United Nations A/C.4/69/SR.25



Distr.: General 16 January 2015

Original: English

Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee)

Summary record of the 25th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 13 November 2014, at 10 a.m.

Contents

Agenda item 53: Comprehensive review of special political missions (continued)

Agenda item 54: Questions relating to information (continued)

Agenda item 50: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (continued)

Agenda item 51: Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories (*continued*)

Agenda item 118: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (continued)

Completion of the Committee's work

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).





The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

Agenda item 53: Comprehensive review of special political missions (*continued*) (A/C.4/69/L.18)

Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.18: Comprehensive review of special political missions

- 1. **Ms. Zitting** (Finland), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that the wider membership of the United Nations would benefit from discussing and learning more about special political missions, which had increasingly broad and complex mandates and faced new challenges. The draft resolution was similar to the two previous resolutions adopted on the subject, but placed greater emphasis on the full involvement of women in conflict prevention and resolution and in peacebuilding. She looked forward to engaging with the high-level independent panel to be established to review United Nations peacekeeping operations and special political missions.
- 2. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications and that Austria, Denmark, Georgia, Kenya, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Montenegro, Nigeria, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, Turkey and Uruguay had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.
- 3. Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.18 was adopted.

Agenda item 54: Questions relating to information (*continued*) (A/69/21, chap. IV)

Draft resolution A: Information in the service of humanity

- 4. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.
- 5. Draft resolution A was adopted.

Draft decision: Increase in the membership of the Committee on Information

- 6. **The Chair** said that the draft decision had no programme budget implications.
- 7. The draft decision was adopted.

Draft resolution B: United Nations public information policies and activities

8. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee), orally presenting a statement of programme budget

- implications in accordance with rule 153 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure, said that the Department of Public Information would support the implementation of paragraph 22 of the draft resolution by, inter alia, ensuring that online social media; United Nations products on the Department's websites; news, television, information and related multimedia products about the United Nations; meetings coverage press releases for the plenary meetings of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council; and downloadable publications and other outreach products, including webcast archives, were made available in all six official languages.
- Those activities would be undertaken in the biennium 2016-2017, in line with the Department's biennial programme plan for that biennium, and would additional requirements of \$13,821,700, including \$7,119,000, for the proposed establishment of 29 Professional and General Service posts (9 P-3, 4 P-2 and 16 GS-OL) to increase parity in the preparation and dissemination of public information products in the six official languages; \$579,600 for general temporary assistance in reviewing, editing, proofreading and publishing for each additional language during peak workload periods of the General Assembly; \$4,083,700 for contractual services relating to the expansion of the online video platform, on-demand video and archives, bandwidth and archive storage; external translation of press releases into Arabic, Chinese, Russian and Spanish; translation and layout of United Nations publications and other outreach products to be made available downloadable digital format; and translation of press kits into all official languages. The requirement for external translation was based on the assumption that press releases and summaries of plenary meetings of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council would be translated into four additional official languages, and did not include press releases for press conferences, meetings of subsidiary bodies, briefings, statements, biographies or notes to correspondents. In addition, an amount of \$2,039,400, of which \$1,067,300 corresponded to non-recurrent costs, would be required under general expenses (\$1,713,400), supplies operating materials (\$29,000) and furniture and equipment (\$297,000) for the proposed establishment and ongoing support of the 29 new posts.

10. Thus, adoption of draft resolution B would not any additional appropriation under the programme budget for the current biennium. Resource requirements of approximately \$13,821,700 would be included in the proposed programme budget for 2016-2017 under section 28, Public information (\$10,872,600); section 29D, Office of Central Support Services (\$1,933,100); and section 36, Staff assessment (\$1,016,000). With respect to the provisions of paragraphs 17, 18, 20, 21, 37, 41, 44-47, 62, 64, 67, 69, 74, 77, 81, 88 and 91 of draft resolution B, attention was drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B and subsequent resolutions, including resolution 68/246, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ).

11. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on paragraph 22 of draft resolution B.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

- 12. **Mr. Arancibia Fernández** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) said that he wished to express his delegation's surprise that the draft resolution, which had been proposed by the Group of 77 and China, had been negotiated in good faith and was the result of consensus, was being put to a vote. He regretted that step backwards, which went against all efforts to ensure multilingualism and promote parity among the six official languages.
- 13. Mr. León González (Cuba) said that he shared the concerns raised by the Bolivian delegation, particularly since the draft resolution had been the object of arduous negotiation, followed by a comprehensive discussion in the Committee on Information, including question-and-answer sessions with officials of the Department of Public Information. His delegation had assumed that, given the consensus on the draft resolution in the Committee on Information, all issues had been addressed. The draft resolution was very important to the work of the Organization and guaranteed the fundamental principle of linguistic parity in the context of multilingualism. The existing disparity in the use of the six official languages had been noted in discussions with the

Secretariat, which had acknowledged that it lacked the necessary capacity to ensure linguistic parity in its public information activities. His delegation would therefore support the draft resolution, to ensure that the United Nations complied with the basic principles governing its work.

- 14. Mr. Vallarino (Argentina), also expressing concerns with regard to voting on a draft resolution on which consensus had been reached after extensive negotiations and full discussion in the Committee on Information, said that there appeared to be a misunderstanding: a budget increase was being requested for the upcoming biennium even though paragraph 21 of the draft resolution expressly underlined the responsibility of the Secretariat in mainstreaming multilingualism within resources on an equitable basis. Thus, the text did not indicate that Member States should contribute more, but that existing resources should be distributed equitably. Any increase in resources, which appeared nowhere in the agreed language of the draft resolution, would have to be debated in the Fifth Committee. Argentina supported the text that had been agreed upon, given that multilingualism was essential to communication and the dissemination of the Organization's message.
- 15. A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 22 of draft resolution B.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Burundi, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Fiji, Gabon, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay,

14-64681 **3/14**

Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania. San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia. Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

- 16. Paragraph 22 of draft resolution B was adopted by 116 votes to none, with 48 abstentions.
- 17. Draft resolution B as a whole was adopted.
- 18. Mr. Davoli (Italy), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the States members of the European Union that were members of the Committee on Information had been pleased to join the consensus whereby that Committee had adopted its report, having reached agreement on important public diplomacy and information measures and underlined the Secretariat's responsibility to mainstream multilingualism in all its communication and information activities within existing resources on an equitable basis. The European Union had therefore been surprised that the Programme Planning and Budget Division had referred, in a statement communicated to the Fourth Committee secretariat on 29 October 2014, to additional requirements amounting to almost \$14 million for 2016-2017, apparently on the basis of its interpretation of paragraph 22 of draft resolution B. However, there was no justification for the generation of that

statement. The European Union member States disagreed with the rationale given therein and had therefore abstained from voting.

- 19. The draft resolution had been negotiated in good faith and no additional resources had been mentioned; it had been understood that activities would be undertaken within existing resources, as clearly called for in paragraph 21 of the draft resolution. The draft resolution had no financial implications and its adoption could not be seen as a commitment to the anticipated financial requirements referred to in the oral statement. Further, the estimates mentioned in the oral statement did not prejudge the consideration of the proposed programme budget for 2016-2017 by ACABQ and the Fifth Committee and should not be perceived as having been endorsed by Member States at the current stage.
- 20. The States members of the European Union strongly supported multilingualism in the United Nations system, and their abstention from voting on paragraph 22 of the draft resolution did not alter their commitment to reaching consensus on the matter.
- 21. Mr. Nishimaki (Japan), recalling that, as in previous years, the Committee on Information had negotiated the draft resolution with the expectation that it would be adopted by consensus by the Fourth Committee, said that paragraph 21 clearly indicated that parity among the six official languages should be improved within existing resources. His delegation had accepted the draft resolution in the Committee on Information on the basis of the Secretariat's assurances that a budget increase would not be necessary. By ignoring the cost-neutral language of paragraph 21, the Secretariat had committed a severe misstep in its unexplained interpretation of paragraph 22 and had unilaterally proposed an increase of more than \$13 million for 2016-2017. In light of that regrettable action, his delegation had abstained from voting on paragraph 22 and hoped that the Secretariat would find a way forward to improve parity without additional resources.
- 22. **Ms. Ventura** (Canada) said that her delegation disagreed with the rationale of the unexpected oral statement. The interpretation that paragraph 22 of the draft resolution warranted a budget increase was unjustified, and she was concerned about the approach taken by the Secretariat. Canada, which attached great importance to multilingualism, had therefore abstained

from voting. Paragraph 21 of the draft resolution indicated that the Secretariat was to continue to work within existing resources, and the draft resolution had no financial implications. Its adoption could in no way be seen as a commitment to the anticipated financial requirements referred to in the oral statement. The estimates in that statement did not prejudge the consideration of the proposed programme budget for 2016-2017 by ACABQ and the Fifth Committee and should not be perceived as having been endorsed by Member States at the current meeting.

- 23. **Ms. McDougall** (Australia) said that while Australia strongly supported the draft resolution, the oral statement by the Secretariat referred to a \$14-million budget increase based on an erroneous interpretation of a paragraph that had been negotiated in good faith. Consequently, her delegation had abstained from voting and looked forward to discussing the resource requirements of the Department of Public Information in the context of the Fifth Committee's consideration, in 2015, of the proposed programme budget for the next biennium.
- 24. Ms. Kiernan (United States of America) said that her country supported the critical work of the Department of Public Information and, as a member of Committee on Information, examined the Department's activities to ensure their effectiveness and efficiency, as well as coherence between the Department's strategic orientation and Member States' expectations. The text drafted by that Committee for consideration by the General Assembly had been negotiated through robust but good-faith debate. It reflected the consensus reached on a number of issues, including multilingualism, and the frustrations of certain Member States with regard to the delays in the implementation of that principle. The Committee on Information had also factored the financial constraints of the Organization and its Member States into its discussions on the Department's activities, as evidenced by the references throughout the text to the need for the Department to operate "within existing resources", "in a cost-neutral manner" and through "partnerships". Paragraph 21 expressed that idea clearly in relation to multilingualism.
- 25. Her delegation was therefore surprised and disappointed by the Secretariat's novel interpretation that paragraph 22 created the need for an additional \$13.8 million in the 2016-2017 biennium. That interpretation was unacceptable because it did not

reflect the understanding and text agreed to by the members of the Committee on Information and had been put forward in the absence of consultations with Member States. The United States had therefore abstained from voting on paragraph 22. It supported the draft resolution but could not countenance the Secretariat's actions, which went against the letter and spirit of the text.

- 26. **Mr. Lee** Tong-a (Republic of Korea) said that, as a long-standing supporter of the Committee on Information and the Department of Public Information, his delegation had hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without difficulty. However, the oral statement delivered by the Secretariat indicated that the draft resolution's implementation would entail additional budgetary requirements that had not been considered by the Committee on Information or the Fourth Committee. On the understanding that any decision that would place an additional financial burden on Member States warranted thorough examination, his delegation looked forward to discussing the matter further in the Fifth Committee.
- 27. **Mr. Maleki** (Islamic Republic of Iran), referring to those delegations that had abstained from voting on paragraph 22 and subsequently expressed their attachment to the importance of multilingualism and its mainstreaming in all United Nations activities, asked how such mainstreaming would be possible without additional costs.
- 28. Mr. Zamora Rivas (El Salvador) said that his delegation had also been surprised by the additional costs identified in the oral statement by the Secretariat, which, it appeared, had not read the text of the draft resolution closely enough. Paragraph 21 expressly stated that it was the Secretariat's responsibility to mainstream multilingualism "within existing resources on an equitable basis". Since it was not more money but equal treatment for all official languages that was being sought, he questioned the rationale of the oral statement.

Agenda item 50: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (continued) (A/C.4/69/L.9, A/C.4/69/L.10, A/C.4/69/L.11 and A/C.4/69/L.12)

29. **Mr. Khan** (Indonesia), introducing the four draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 50 (A/C.4/69/L.9, A/C.4/69/L.10, A/C.4/69/L.11 and

14-64681 5/14

A/C.4/69/L.12) and reviewing their provisions, said that they reflected fundamental principles and positions regarding the rights of Palestine refugees and the international community's commitment to alleviating their plight until a just solution was achieved, as well as its strong support for the humanitarian work of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), which was making a vital contribution to regional stability. He expressed the hope that all the draft resolutions would again receive the overwhelming support of the Committee.

Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.9: Assistance to Palestine refugees

- 30. Mr. Alsina (Brazil) said that his country was pleased that the draft resolution included a decision to invite Brazil to become a member of the UNRWA Advisory Commission, since that would further strengthen Brazil's cooperation with the Agency. UNRWA played a crucial role in efforts to ensure that stability took root in an environment where poverty, injustice and a lack of opportunities prevailed. His country pledged to continue supporting the Agency and assisting the Palestinian people.
- 31. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Iceland, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway and Switzerland had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.
- 32. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India,

Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. San Marino. Saudi Arabia. Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Tanzania. Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel.

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, Paraguay, United States of America, Vanuatu.

33. Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.9 was adopted by 165 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.10: Persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities

- 34. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the Plurinational State of Bolivia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.
- 35. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize,

6/14

Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Korea, Republic of Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland. Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan. Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela Tanzania. (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Paraguay, Vanuatu.

36. Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.10 was adopted by 165 votes to 7, with 4 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.11: Operations of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

37. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the Plurinational State of Bolivia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

38. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Diibouti. Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela

14-64681 **7/14**

(Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Paraguay, Vanuatu.

39. Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.11 was adopted by 164 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.12: Palestine refugees' properties and their revenues

- 40. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway and Switzerland had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.
- 41. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Korea, Denmark, Republic of Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland. Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru,

Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Paraguay, Vanuatu.

42. Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.12 was adopted by 165 votes to 7, with 4 abstentions.

Agenda item 51: Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories (continued) (A/C.4/69/L.13, A/C.4/69/L.14, A/C.4/69/L.15, A/C.4/69/L.16 and A/C.4/69/L.17)

43. Mr. León González (Cuba), introducing the five draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 51 (A/C.4/69/L.13,A/C.4/69/L.14, A/C.4/69/L.15, A/C.4/69/L.16 and A/C.4/69/L.17) and reviewing their provisions, said that the human rights situation of the civilian populations in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and the occupied Syrian Golan remained critical as a result of Israel's violations of human rights and international law. Conditions in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, had deteriorated further as Israel continued its deliberate and systematic policy of colonization, especially its illegal settlement campaign, which was jeopardizing the possibility of achieving a two-State solution based on the pre-1967 borders. It was extremely important for the members of the Committee to stand firmly behind such crucial draft resolutions.

44. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) read out minor corrections to draft resolutions A/C.4/69/L.13, A/C.4/69/L.14, A/C.4/69/L.15 and A/C.4/69/L.16.

Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.13: Work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories

- 45. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the Plurinational State of Bolivia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.
- 46. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Grenada, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates. United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, Panama, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia,

Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

47. Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.13, as orally revised, was adopted by 90 votes to 9, with 75 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.14: Applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, to the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the other occupied Arab territories

- 48. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the Plurinational State of Bolivia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.
- 49. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain. Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania,

14-64681 **9/14**

Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino. Saudi Arabia. Senegal, Serbia. Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka. Sudan. Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, South Sudan, Togo, Vanuatu.

50. Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.14, as orally revised, was adopted by 160 votes to 7, with 9 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.15: Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan

- 51. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Iceland, Lesotho, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland and Ukraine had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.
- 52. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of),

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Denmark, Diibouti. Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey. Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Honduras, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, South Sudan, Togo, Vanuatu.

53. Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.15, as orally revised, was adopted by 157 votes to 7, with 11 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.16: Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem

- 54. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the Plurinational State of Bolivia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution
- 55. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho. Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela

(Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia, Malawi, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, South Sudan, Togo, Vanuatu.

56. Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.16, as orally revised, was adopted by 155 votes to 8, with 11 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.17: The occupied Syrian Golan

57. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Belarus and the Plurinational State of Bolivia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

58. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of

14-64681 11/1**4**

Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino. Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia. Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Lanka. Sudan. Suriname. Sweden. Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel.

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Honduras, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, South Sudan, Togo, Tonga, United States of America, Vanuatu.

- 59. Draft resolution A/C.4/69/L.17 was adopted by 158 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.
- 60. **Mr. Sanfilippo** (Italy), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that, while the European Union member States had followed a coordinated voting pattern on the draft resolutions just adopted, the European Union as a whole had not adopted a legal definition of the term "forced displacement", which was used in some of the draft resolutions. Furthermore, the use of the term "Palestine" could not be construed as recognition of a State of Palestine and was without prejudice to the individual positions of member States on the issue and, therefore, to the question of the validity of Palestine's accession to the international instruments referred to in the draft resolutions.
- 61. **Ms. Abdelhady-Nasser** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that the Committee's adoption of the draft resolutions submitted under agenda items 50 and 51, once again by an overwhelming majority, strongly reaffirmed the rights of the Palestinian people, including Palestine refugees; the indispensable role of UNRWA; and the imperative of respect for humanitarian and human rights law. The action just taken by the Committee exemplified the role that the United Nations could and must play in safeguarding human rights and upholding international law.

- 62. Palestine was grateful for the support of Member States, host countries and the donor community to UNRWA and stressed the urgency of providing more funds for the vital work that the Agency was doing to address the crisis situation and emergency needs in Palestine, especially in Gaza, and in the host countries.
- 63. Her delegation also appreciated the support expressed for the mandate of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories and for its efforts to raise international awareness of the gross and systematic human rights violations perpetrated under the 47-year Israeli military occupation. It stressed the importance of reaffirming the international consensus on the Fourth Geneva Convention's applicability to the Territory, including East Occupied Palestinian Jerusalem, and on the illegality of the Israeli settlement campaign and other grave breaches that were sabotaging what little opportunity remained for achieving peace under the two-State solution.
- 64. Mr. Ja'afari (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the overwhelming support for the draft resolutions just adopted under agenda items 50 and 51 sent an unambiguous message to Israel to end its occupation of all the occupied Arab territories and to cease immediately all violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. Israel's attempt to annex the Syrian Golan not only was a serious provocation, but also was reminiscent of a dark chapter in modern human history when a certain State had forcibly annexed parts of other sovereign States at the beginning of the Second World War. Israel had openly supported the terrorists who had forced the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) out of its positions in the occupied Syrian Golan.
- 65. **Mr. Nitzan** (Israel), speaking on a point of order, said that the Syrian delegation's allusion to Nazi Germany, made at both the current and the previous session of the General Assembly, was an anti-Semitic provocation that showed contempt for the memory of the Holocaust. Such comments should not be tolerated anywhere, let alone at the United Nations.
- 66. **The Chair** requested the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to bear in mind the comments of the representative of Israel when continuing his statement.

12/14

- 67. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the Secretary-General's most recent report on UNDOF (S/2014/665) demonstrated that Israel had been helping members of the terrorist organization Al-Nusra Front to cross the area of separation and had treated them in Israeli hospitals, where they had received visits from eminent Israeli politicians, as shown on Israeli television. Those comments were not anti-Semitic and bore no relation to the Holocaust; they were based on simple fact.
- 68. Israel was the only State to have voted against the draft resolution on the occupied Syrian Golan and had voted against the entire set of draft resolutions under agenda items 50 and 51, demonstrating its blatant disregard for international consensus, the United Nations and international law. Although Israel claimed to have been created by the United Nations, it acted as though the Organization's resolutions were of no consequence. The Syrian delegation appealed to those few delegations that had abstained from voting on the draft resolution on the occupied Syrian Golan to join the international consensus and vote in favour when it came before the plenary Assembly. Any hesitation to condemn occupation and forced annexation would send a dangerous signal to lawbreakers such as Israel, suggesting that they could do as they pleased and that the law of the jungle had replaced the law.
- 69. It appeared that the Israeli delegation would prefer to replace the set of draft resolutions that had just been adopted with one that glorified all of Israel's illegal practices. If the Government of Israel did not wish its policies to be compared with Nazism, it should reverse them. The comments of the representative of Israel were intolerable, as were the Israeli Government's continued occupation of Arab territories and attempt to annex the Syrian Golan, which had been met with overwhelming international opposition. If Israel was portrayed in a negative light, that was entirely its own doing.
- 70. **Ms. Ventura** (Canada) said she regretted that the representative of Syria had repeated his inappropriate comments of the previous year; any comparison between Israel and Nazism was wholly unacceptable.
- 71. **Mr. Miller** (United States of America) said that his delegation strongly condemned the comparison just drawn, for the second time, between Israel and the Nazi regime, which demonstrated a complete

- misunderstanding of history and of the current situation.
- 72. **Mr. Selle** (Germany) said that, while his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the occupied Syrian Golan, it unambiguously rejected the historically inaccurate comparison made by the Syrian delegation.
- 73. Mr. Nitzan (Israel) said that the use of such rhetoric at the United Nations was shameful. It was remarkable that the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic should presume to lecture others on terrorism, human rights and the plight of Palestine representing refugees while a regime systematically used military and even chemical weapons to terrorize and kill its people and raze cities to the ground. The Syrian regime had massacred over 220,000 of its own people over the last three years and had killed thousands of Palestine refugees living in Syrian camps. Nothing the Syrian delegation could say about Israel would succeed in diverting international attention from the atrocities committed by the Syrian Government.
- 74. With regard to recent events in the Syrian Golan, the Syrian army had fled the area of separation in the face of advancing Al-Nusra Front terrorists, leaving UNDOF unprotected. In contrast, Israel had provided UNDOF staff with safe harbour and had given humanitarian aid clearly an alien concept to the Syrian Government to Syrians who had been attacked by Syrian government forces.
- 75. **Mr. White** (Australia) said he was also disappointed at the comparisons drawn by the Syrian delegation between Israel and Nazi Germany. Such remarks were baseless, historically inaccurate and unhelpful to the consideration of the current agenda item.

Statements made in exercise of the right of reply

76. **Mr. Hamed** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that certain delegations had clearly misunderstood his delegation's statement, in which it had simply pointed out that Israel was violating international law by forcibly annexing the territory of other States, calling to mind a dark chapter of human history. The representative of Israel, clearly troubled by the results of the votes just taken, had interpreted those comments in his own way and had reacted by launching accusations at other delegations, including that of the

14-64681 13/14

Syrian Arab Republic. He was surprised that the representative of Israel had commented on human rights when the magnitude and brutality of Israel's crimes against Arab citizens under its occupation were unmatched. With regard to Israel's provision of so-called humanitarian aid, he reminded the Israeli delegation that treating terrorists in Israeli hospitals and helping them return to the area of separation to continue their attacks did not count as humanitarian aid.

- 77. **Mr. Nitzan** (Israel) said he regretted that the Syrian representative, whose ignorance of history was embarrassing, insisted on telling unacceptable lies at a United Nations meeting. The fact that 220,000 Syrians had been killed by the Syrian regime spoke volumes.
- 78. **Mr. Hamed** (Syrian Arab Republic) said he was surprised that, instead of responding to the international community's condemnation of Israel's crimes, as described in the Secretary-General's report, the representative of the Israeli occupation had resorted to making accusations against the Syrian and other delegations. If the representative of Israel wished his voice to be heard, he should acknowledge the need for his Government to end its occupation, cease its illegal practices and be held accountable for its crimes.

Agenda item 118: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*) (A/C.4/69/L.7 and A/C.4/69/L.8)

Draft decision A/C.4/69/L.7: Rotation of the post of Rapporteur of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) for the seventieth to seventy-third sessions of the General Assembly

79. Draft decision A/C.4/69/L.7 was adopted.

Draft decision A/C.4/69/L.8: Proposed programme of work and timetable of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) for the seventieth session of the General Assembly

80. Draft decision A/C.4/69/L.8 was adopted.

Completion of the Committee's work

81. **The Chair** declared that the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) had completed its work for the main part of the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.