

UNITED NATIONS
 General Assembly

FORTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
25th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 22 November 1989
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 77: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES
(continued)

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

AGENDA ITEM 79: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued)

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MR. RENE MOAWAD, PRESIDENT OF THE LEBANESE REPUBLIC

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

UN LIBRARY
DEC 6 1989
UNISA COLLECTION

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 corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/44/SR.25
27 November 1989

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 77: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued) (A/44/81, 83, 117, 151, 152, 155, 167, 176, 182, 209, 227, 235, 259, 299, 309, 352, 354, 355, 361, 364, 365, 397, 409 and Corr.1-2, 489, 494, 515, 517, 551, 562-66, 570, 599, 610, 640, 643, 666, 687 and Corr.1, 689, 699 and Corr.1; A/SPC/44/L.19 and Corr.1, L.20-25)

1. Mr. AL-ZAYANI (Bahrain) said that the annual report of the Special Committee (A/44/599) described the deteriorating situation with regard to human rights in the occupied territories, especially since the emergence of the valiant intifadah in response to the flagrant violations of human rights by the Israeli occupation forces, which were in contradiction to the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

2. Since 1967, Israel had pursued policies of domination and annexation through the establishment of settlements in the occupied territories, thereby modifying the demographic composition of the territories, infringing on the rights of the population and exploiting the natural resources of the territories. The establishment of settlements was in violation of numerous international conventions and resolutions. There were now 196 Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories and 42 in the Syrian Arab Golan.

3. The intifadah had alerted world opinion to events and human rights violations in the occupied territories and was an expression of the determination of the Palestinian people and the Syrian Arab residents of the Golan to free themselves from the occupation, which had become more ferocious, including aggression against the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) in disregard of that humanitarian Agency's diplomatic immunity. The Israeli occupation authorities imagined that they could crush the intifadah through an escalation of oppressive practices of intimidation and terror, using the army or inciting settlers to attack Palestinian towns and villages. Indeed, the report had noted the increasingly active part played by Israeli settlers in the scheme of repression through vigilante intervention forces and raids of "retaliation and intimidation".

4. The military administration of justice had sunk to new low levels, as shown by paragraphs 78 to 120 concerning the arrest of Palestinians, the difficulties faced by lawyers, administrative detention procedures, the "quick justice" practice of extracting confessions under duress, and the arrest of minors, not to mention burial alive, the breaking of bones, the use of gases, beatings, murders, chemical poisoning, raids on hospitals and the disruption of teaching.

5. On the first anniversary of the proclamation of the State of Palestine and as the intifadah was entering its third year, he was deeply concerned that the

(Mr. Al-Zayani, Bahrain)

international community had been unable to take effective steps to protect the human rights of civilians in the Arab occupied territories. The international community should take the necessary steps through the Security Council to provide such protection in accordance with the Secretary-General's recommendation contained in document S/19443.

6. Mr. GORDON (Israel) said that the Six Day War had been a defensive battle to counter a concerted and premeditated Arab attack on Israel within its 1948 borders. The Arabs had intended to throw Israel into the sea, not to liberate Judea, Samaria and Gaza, as those areas had been under Arab control and had been used as launching pads for assaults against Israel. Israel had foiled that plan, and Judea, Samaria and Gaza had been in its hands at the end of the war.

7. Israel had not considered the status quo of those areas to be permanent and had endeavoured to reach a negotiated agreement. The Camp David accords had provided the framework for negotiations on the future of the inhabitants and the areas concerned. Regrettably, the Arab side had impeded progress. The recent Israeli four-point peace initiative, presented by Prime Minister Shamir, provided a unique opportunity to determine the future status of the territories. However, the disturbances in those areas were a new obstacle to peace. The Arabs were applying force in order to achieve political goals without negotiation and agreement. Such action aimed to destroy Israel in one blow or in stages. However, the Arabs had failed to achieve their objectives in spite of military, political and economic warfare and terrorist campaigns in Israel and around the world.

8. The instigators of the riots cynically exploited children, knowing that Israeli law enforcement personnel would not retreat under an assault even if children were deployed. That was disappointing to some of the Committee members who wished to see Israel stampeded by those children to the 1967 lines or to the Mediterranean. Israel had no choice but to contain those attacks. Children were likely to get hurt and the people who incited them to riot were to blame for such casualties.

9. Referring to the Journal of Palestine Studies, he noted the manner in which children were deployed to ignite tyres, throw rocks and lead attacks. A leaflet distributed by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) urged children to throw stones and Molotov cocktails. Bassam Abu Sharif, Yasser Arafat's political adviser, had said that the moment would come when every Palestinian child took a knife and killed an Israeli. Moreover, the PLO would reportedly hold a one-month military training course for 1,000 children from Arab countries in Democratic Yemen. He referred to a resolution on the protection of children in armed conflicts, adopted by the International Committee of the Red Cross, and to the draft convention on the rights of the child, which expressed concern for children who took a direct part in hostilities and who had been trained to hate.

10. He regretted that the instigators of the disturbances had failed to keep the schools out of the vortex of violence. Schools had been systematically used as centres for organizing and launching violent demonstrations and riots. Instigators

(Mr. Gordon, Israel)

goaded the children to attack traffic and law enforcement personnel. The authorities were faced with the difficult choice of using force to restore order or temporarily closing schools to avoid casualties. While educational institutions in Judea and Samaria had been closed for long periods because of persistent rioting, those in the Gaza District, where children had not been made to riot, had remained open. Although the Israeli authorities agreed to open schools when given a commitment that they would be used only for learning, headmasters, parents and community leaders in Judea and Samaria were afraid to do so lest they be branded as collaborators by the terrorist organizations and punished or killed. Moreover, even when the schools were open, the various terrorist organizations imposed days of remembrance, days of mourning, days of solidarity and other days of full or partial strikes, which entailed their closing. Nevertheless, those organizations had the audacity to claim that their only interest was the smooth functioning of schools. Furthermore, the scores of strikes played havoc with the local economy. While Israel was blamed for such social and economic self-mutilation, it was the Arabs, first and foremost, who wished to disrupt life and create a state of turmoil.

11. Arab instigators openly declared that they had initiated the intifadah. They resorted to force, rather than negotiations and subsequently complained in the United Nations about the dismal results of their actions.

12. The leaders of the Arab countries and terrorist organizations were responsible for the creation of the Palestine refugee problem and for its perpetuation. They were also answerable for the anachronistic existence of the refugee camps, because they had rejected every United Nations resettlement project. The camps were a hotbed of resentment and their residents were being exploited to provoke and prolong the riots. They were a laboratory where terrorist warlords bred recruits to murder Palestinian Arabs who failed to toe the line of the terrorist organizations affiliated with the PLO. In fact, the word "assassin" came from the Arabic word for a sect that murdered its political opponents, mainly among its own people. The terrorist organizations were thus respecting an old tradition. Similarly, by order of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, thousands of Arab political opponents had been assassinated by Palestinian Arabs. The Grand Mufti had collaborated with Adolph Hitler and had subsequently been rewarded by the Palestinian leaders for doing so. The PLO terrorists were his direct political heirs. They were conducting a murderous campaign of intimidation and coercion in order to force Palestinians and the staff members of international organizations to co-operate with them.

13. Since 1988 over 150 Palestinians had been murdered by PLO "shock squads". The homes, shops and cars of hundreds of Palestinians had been set on fire. Many more Palestinians had received written or oral threats. That phenomenon was so widespread that the number of Palestinian Arabs killed by terrorists had reached nearly 25 per cent of all Palestinian Arabs killed in the recent disturbances. Over 80 per cent of the Arabs murdered by terrorist gangs had been killed since April 1989 and the monthly assassination rate had been quickly escalating. The victims were often kidnapped, tortured and finally executed by beatings, hatchet blows or multiple stabbings. Some were burned or buried alive and hung in streets

(Mr. Gordon, Israel)

and school yards. Every new victim was a symbol of PLO failure. In spite of the concern expressed for the Palestinians in the United Nations, reference could not be found in the Organization's reports and resolutions to the human rights of Palestinian opponents to the PLO.

4. Moreover, the Palestinian leaders did not have any compunction about destroying the environment. The history of civilization in the Middle East was marked by the struggle against desertification. The Zionist movement and the State of Israel had made intensive efforts to preserve and revive remnants of the natural forest which had survived the ravages of successive occupations. Trees and forests had been planted in the interest of all the inhabitants in the area, Jew and Arab alike. However, the leaders of the disturbances had ordered their henchmen to burn the land and had declared 6 June 1988 as a day for setting Israeli agricultural property on fire. In September the forests of Mount Carmel had been turned into a charred wasteland, as a result of a forest fire that had been ignited by an arsonist. An Arab terrorist organization had taken credit for the destruction of approximately 2,000 acres of the oldest forests.

5. The struggle in Israel concerned not only its borders, but its very existence and was directed not only against Israelis but also against the Jewish people. From 1936 to 1939, although Israel had not yet come into existence and there had not been any occupied territories, scores of Jews had been attacked and murdered. The wars of 1948 and 1967 had been waged in opposition to the very existence of the State of Israel, not because of occupied territories.

6. The current disturbances were superfluous, because Israel was committed to a peace initiative, including the holding of elections, aimed at altering the current situation and reaching a negotiated settlement. Moreover, the disturbances were futile, because Israel had demonstrated that it would not be stampeded by rioters any more than it had been crushed by the wars of aggression waged against it. The self-serving Palestinian leaders wished to prevent truly free elections. They knew that they would be replaced by a new leadership, which they were suppressing through terror and international pressure. Israel did not know of other law enforcement authorities which, under similar circumstances, had succeeded in using less force and in totally eliminating incidents of police and military excesses. Nevertheless, it would spare no effort to achieve the highest standards possible.

7. Israel was not impressed by sermons on human rights delivered by Governments in the Middle East or elsewhere, which did not even practice what they preached. True to tradition, the Special Committee's report (A/44/599) was a propaganda pamphlet, produced and distributed at United Nations expense. He regretted that such smoke-screens were allowed to impede the true road to progress.

8. Mr. KHANI (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Israel had made his usual statement of lies and false claims in justification of Israel's military occupation, which was the result of an act of aggression, as defined by international laws and resolutions. Israeli practices in the occupied territories constituted a moral and ethical affront not

/...

(Mr. Khani, Syrian Arab Republic)

only to the Arabs but to the entire international community. The inhabitants of the occupied territories were treated inhumanly and tortured and murdered with glee, as shown by the recent events in Beit Sahur. Since the beginning of the intifadah, over 600 Arab children had been killed in retaliation for mere demonstrations, strikes, stone throwing and other peaceful forms of opposition to the occupation. The Arabs could not passively and silently accept the oppression of the occupation, even if Israel had managed to induce the Western world to do so. Zionist fanatics all over the world blamed Palestinian children for the events in the occupied territories, accusing stone throwers of terrorism. The international community was urged to put a stop as soon as possible to the criminal Israeli practices in the occupied Arab territories.

19. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer for Palestine), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that people who lived in glass houses should not throw stones. Israel's lengthy statement contained lies and distortions. Referring to the etymology of the word "assassin", he noted that the Prime Minister of Israel had been involved in activities to assassinate some of his own colleagues, as had been reported in respected magazines and newspapers.

20. Israel had tried to convince the Committee that the PLO did not care about children and that the crimes of the occupying Power could be justified. In that case, the reports of UNRWA, the International Committee of the Red Cross and the United States Department of State would merely be falsehoods. Similarly, the relevant General Assembly resolutions would be lies and propaganda. It would be interesting too to know whether President Mitterrand had been lying when he had recently stated that Israel's crimes in the occupied territories had lasted too long and should immediately come to an end. The leaders of Israel were detached from reality. It was high time for them to respect international law and United Nations resolutions.

21. He was touched by the plight of his people under the occupation and wished to extend a hand to anyone who would take part in the march towards peace. While the Palestinian peace initiative was supported by nearly all countries, Israel's proposal was not endorsed by anyone. Even the United States of America had only given it qualified support. He challenged Israel to accept the internationally supported proposal to convene an International Peace Conference on the Middle East. The international community should bring pressure to bear on Israel to cease its crimes in the occupied territories and to participate in such a conference.

22. Mr. BURAYZAT (Jordan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply to the Israeli claim that Palestinian children were being deployed and activated, quoted a British study prepared in Arabic, which showed that Palestinian children had been victims of the barbarous repression of the intifadah. Israeli soldiers and settlers frequently raided Palestinian homes and beat their occupants. The Israeli army encouraged settlers to commit barbarous crimes against defenceless Palestinian civilians, including children between the ages of nine months and seven years, who formed a large proportion of victims. He cited numerous examples of such barbarous practices, which included the use of live ammunition, tear-gas, rifle butts and

(Mr. Burayzat, Jordan)

clubs, sometimes resulting in death. Children had been given poisoned drinks, and poisoned candy had been dropped from helicopters. Those were not isolated incidents. Settlers had kidnapped children from their homes and tortured them. It was claimed that rubber bullets did not kill, however, it was abundantly documented that they could and did blind children. There was one case of forcible abduction of a one-and-a-half-year-old child, who could not possibly have thrown stones.

23. Such methods were part of an organized campaign of extermination. Curfews obliged people to remain in their homes. When Israeli patrols saw pregnant women or young children in their own houses, they threw in tear-gas with the intent of killing. Such practices during curfew were an important factor in infant mortality and miscarriages.

24. The 1967 war had not been defensive but a planned offensive action, on the admission of Israeli leaders themselves.

Consideration of draft resolutions (A/SPC/44/L.19 and Corr.1, L.20-25)

25. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), introducing draft resolutions A/SPC/44/L.19 and Corr.1, and L.23 to L.25 on the report of the Special Committee, and reviewing their major points, said that India had joined the sponsors of the first and last of those draft resolutions. The Special Committee's report had reflected the harrowing realities of the situation of the Palestinians living under the yoke of Israeli occupation, their heroic efforts to regain their freedom and dignity, and the obduracy and ruthlessness of Israel. He saluted the boldness and dynamic leadership of the PLO in confronting the situation. Israel held the key to a solution of the conflict: it should heed world opinion and immediately restore freedom and human rights to the Palestinian people.

26. Mr. BHATTI (Pakistan), introducing draft resolutions A/SPC/44/L.20, L.21 and L.22 and reviewing salient paragraphs, said that they dealt respectively with three subjects of particular concern: the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War; the measures taken by Israel to change the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition of the occupied territories; and arbitrary detention of Palestinians by Israel. The past two years had been a study in contrasts: there had been a blatant pursuit by Israel of repressive practices that violated the rights of the Palestinian people, as against the political realism shown by the Palestinian leadership in its declaration of the independence of Palestine and its acceptance of all relevant United Nations resolutions. The Palestinian position offered Israel an opportunity to work towards a peace settlement, which it should seize.

27. Mr. URBANCIC (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his country had a strong interest in the human rights situation in the occupied territories and maintained a dialogue with the Government of Israel on the subject. Where the United States disagreed with Israeli policies and practices, it made those views known to the Government of Israel and would continue to do so. His Government could not support resolutions that made no

/...

(Mr. Urbancic, United States)

contribution to safeguarding the human rights of the Palestinians in the occupied territories or to advancing the search for a just and lasting peace in the region. The one-sided, inflammatory language of the draft resolutions before the Committee only served to divide the parties further and make a negotiated settlement more remote. His delegation once again urged an end to such sterile rhetoric and the adoption of a more constructive approach, focusing on the real need for reconciliation and dialogue between the parties.

28. His country strongly objected to draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.19 in particular, with its sweeping condemnation of a long list of unsubstantiated Israeli practices, including the reference to the "torture of children and minors" and the characterization of breaches of the Geneva Convention as "war crimes and an affront to humanity". Nor could it support language urging the Security Council to consider measures to secure "international protection" for the Palestinian inhabitants of the occupied territories, since that was impractical and did not address the underlying problems. Additionally, his delegation reiterated its objection to the expense the Special Committee imposed on the United Nations budget, particularly at a time when the Organization's financial resources were so scarce.

29. It was well known that his country supported the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, and his delegation had therefore requested a separate vote on paragraph 1 - which it supported - of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.20. It would, however, abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, because its strident rhetoric did nothing to resolve the problems it sought to address.

30. His country had clearly stated its opposition to further Israeli settlement activity in the occupied territories, viewing it as an obstacle to peace. However, it would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.21 since it believed that debate on the legalities of the issue only diverted attention from the real task of promoting peace through direct negotiations.

31. The United States had consistently opposed the practice of administrative detention; however, because draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.22 did not address the legitimate security problems that existed in the occupied territories, his delegation would vote against it. Similarly, his country had repeatedly stated that it considered Israel's deportation of Palestinian residents from the occupied territories to be inconsistent with the fourth Geneva Convention and that those deported should be permitted to return. It was nevertheless obligated to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.23 because its harsh polemics provided no realistic means of addressing the problem.

32. Security Council resolution 497 (1981) had declared the Israeli decision to impose its law, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights null and void and without international legal effect. The United States opposed any unilateral action to determine the status of territories occupied by Israel in 1967, for that was an issue for negotiation in accordance with Security

(Mr. Urbancic, United States)

Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). The United States position was that the Golan was occupied Syrian territory and that the fourth Geneva Convention applied therein. Again, however, the harsh and unbalanced rhetoric of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.24 mandated a United States abstention.

33. In spite of United States concern over the current situation with respect to education in the occupied territories, it objected to draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.25 because its sweeping condemnations of Israeli policies and practices were unjustified and counter-productive.

34. Lastly, his delegation objected to phrases such as "Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem", appearing in the various resolutions. It considered that such phrases described the territories demographically and - particularly in the case of Jerusalem which must remain undivided - did not prejudge their status, which could only be resolved through negotiation.

35. A separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.19 and Corr.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Greece, Hungary, Kenya, Liberia, Malawi, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Samoa, Suriname, Sweden, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

36. Paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.19 and Corr.1 was adopted by 75 votes to 20, with 28 abstentions.

37. Mr. ALEMU (Ethiopia) said that he had intended to abstain in the separate vote on paragraph 6.

38. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.19 and Corr.1 as a whole.

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

Against: Israel, United States of America.

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

39. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.19 and Corr.1 as a whole was adopted by 93 votes to 2, with 31 abstentions.

40. A separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.20.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Malawi, Venezuela.

1. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.20 was adopted by 124 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

2. Mr. ACOSTA (Venezuela) said that his delegation had intended to vote in favour of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

3. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.20 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana,

Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Malawi, United States of America, Zaire.

44. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.20, as a whole, was adopted by 124 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

45. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.21.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Kenya, United States of America, Zaire.

46. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.21 was adopted by 123 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

47. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.22.

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

48. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.22 was adopted by 124 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

49. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.23.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic

Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, 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.

Abstaining: United States of America.

50. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.23 was adopted by 125 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

51. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.24.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain

and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Kenya, Malawi, United States of America, Zaire.

52. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.24 was adopted by 122 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

53. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.25.

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

54. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.25 was adopted by 125 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

55. Mr. ZAWELS (Argentina), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolutions because they generally reflected his Government's position on the Middle East. It none the less had reservations regarding terms in paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.19 that were not directly related to the topic and could be interpreted ambiguously.

56. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria) said that Austria had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.19 and Corr.1 because, while it agreed with the basic thrust, it found some of its formulations unacceptable, particularly the legal qualification of certain acts in paragraph 6 which, in Austria's view, could only be made by a competent judicial authority.

57. Mr. HOSSEINI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions despite its reservations regarding all terms and implications of recognition of the Zionist régime, which Iran believed must unconditionally withdraw from all territories, even those occupied prior to 1967.

58. Mr. ELLEFSEN (Norway) said that it had voted in favour of three of the draft resolutions, A/SPC/44/L.22, L.23 and L.24, even though it had reservations about some of the formulations. It was crucial for Israel and the Palestinians to seize the opportunity for progress towards negotiations. Both sides should try to build trust so that the circle of violence and hatred might eventually be broken, and the world community must aid them in doing so. Norway supported the efforts by involved parties to launch a dialogue between Israel and the Palestinians and hoped for the early convening of such a meeting on Egyptian soil, as proposed.

59. Mr. LYNCH (New Zealand) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.22, that should not, however, be taken as indicating approval of the use of violence, which New Zealand condemned. Moreover, New Zealand interpreted all references in the draft resolutions to "occupied Palestinian territories" as including only those occupied by Israel since 1967.

60. Ms. von HEIDENSTAM (Sweden) said that her delegation had voted in favour of six of the draft resolutions but had been obliged to abstain on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.19 as well as on paragraph 6 of that resolution. While supporting most of the substance of the resolution, especially the condemnation of various Israeli policies and practices in paragraphs 8 and 9, it was not convinced that all the formulations of those paragraphs were fully justified by proven facts. Also it found that paragraphs 12 and 13 went beyond the competence of the General Assembly.

61. It should further be pointed out that Sweden's support for draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.24 in no way altered Sweden's stand on resolution ES-9/1, recalled in the preamble, against which Sweden had voted in 1982.

62. Ms. THOMSEN (Canada) pointed out that, in voting for draft resolutions A/SPC/44/L.23 and L.25, Canada had interpreted the term "occupied Palestinian territories" as referring to the West Bank, Gaza and East Jerusalem, occupied after 1967. Its vote in favour of those draft resolutions in no way implied a change of Canada's view on the status of those territories.

63. Mr. PAOLI (France), speaking on behalf of the 12 members of the European Community, said that they attached the highest importance to human rights and to respect for international law, which precluded the acquisition or occupation of land by force. The Twelve had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions except draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.19, on which they had abstained because of the formulation of certain paragraphs. They condemned violence and sought negotiation as the only solution.

(Mr. Paoli, France)

64. It should be noted, regarding paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.23, that the Twelve had not voted in favour of all the resolutions mentioned therein.

65. Mr. BAMSEY (Australia), speaking in explanation of vote, said that although his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution L.23, had there been a separate vote on paragraph 1, his delegation would have abstained, as that paragraph referred to certain General Assembly resolutions that Australia had not supported. His delegation also wished to place on record that any reference under item 77 or any other item to "occupied Palestinian territory", "the Palestinian territory occupied by Israel since 1967", "Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967" or other variations were understood by Australia to refer only to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967.

AGENDA ITEM 76: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued) (A/SPC/44/L.5 and Corr.1, L.8-14, L.15 and Corr.1, L.16, L.17)

66. Mr. URBANCIC (United States of America), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.5 on assistance to Palestine refugees, observed that the resolution would authorize extension of the mandate of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) for another three years. Long committed to a negotiated settlement that would bring a just and durable peace to the Middle East, the United States had traditionally sponsored the resolution as a sign of its concern over the plight of the Palestine refugees and its strong support for the Agency's vital humanitarian programmes, to which it had always been a major contributor. The United States called upon the international community to contribute generously to UNRWA and to adopt the draft resolution.

67. Mr. BAS BACKER (Netherlands), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.9 on behalf of the sponsors, outlined its major points. It was unfortunate that part of UNRWA's programme, in particular emergency assistance, had had to be postponed. In order to carry out the emergency programmes in 1990, additional funds would be required. As the debates in the Committee had illustrated, the needs of the refugees were greater than ever. Given the difficult financial situation of the Agency, the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA had an important task in monitoring the financial situation and helping the Agency to find ways and means to continue its commendable work. It was to be hoped that, as in previous years, the Committee would adopt draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.9 without a vote.

68. Ms. von HEIDENSTAM (Sweden), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.8 on behalf of the sponsors, said that, as in previous years since 1967, the objective of the draft resolution was to reconfirm the Assembly's endorsement of UNRWA's efforts to provide assistance to persons who had become displaced and were in serious need of assistance as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities. The sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.8 were confident that it would be approved by consensus.

69. Mr. JALAL (Bangladesh), introducing draft resolutions A/SPC/44/L.10, L.13, L.14 and L.16 on behalf of the sponsors, drew attention to their major points.

/...

(Mr. Jalal, Bangladesh)

Bangladesh had repeatedly stressed the value of the work accomplished by UNRWA since its establishment in providing education, health and relief services to Palestine refugees and had consistently expressed its concern at the prolongation of their desperate plight. His delegation condemned Israel for its illegal occupation of Palestine and the Arab territories and demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from those territories so that the refugees could return to their homes and live in peace and dignity, in the safety and security of their own free and sovereign homeland. Bangladesh emphasized the need for Member States to provide grants and scholarships for higher education, including vocational training for Palestine refugees, and also the establishment of the University of Jerusalem Al-Quds. For its part, his Government had been offering scholarships to Palestinian students studying in Bangladesh.

70. Mr. KHITAB-KHAN (Pakistan), introducing draft resolutions A/SPC/44/L.11, L.12, L.15 and Corr.1 and L.17 on behalf of the sponsors, outlined their major points and drew attention to the following oral revision of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.15/Corr.1:

"1. Holds Israel responsible for the security of the Palestine refugees in the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967 and calls upon it to fulfil its obligations as the occupying Power in this regard, in accordance with the pertinent provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949; 4".

71. He expressed the hope that the draft resolutions would receive the overwhelming support of the Committee so that UNRWA could provide at least a minimum of assistance in order to alleviate the sufferings of the Palestine refugees.

72. Mr. GORDON (Israel), said that his delegation had taken note with regret that most of the draft resolutions being considered were manifestly one-sided. They served political goals and ran counter to the true interests of the refugees.

73. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.17 was a case in point. It purported to protect Palestinian schools and students, but it did not address the problem of child abuse and school abuse by instigators and rioters egged on by terrorist organizations. It did not call upon leaders, educators and parents to leave the children and schools alone and to refrain from embroiling them in violence. The reason for that shocking omission was that the instigators knowingly intended to allow children to be crippled physically and educationally so that they could arouse sympathy and score political points.

74. A similar inhuman approach was manifested in draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.11, paragraph 1, which was directed against the humanitarian project of refugee rehabilitation that Israel had been carrying out in the Gaza area since 1972. That demand, which had been repeated for years, demonstrated how inconsistent the political interests of the forces behind the draft resolution were with the interests of the refugees. Once the refugees had been given the opportunity to choose, they had voted against that resolution with their feet, close to 150,000

(Mr. Gordon, Israel)

people having moved out of the camps of their own volition to inhabit neighbourhoods nearby.

75. Instead of meeting the needs of the refugees, the United Nations machinery was being used to impose upon the refugees policies that were against their best interests. The PLO, that self-styled leadership, feared the independent decision of the refugees and the truly free elections called for by Israel in its peace initiative. The PLO was attempting to silence any departure from its line through a campaign of terror against Palestinian Arabs, including UNRWA staff, and he referred to a number of recent assaults in which UNRWA staff members had been murdered or wounded by Palestinian terrorists.

76. Mr. AL-SALLAL (Kuwait), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of Israel was reading a statement in disregard of the rules of procedure.

77. The CHAIRMAN said that it was his understanding that any delegation could make a statement in connection with the draft resolutions under consideration.

78. Mr. GORDON (Israel) said that, while the draft resolutions castigated Israel for purported violations of UNRWA staff privileges, they ignored the murder and attempted murder by terrorist organizations of Palestinians employed by UNRWA. The selective morality of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.11 was also seen in the fact that nowhere did it mention the numerous cases of UNRWA staff members who had been detained in Syria for a number of years. One could easily imagine the storm of protests that would have been directed against Israel had it been detaining those UNRWA employees.

9. Mr. BURAYZAT (Jordan), speaking on a point of order, said that the debate on agenda item 76 had already been completed; he asked the Chairman where in the rules of procedure it was stated that a delegation could make a statement at the current stage of debate.

0. The CHAIRMAN said that it was the customary practice of the Special Political Committee that before a decision on a draft resolution there could be general statements made regarding those draft resolutions. Any delegation that so desired could speak before the vote to present its position on the draft resolutions under consideration, and the Committee could decide to proceed with a vote once there were no further speakers.

1. Mr. AL-KAHTANY (Saudi Arabia), speaking on a point of order, said that his delegation did not understand the procedure. Delegations had already made statements on the draft resolutions under consideration, and if they were to do so again, it would be necessary to hold another meeting.

2. The CHAIRMAN said that the general debate had been concluded. But, under the rules of procedure, any delegation that wished to speak in connection with the draft resolutions could do so before the Committee proceeded to explanations of vote before the vote. He therefore asked the representative of Israel to continue

(The Chairman)

his statement, reminding him to address only the draft resolutions under consideration.

83. Mr. GORDON (Israel) said that the murder of UNRWA staff members by Palestinian terrorists or those who had been long detained or even died in Syrian prisons had not elicited a single resolution. Apparently it was the intention of the Special Political Committee to send a message to Syria that the detention of UNRWA staff members could proceed indefinitely, because the United Nations was indifferent to their fate and to that of the UNRWA staff in Gaza, Judea and Samaria and that UNRWA staff members had better obey the terrorist organizations, because the United Nations was not prepared to protect them against assassination and torture. The Special Political Committee was following a double standard in the draft resolutions under consideration, and his delegation would vote accordingly.

84. Mr. BURAYZAT (Jordan), speaking on a point of order, said that it was possible to depart from the rules of procedure in allowing delegates to make an introductory statement or to speak to draft resolutions only when those delegations had not made statements in the course of the general debate; furthermore, those delegations could only speak once. The delegation of Israel had made a second statement, and the Committee should not allow that to set a precedent.

85. The CHAIRMAN, referring to rule 113 of the rules of procedure as well as the rules of common sense, said that any delegation that would like to make a general statement should be allowed to do so.

86. Mr. URBANCIC (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the United States strongly supported UNRWA, as shown by its sponsorship of the annual resolution on "Assistance to Palestine refugees". It would also join in the traditional consensus on the draft resolutions contained in A/SPC/44/L.8 and L.9. However, he regretted that many of the other resolutions concerning UNRWA were highly politicized and contained unwarranted criticism of Israel's treatment of refugees, or made financially unsound proposals. His delegation would therefore vote against those resolutions.

87. It would support draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.10 with a reservation regarding paragraph 5 concerning a proposed Jerusalem University "Al-Quds", which it did not support. It would not support draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.11 because it referred to an "inalienable right of return" but failed to mention the peace negotiations that would be necessary to resolve the underlying issues. With respect to requesting the Secretary-General to resume issuance of identification cards to all Palestinian refugees and their descendants, the Commissioner-General should be able to administer UNRWA's programmes without such outside interference. The United States opposed the destruction of dwellings but did not object in principle to the concept of voluntary relocation. The United States had traditionally opposed draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.12 because it ran counter to the judgement of the Commissioner-General that the real need for general ration distribution had ended. The United States would oppose draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.13 because it again reaffirmed the right of return without reference to the necessary direct negotiations. It would oppose draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.14 because it sought to

(Mr. Urbancic, United States)

prejudge the question of refugee compensation outside the context of a negotiated settlement.

88. The United States would oppose draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.15 because the measures urged clearly exceeded UNRWA's mandate. In 1982 the United Nations Legal Counsel had pointed out that Israel, as the occupying Power, had the authority and responsibility to maintain security in the area. The United States would oppose draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.16 because it was neither practical nor appropriate for the General Assembly to concern itself with the establishment of an institution such as the University of Jerusalem "Al-Quds". The United States would vote against draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.17. Despite its deep concern over school closures and disruption of UNRWA's activities, it objected to the harsh condemnation of Israel in that text.

89. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.5 and Corr.1.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: Dominica, Israel.

90. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.5 and Corr.1 was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

91. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.9, informed the Committee that, according to the Programme Planning and Budget Division, the assistance necessary for the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA to carry out its task would involve the provision of services to 10 one-day meetings, with no additional cost. It was his understanding that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

92. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.9 was adopted without a vote.

93. The CHAIRMAN said that it was his understanding that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.8 without a vote.

94. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.8 was adopted without a vote.

95. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.10.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

96. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.10 was adopted by 131 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

97. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.11, informed the Committee that, according to the Programme Planning and Budget Division, the Secretary-General had indicated that he was unable to comply with the request contained in paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 43/57 E. All refugee families currently registered with UNRWA received registration cards issued by the Agency; however, the Commissioner-General did not have the means to issue identity cards. Should that draft resolution be adopted, the Secretary-General would keep the situation under review regarding appropriate documentation of the registration status of individual members of refugee families.

98. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.11.

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

99. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.11 was adopted by 130 votes to 2, with no abstentions.

100. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.12.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian

Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, 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, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Greece, Guatemala, Spain.

101. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.12 was adopted by 108 votes to 20, with 4 abstentions.

102. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.13.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

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

103. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.13 was adopted by 108 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions.

104. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.14.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

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

105. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.14 was adopted by 107 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions.

106. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.15 and Corr.1, as orally revised.

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

107. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.15 and Corr.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 130 votes to 2, with no abstentions.

108. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.16, informed the Committee that, according to information provided by the Programme Planning and Budget Division, the functional feasibility study on the proposed University of Jerusalem "Al-Quds" had not been completed as planned. Thus, the Secretary-General was not in a position to foresee related programme budget implications. Should the situation change during 1990, he would initiate action under the provisions of the resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses in the biennium 1990-1991.

109. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.16.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria,

Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, 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.

110. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.16 was adopted by 130 votes to 2, with no abstentions.

111. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.17.

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

Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, 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: Malawi.

112. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.17 was adopted by 127 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

113. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria), speaking in explanation of vote, said that Austria had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.11 on the understanding that paragraphs 2 and 3 would be considered in the light of the means available to the Agency and the actual possibilities of compliance with the requests contained therein.

114. Mr. ELLEFSEN (Norway) said that Norway was deeply concerned about the situation in the occupied territories. Although it had voted in favour of the draft resolutions, it had done so with reservations.

115. Mr. EHLERS (Uruguay) said that, as usual, Uruguay had voted in favour of the draft resolutions, as it shared the humanitarian concerns for the residents of the occupied territories. It regretted, however, that draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.17 used condemnatory language, as such language was not the best way to achieve its objectives.

116. Ms. THOMSEN (Canada) said that her delegation understood that, in draft resolutions A/SPC/44/L.10, L.11, L.15 and L.17, the words "occupied Palestinian territory" referred to the West Bank, Gaza and East Jerusalem. Canada's vote in favour of those resolutions did not indicate any change in the view of her Government concerning the status of those territories.

117. Mr. BEN OMRAN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation had joined the consensus and had voted in favour of the draft resolutions but reaffirmed its reservations regarding all paragraphs directly or indirectly indicating recognition of the Zionist entity.

118. Mr. POLETTI (France), speaking on behalf of the 12 members of the European Community, expressed the firm support of the Twelve for UNRWA because of the indispensable services which it provided to refugees. Though in some cases they had been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolutions, that should not be construed as any restriction of support for the Agency. While welcoming the improvements in its financial status, the Twelve nevertheless echoed the concerns of the Commissioner-General with respect to the financial threat to the Agency in the near future, possibly affecting emergency operations. While they supported the political and humanitarian development of services to Palestinian refugees, the

(Mr. Poletti, France)

elve held reservations with regard to placing the senior official in unrealistic situations.

19. Mr. HOSSEINI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation's positive notes on the draft resolutions should not be construed as indicating any recognition of the Zionist régime. The Zionist forces of occupation must withdraw unconditionally from all occupied territories, including those occupied prior to 1967.

20. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer for Palestine) thanked all countries which had voted in favour of the draft resolutions on agenda items 77 and 76 in support of the Palestinian people. Such massive international backing would strengthen their resolve to sustain the glorious intifadah and put an end to Israeli occupation, permitting the attainment of their national rights. He wondered whether the Government of Israel would respond to that massive international outpouring by reconsidering its position and leaving its isolation in order to get down to the business of peace based on justice and fairness for all.

AGENDA ITEM 79: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued) (A/SPC/44/L.26)

21. Mr. RASTAM (Malaysia), introducing the draft resolution contained in document A/SPC/44/L.26 on behalf of the Group of 77, said that it sought to reaffirm the mandate given to the Committee on Information by General Assembly resolution 44/182. The text reflected the consensus achieved at the recent General Conference of UNESCO and, in the judgement of its sponsors, constituted a solid basis for consensus in the Committee. Unfortunately, time had run out before that was achieved. The Group of 77 had considered proposals made by others during negotiations and believed that, with time and understanding, they could all have been accommodated. But since consensus had proved elusive, the Group of 77 was obliged to table the draft for consideration. Once adopted, it would provide the basis for future work on questions relating to information both in the Committee on Information and in the General Assembly.

22. The CHAIRMAN said, with reference to the programme budget implications of the draft resolution, that according to the Programme Planning and Budget Division, the Secretary-General would initiate consultations with the new Government of Namibia immediately after independence concerning the establishment of the information centre referred to in part II, paragraph 1 (2) (h) of the resolution, if it was adopted by the General Assembly. He would then submit specific proposals to the General Assembly. No programme budget implications were anticipated for the other information activities referred to in the draft resolution, on which a recorded vote had been requested.

23. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.26.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile,

China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

124. Draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.26 was adopted by 107 votes to 2, with 20 abstentions.

125. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria), speaking in explanation of vote, said that Austria had voted in favour of the draft resolution because of the improvements made to the text since 1988. However, his delegation would have preferred a more complete reflection of the language adopted at the recent General Conference of UNESCO. Austria's positive vote did not imply any change in its position on the item but should be seen as encouragement to achieve a text that could be adopted by consensus in 1990.

126. Mr. ZEGELBONE (United States of America) said that, despite his delegation's hopes of achieving consensus, it had been forced to oppose the draft resolution because its terms might allow State control of the media and its agenda for the Department of Public Information (DPI) was not as balanced as had been hoped. He was optimistic that progress might be made on those issues at the spring session of the Committee on Information. A major objection to the resolution was that it called on DPI to focus on certain issues and regions, to the neglect of others of equal importance, and referred to General Assembly resolutions which presented a one-sided image of certain political situations. His delegation was also concerned about efforts to distort the meaning of the Charter regarding the importance of recruiting staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

127. On the broader question of information in the service of mankind, the call for the establishment of a new world information and communication order had taken on

(Mr. Zegelbone, United States)

connotations which could be used to oppose the ideals of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. His delegation therefore believed that the phrase was unacceptable in a document that called for those freedoms. However, the United States would be pleased to support a resolution which it felt could be truly effective in assisting public and private media organizations around the world to enter more forthrightly into the international flow of information.

28. Mr. GORDON (Israel) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because the United Nations and its Department of Public Information should provide objective information unaffected by political considerations. He regretted that the requirement for DPI to continue to cover the Middle East situation in accordance with relevant United Nations resolutions, as contained in part II, paragraph 1 (2) (g), of the draft resolution, meant the recruitment of DPI to promote the Arab side in the conflict.

29. Mr. YUAN Shibing (China) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, even though it had not retained the earlier reference to the principle of sovereign equality in the field of information as China would have wished.

30. Ms. LINDAHL OWENS (Sweden) said that her country's position on the issue and principles of a new world information and communication order was well known. Her vote in favour of the draft resolution reflected no change of position, but satisfaction with the progress made. Her delegation would have preferred the language produced by the recent General Conference of UNESCO to be more amply reflected in the text, and hoped that a draft which could command consensus might be achieved at the next session of the General Assembly.

31. Mr. KEMBER (New Zealand) said that the draft resolution demonstrated a clear effort to achieve common ground and his delegation endorsed its language, especially that in part II. However, it had been too soon to take the results of the recent General Conference of UNESCO properly into account. He had therefore abstained from voting and would prefer the subject to be reconsidered at the next meeting of the Committee on Information, with a view to achieving a text which could command consensus at the next session of the General Assembly.

32. Mr. KARINEN (Finland) said that although the draft resolution represented a considerable advance on the previous year's text, his delegation had abstained from voting for procedural reasons. In view of the results achieved by UNESCO, it felt that consensus should have been possible and hoped that the Committee on Information would achieve that goal at its next session.

33. Mr. LO-PINTO (France), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Community, expressed satisfaction that the text contained a number of improvements. However, further improvements were necessary in both operative parts of the draft resolution before there could be consensus. The members of the European Community had therefore abstained from voting in the hope that consensus could be achieved at the next meeting of the Committee on Information, where they would pursue their discussions with other regional groups in a positive spirit, taking into consideration the new strategy adopted in UNESCO.

/...

134. Mr. BAMSEY (Australia) said that he had abstained from voting because the draft resolution had not yet reached a stage at which the General Assembly should take a decision on its substance. His delegation would prefer to await the Committee on Information's consideration of the results of the recent General Conference of UNESCO, in the hope that consensus could be achieved in time for the next session of the General Assembly.

135. Mr. GREEN (Canada) said that his delegation had abstained from voting in the hope that efforts would continue in the Committee on Information to achieve the further improvements necessary for consensus.

136. Mr. SATO (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained from voting for similar reasons to those given by the representative of France. It too hoped that consensus could be achieved in 1990.

Candidacy of Nepal for membership of the Committee on Information

137. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee on Information had decided to submit the candidacy of Nepal for membership to the General Assembly for approval (A/44/21, para. 16). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to recommend the candidacy of Nepal for membership of the Committee on Information for approval.

138. It was so decided.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MR. RENE MOAWAD, PRESIDENT OF THE LEBANESE REPUBLIC

139. The CHAIRMAN said that he had just learned with profound shock and sorrow of the assassination in Beirut of Lebanon's newly elected President René Moawad. On behalf of the Committee, he paid tribute to President Moawad and expressed deepest condolences to the families of all those assassinated in that attack and to the Government and people of Lebanon.

140. Mr. ELLEFSEN (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Group of Western European and Other States, Mr. Al-SALLAL (Kuwait), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, Miss LEONCE (Saint Lucia), speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, Mr. OSMAN (Brunei Darussalam), speaking on behalf of the Group of Asian States, Mr. KOLANE (Lesotho), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, and Mr. BUSEK (Czechoslovakia), speaking on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States, also expressed condolences to the families of the deceased and to the Government and people of Lebanon.

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

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

The meeting rose at 2.20 p.m.