her delegation looked forward to an expansion of services to the Caribbean subregion. The countries of that region were striving for economic, social and cultural progress, and their role in the international community was no less important than that played by other regions.

90. Her delegation was pleased to note from the report of the Committee on Information that serious consideration was to be given to the establishment of a United Nations shortwave radio network. Although the Bahamas was not at present a host country for a United Nations Information Centre, she hoped that it too might benefit from the recommendation contained in the report that information centres should intensify their exchanges with local communities.

91. Mr. VIKIS (Cyprus) said that the increased recognition by the international community of the importance of information was accompanied by a sense of the urgency of establishing a new, more just and more effective world information order.

92. At the forefront of the struggle for the decolonization of information were the non-aligned and developing countries, which suffered most from the imbalances in the current information order. The Conference of the Ministers of Information of the Non-Aligned Countries, held at Jakarta in January 1984, had stressed the need to redress those imbalances.

93. A significant role in the realization of such objectives was being played by the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies and by broadcasting organizations of the non-aligned countries. Such self-reliant efforts should be intensified and expanded. UNESCO played a constructive and positive role in efforts for the establishment of a new information order, notably through its International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC), to which members should extend all possible material and moral support.

(Mr. Vikis, Cyprus)

94. The Department of Public Information (DPI) should intensify its efforts to publicize the positive and constructive activities of the United Nations system in economic, social and development fields, correcting the distorted image of the organization propagated by the Western mass media. As the Under-Secretary-General for Public Information had noted, DPI could not act in isolation. His delegation supported the intensification of the efforts of DPI, while noting that there was much still to be done and that some aspects of the Department's operations were capable of improvement.

95. The Report of the Committee on Information reflected the diversity of opinion within the Committee, while providing concrete proof of conciliation leading to consensus. The Committee's recommendations were not wholly satisfying, either to the developing or the developed countries, but they would nevertheless serve their collective aims well.

96. The question of information was a complex of many issues. Problems understandably arose in deciding priorities among them. The elimination of the inequalities and injustices in the field of communication and information would form a platform from which to tackle related problems. His delegation would continue to do its utmost within the Committee on Information, the Non-Aligned Movement and other fora, for the achievement of justice, development and peace.

97. Mr. TOWO-ATANGANA (Cameroon) said that his Government had always done everything within its limited financial means to facilitate the generation, dissemination and free circulation of information. At that moment Cameroon possessed a large radio network involving even the most remote villages of the country in national and international life, and within a few months would complete a television network based on an important telecommunications centre which had been under construction for several years. His Government had in addition funded an institute for advanced training in information science and technology, whose structure and teaching programme catered to African needs. During the previous two years the privately-owned press had grown spectacularly, with the founding of more than 40 newspapers in French, English as well as indigenous tongues.

98. Unfortunately, however, the communication media were still dominated by a minority of industrialized countries which had no intention of giving up their control. The best cultural and scientific programmes were mostly inaccessible to the peoples of the third world. Their countries were saturated with images and information which often left a great deal to be desired and took little account of their cultural identity and their development needs. The giant press agencies indulged in sensationalism, while denigrating the cultures of third world peoples; they remained silent about their development efforts and ignored or distorted the struggle for freedom and dignity of colonialized peoples.

99. Those were the realities behind the attitude of certain third world States accused of being opposed to freedom of information. Those countries were in fact fighting to preserve their basic values and to protect the most vulnerable sectors of their people from manipulation. His delegation considered that, while freedom of information should be defended, its abuse should also be restricted.

/...

(Mr. Towo-Atangana, Cameroon)

100. Imbalance between North and South in information generation and flow was a major obstacle to international co-operation and understanding, and thus to world peace. That was why the new world information and communication order was so important. His delegation applauded the concrete steps taken in this direction by UNESCO through its International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC). It was to be hoped that the baseless campaign of denigration directed against that organization and its Director-General would be replaced by renewed dialogue in a body which had done so much for education, science and culture.

101. As a country with a largely oral history and culture, Cameroon attached particular importance to the project for establishing film and sound archives and training specialists in film and magnetic tape conservation announced in the report of the Director-General of UNESCO (A/39/497).

102. His delegation supported the recommendation of the Committee on Information for closer collaboration between the United Nations and UNESCO, and in particular between the Department of Information and the Pool of Non-Aligned News Agencies and national, regional and interregional news agencies of developing countries. It welcomed the steps already taken in that direction.

103. His Government hoped that the appointment of a permanent Director for the Information Centre at Yaoundé (para. 12 of General Assembly resolution 38/82 B) would be made before the following summer.

104. His delegation supported the recommendation of the Committee on Information for strengthening the Department of Information, especially in publicizing activities of the United Nations. The third world, and African countries in particular, should be better represented in DPI, especially at the higher level.

105. Mr. BLOCKER (United States of America) speaking in exercise of his right of reply, took exception to the meretricious charges directed at the United States by the representative of Nicaragua. She had introduced irrelevant and extraneous matters to the debate. By accusing his Government of "disinformation" in its public statements about Nicaragua's increasing military build-up, she had perpetrated a kind of "verbal imperialism". When totalitarian countries were charged with lying or concealing the truth, they turned the charge upside down and accused their accusers of the crime they themselves had committed.

106. It was not the United States, but Nicaragua which had called the Security Council into urgent session eight times during the preceding 18 months to warn of "imminent invasion" by his country. On the last such occasion, the United States representative in the Security Council had described the session demanded by Nicaragua as a "media event", pointing to the irony of a country whose own military build-up constituted a serious threat to its neighbours making the unfounded claim that it was threatened militarily itself.

107. No threat to Nicaragua existed, and no invasion had taken or would take place. "Disinformation" was the only appropriate description for the knowingly false charges made by the delegate of Nicaragua.

/...

108. Mrs. RUBIALES (Nicaragua) speaking in exercise of her right of reply, said that by exercising his right of reply, the representative of the United States had admitted that his country was guilty of aggression against Nicaragua. She hoped that those present would note that for future reference.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.