



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KORHONEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 75: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL* (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 79: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER-GENERAL (continued)
- (b) SPECIAL REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)
- (c) LETTER DATED 27 MARCH 1985 FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (d) NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TRANSMITTING THE SPECIAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER-GENERAL ON THE FINANCIAL SITUATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

* A full transcription of all statements made under this item will be issued in documents A/SPC/40/PV.16 et seq.

/...

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/40/SR.27
13 November 1985

/...

CONTENTS (continued)

- (e) LETTER DATED 30 MAY 1985 FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (f) REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)
- (g) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE (continued)
- (h) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

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

AGENDA ITEM 75: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/SPC/40/L.8-L.11, L.12/Rev.1, L.13-L.15)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolutions A/SPC/40/L.8 to L.11, L.12/Rev.1, L.13 and L.14 and to document A/SPC/40/L.15 containing the programme budget implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/SPC/40/L.11.
2. Mr. BARROMI (Israel) said that his delegation would vote against the seven draft resolutions submitted by Kuwait. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8 was absolutely preposterous. Ziyad Abu Ean, a convicted murderer who had been released on 20 May 1985 had been placed under administrative detention on 31 July 1985 for plotting to commit further criminal acts. The demand for his release was totally unwarranted. Furthermore, according to paragraph 1 of that draft resolution, persons who had been duly convicted and sentenced for committing horrible crimes, including murder, should also be released if they claimed to have fought for self-determination. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8 should be rejected.
3. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.9, his delegation's position concerning the applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, had been explained in previous statements. In any case, Israel abided by the humanitarian provisions of that Convention and the Hague Regulations. Referring to draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.10, he stressed that Israel was fully entitled to enhance the security of the occupied territories through the establishment of agricultural and urban centres. Furthermore, there was no legal justification for prohibiting Jews from living in the territories of the former British Mandate or in other areas.
4. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.12/Rev.1, he pointed out that the authority for expulsion orders was based on article 112 of the Defence (Emergency) Regulations of 1945, which had been in force under the British and Jordanian administrations. According to a decision of the Israel High Court of Justice, expulsion orders issued to protect public order and safety had nothing to do with the deportations for forced labour, torture and extermination which had occurred in the Second World War and had motivated the inclusion of article 49 in the fourth Geneva Convention. The High Court had found in the Abu Awad case that the objective of the expulsion order had been to remove the applicant from the country in order to prevent the danger which he constituted to public safety. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.12/Rev.1 was therefore unjustified and unacceptable.
5. His delegation also found draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.13 unacceptable. Under the Syrian administration, the Golan Heights had been a peripheral region with no local judicial system. Since the shifting of the lines had created a judicial and administrative void, the application of Israeli laws had endowed the area with normal legal guarantees, thus favouring its development. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.14 concerned the educational and cultural situation in the territories. In that regard, paragraph 70 of the report of the Secretary-General on living

/...

(Mr. Barrami, Israel)

conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian Territories (A/40/373) presented a totally different picture from that portrayed by the draft resolution, which referred to a systematic Israeli campaign of repression against and closing of universities and other educational and vocational institutions. The truth of the matter was that the six universities in question functioned normally and satisfactorily as long as foreign elements did not incite students to disturb the peace and commit acts of violence.

6. The charges made in draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11 were unfounded and, in certain cases were mere figments of imagination. The only possible explanation for the accusation of interference with family rights and customs was that the sponsors of the draft resolution resented the increasing consciousness of women's rights in the Israeli-administered territories, in contrast to the attitudes prevailing in the Arab countries.

7. Paragraph 9 of the draft resolution gave a totally distorted picture of the educational situation in the Golan District. In that regard, he recalled that in 1967 and 1968, a UNESCO commission had examined the Jordanian and Egyptian textbooks used by UNRWA schools in Judea, Samaria and Gaza in order to eliminate books or passages containing anti-Semitic remarks. Of the 127 textbooks examined, the Commission had recommended that 14 should be withdrawn entirely, 16 should be used only after modification, and 48 should be retained as they were. The Commission had also found that the textbooks on religion and history gave excessive importance to the problem of relations between the Prophet Muhammad and the Jews of Arabia, in terms tending to convince young people that the Jewish community as a whole had always been and would always be an irreconcilable enemy of the Muslim community. Since 1969, Jordan and Egypt had submitted their textbooks to UNESCO. Since Syria had refused to do so, Syrian textbooks were not allowed. Furthermore, there was no truth to the contention that Syrian students receiving higher education in Syria were not allowed to return.

8. Paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11 declared that Israeli's "grave breaches" of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 were "war crimes and an affront to humanity". That was the most shocking aspect of the whole text. An affront to humanity might be the proper term for the many crimes committed by the PLO. To use it against the Israeli people was an abominable offence. The unfortunately widespread practice in the United Nations of using irresponsible language and expressions must come to an end. Paragraph 6 of that draft resolution was a case in point. His delegation therefore called for an outright rejection of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that, if no delegations wished to explain their vote before the vote, the Committee would proceed to the vote on the draft resolutions under consideration. Recorded votes had been requested on all the draft resolutions and separate votes had been requested on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.9, paragraphs 6 and 21 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11, paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.12 and paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.14.

10. Mr. BURAYZAT (Jordan), speaking on a point of order, inquired whether the representative of Israel had already spoken in explanation of the vote.
11. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Israel had made a statement in connection with the draft resolutions.
12. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

13. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8 was adopted by 77 votes to 2, with 29 abstentions.
14. Mr. LAGORIO (Argentina) said that, if his delegation had been present during the vote, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8.
15. A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.9.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India,

Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Ivory Coast, Zaire.

16. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.9 was adopted by 117 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

17. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.9 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Ivory Coast, Liberia, Malawi, United States of America, Zaire.

18. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.9 was adopted by 114 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

19. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.10.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, 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.

Abstaining: Malawi, United States of America.

20. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.10 was adopted by 118 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

21. A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico,

/...

Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, 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, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Greece, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Malawi, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

22. Paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11 was adopted by 79 votes to 18, with 23 abstentions.

23. A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 21 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Toqo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Ivory Coast, United States of America, Zaire.

24. Operative paragraph 21 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11, was adopted by 117 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

25. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, Mongolia, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

26. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11 as a whole was adopted by 90 votes to 3, with 27 abstentions.

27. Mrs. NAVCHAA (Mongolia) said that, owing to a technical malfunction, her vote had not been correctly recorded. She had wished to vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11.

28. A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.12/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic,

Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Suriname, Swaziland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

29. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.12/Rev.1 was adopted by 98 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions.

30. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.12/Rev.1 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

/...

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Norway, Swaziland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

31. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.12/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 106 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions.

32. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.13.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Ivory Coast, Liberia, Malawi, Swaziland, United States of America, Zaire.

33. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.13 was adopted by 114 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

34. A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.14.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador,

/...

Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

35. Paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.14 was adopted by 84 votes to 2, with 34 abstentions.

36. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.14 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

/...

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

37. Draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.14 as a whole was adopted by 92 votes to 2, with 26 abstentions.

38. Mr. MALLIKOURTIS (Greece), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the position of his Government on the Middle East was well known, and that he had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions before the Committee, except for draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8, because the wording of paragraphs 4 and 8 was too vague and could lead to problems of international law.

39. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria) said that his Government rejected Israeli practices in the occupied territories and had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions, except draft resolutions A/SPC/40/L.8 and L.11, on which it had abstained. He had some difficulties with the wording of paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8, and, although the basic thrust of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11 was correct, he felt that the formulation was not acceptable. His country supported paragraph 21 in particular and had protested immediately after the closure of the medical facility in Jerusalem referred to in that paragraph.

40. Mr. IMMERMAN (United States of America) said that the adoption of a set of one-sided resolutions every year, retarded rather than advanced progress towards peace in the area. His country must therefore continue to oppose some and abstain from others; it was firmly committed to peace, and inflammatory rhetoric and unjustified allegations delayed the direct negotiations necessary for peace. The resolutions failed to recognize positive steps taken by the Government of Israel over the past year, and the members of the Committee should encourage further positive action by acknowledging improved conditions in the occupied territories.

41. His country opposed such practices as administrative detention but could not support draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8, which was an attempt to excuse acts of terrorism.

42. His country had requested a separate vote on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.9, in order to reiterate its view that the fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War was applicable to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967. His country had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, however, since it appeared to retard rather than promote a solution to the problem at issue. In addition, his delegation regarded the phrase "Palestinian and other Arab territories it has occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem" as being demographically and geographically descriptive but not indicative of sovereignty.

/...

(Mr. Immerman, United States)

43. His Government believed that further settlement activity in the occupied territories was not necessary for the security of Israel, but had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.10 because it diverted attention from the basic question of whether the settlements advanced or hindered a just and lasting peace.

44. His country had voted against resolution A/SPC/40/L.11 because it was unbalanced and would only widen differences and inflame an already embittered situation. His country also wished to record its objection to the expense which the Special Political Committee imposed on the budget of the United Nations; and it regarded that an unwise diversion of scarce resources.

45. His country had abstained in the vote on paragraph 21 because, although it shared the concern expressed for the welfare of the residents of Jerusalem and their proper health care and over the procedure followed in closing the Hospice, the paragraph did not recognize that one of the factors in the decision to close the Hospice had been the fact that it was a property of the Austrian Catholic Church, which wished to return it to its original function as a pilgrims' hostel.

46. His delegation had abstained in the vote on resolution A/SPC/40/L.12/Rev.1 because it did not contain any reference to the contributory factors to the deportation of the individuals in question. His country did, however, believe that the deportations were contrary to the fourth Geneva Convention and that the deportees should be allowed to return.

47. His country had also abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.13. The Golan Heights were occupied territory and the fourth Geneva Convention applied there; Israel, as the occupying Power, should meet its obligations thereunder. It also continued to support Security Council resolution 497 (1981) which declared the imposition of Israeli law, jurisdiction and administration in the Golan Heights null and void. However, draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.13 went far beyond the Security Council resolution.

48. His country had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.14 because of its condemnatory language and inflammatory nature. His country strongly defended the principle of economic freedom and had made its views known where Israeli practices towards economic institutions in the occupied territories had been open to criticism. It could, however, not support indiscriminate condemnation without regard to the facts.

49. His delegation continued to believe that direct negotiation on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) was the only way to reach a just and lasting peace, and it had been encouraged by the progress made over the past year.

50. Mrs. MARTIN (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote, said that draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8 presented some difficulties relating to questions of fact. Her country was, however, concerned about arrest without trial and about detention; she had therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8, paragraph 1, and A/SPC/40/L.12/Rev.1, paragraph 1.

51. Mr. WOLLTER (Sweden) said that his country was convinced that the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War was applicable to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967. The annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights was a flagrant violation of international law. Israel could also improve the prospects for peace by dismantling the settlements in the occupied territories.
52. Although his delegation could support most of the content of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11, it was not convinced that all of paragraph 8 was fully justified by proven facts. Since draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11 also went beyond the competence of the General Assembly, his delegation had abstained in the vote on that text and in the vote on paragraph 6.
53. The wording of paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8 was too sweeping and his delegation had not been able to support that draft resolution.
54. His country's support for draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.13 did not alter its stand on General Assembly resolution ES-9/1, which it had voted against.
55. His country had abstained in the separate vote on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.14 because of its categorical and sweeping formulation, which was not fully borne out by the facts. It was however in general agreement with the main thrust of the draft resolution and with some hesitation had supported the text as a whole.
56. Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his country supported all the draft resolutions, but wished to record its reservations concerning any references which could be interpreted as implying willingness to recognize Israeli occupation.
57. Mr. LAGORIO (Argentina) said his country had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions. It wished however to register its concern about some references in the texts which were not in accordance with the subject-matter of those texts.
58. Mr. CABANAS (Mexico) said that his country had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions before the Committee, and that they were compatible with the information in the report of the Special Committee (A/40/702), even if their wording was not always the best.
59. If Israel challenged the report of the Committee, then its Government should give the Special Committee all the facilities to allow it to do its work and permit it to visit the occupied territories. His country appealed to the Government of Israel to provide full information on the situation in the occupied territories.
60. Mr. AB OUASSI (Lebanon) said that he had not been present to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8. Had he been present, he would have voted in favour of that text.

61. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Iran, Islamic Republic of), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the criminal practices of the Zionists in Palestine were to be expected because Zionism was evil. The Muslim world was united in its desire to hoist the flag of Palestine over the State of Israel.

62. His country regretted that the United States sacrificed its own interests to support the Zionist occupation of Palestine.

63. Certain paragraphs in draft resolutions A/SPC/40/L.8, L.9, L.10, and L.11 were inconsistent with that position, because they implied recognition of the Zionist philosophy, and he wished to express his reservations concerning whole phrases and words which implied recognition of Israel.

64. Mr. BARRIOS (Spain) said that as in past years, he had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions, but had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8, not because of a change in policy, for his country's position on human rights was well known, but because the wording of paragraphs 1 and 4 was vague and open to interpretations in conflict with international law.

65. Ms. GUARDIA (Venezuela) said that, had she been present, she would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8.

66. Mr. EMPALO (Guinea-Bissau) said that, had he been present, he would have voted in favour of all the draft resolutions.

67. Mrs. CARRASCO (Bolivia) said that, had she been present, she would have voted in favour of all the draft resolutions.

68. Mr. NKOWE (Botswana) said that, had he been present, he would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.8.

69. Mr. ADAN (Somalia) said that, had he been present, he would have voted in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/40/L.8, L.9, L.10, L.11, L.12/Rev.1, L.13, L.14 and L.15.

70. Mr. ABDI (Ethiopia) said that, had he been present, he would have voted in favour of all the draft resolutions.

71. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) said that he appreciated all votes in favour of the draft resolutions as a sign of support to the just struggle for the self-determination of the Palestinian people.

72. The voting had revealed the isolation of two countries in the international community. It was difficult to see how the United States could consider itself qualified to pursue a just solution in the Middle East if it supported the closure of universities.

73. The only path to just peace in the Middle East lay in convening an international peace conference under United Nations sponsorship (General Assembly resolution 38/58) with PLO participation on an equal footing and with equal rights. The struggle would continue until the liberation of Palestine had been accomplished.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 79: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER-GENERAL (continued) (A/40/13 and Add.1)
- (b) SPECIAL REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued) (A/40/207)
- (c) LETTER DATED 27 MARCH 1985 FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/40/216)
- (d) NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TRANSMITTING THE SPECIAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER-GENERAL ON THE FINANCIAL SITUATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued) (A/40/299)
- (e) LETTER DATED 30 May 1985 FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/40/350)
- (f) REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued) (A/40/736)
- (g) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE (continued) (A/40/580)
- (h) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/40/543, 612-616, 756, 766)

74. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) said that, as an institution running schools, health centres and relief services for a very large number of Palestine refugees, UNRWA continued to play a central role in their lives.

75. His delegation was disturbed to learn that Israeli forces had blocked the Agency's relief supplies to south Lebanon and that Palestine refugees living in the Gaza Strip had experienced a marked deterioration in security during the previous two months. Moreover, since the beginning of July 1984, nine UNRWA staff members had been detained by the Israeli occupying authorities for interrogation and four of them were still in custody. Other matters of serious concern included recent Israeli action which had forced UNRWA to suspend its maintenance and construction programme in the Jabalia camp area and increased tensions on the West Bank, including confrontations between Israeli settlers and the local population.

76. His delegation hoped that better conditions would be created for UNRWA to carry on its services to the Palestine refugees and that the Secretary-General would use his good offices to obtain the release of the detained UNRWA staff members without further delay. It would also like to emphasize that, as UNRWA did not have either the necessary physical capability or the legal powers, the United Nations, and the Secretary-General in particular, should give urgent attention to the physical and legal protection of the Palestine refugee civilians.

/...

(Mr. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

77. His delegation had noted that UNRWA, faced by a bleak financial situation, had severely reduced its construction and maintenance activities and had adopted severe austerity measures. He urged all concerned, particularly donor countries, to provide the \$20 million required by the middle of 1986 if major cuts in the Agency's basic services were to be avoided. As 67 per cent of the actual budget in 1986 would be spent on education, it was to be feared that any shortfall would badly affect that vital sector of UNRWA operations. Under the deteriorating circumstances currently affecting the refugees, their reliance on UNRWA had increased greatly.

78. An informal meeting of interested Governments to discuss the Agency's continuing financial difficulties, as suggested by the Commissioner-General with the support of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA, could be a useful step. His delegation approved the Working Group's support for the Advisory Commission's proposal that the Commissioner-General should send fund-raising missions to current and prospective donor countries.

79. His delegation would like to express its deep appreciation to the Arab Gulf Programme for United Nations Development Organizations for its new contribution of \$535,000 to UNRWA's school building programme.

80. His delegation believed that General Assembly resolution 39/99 H, requesting the Secretary-General to establish a fund for the receipt of income derived from the administration of Arab property, assets and property rights in Israel on behalf of the rightful owners, should be implemented with a view to providing a permanent source of finance. It also felt that, as the occupying Power, the Israeli authority should pay UNRWA for its services. Bangladesh also supported the early establishment, under the aegis of the United Nations, of a University of Jerusalem to cater to the needs of the Palestine refugees in the area. It had noted with regret that the Israeli authorities continued to prevent any progress in that regard.

81. The main obstacle in the way to the solution of the Palestine question was Israeli intransigence and its aggressive and expansionist policies. Until the international community was in a position to act decisively to restore the rights of the Palestinian people, his delegation believed that the education, health and relief services provided by UNRWA not only helped Palestine refugees to be socially productive and to maintain a separate identity of their own but also contributed towards stability in the area.

82. His delegation proposed, as in previous years, to introduce a draft resolution which would provide a basis for combined efforts by the international community to resolve the question of Palestine.

83. Mr. NAZARI (Iran, Islamic Republic of) said that his delegation regretted that the continuing denial by the Zionist régime of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people had turned UNRWA into a perpetual charity institution.

84. It was imperative that, until the Palestinians could achieve their rightful aspirations, they should be properly compensated for the conspiracy which, since 1984, had been responsible for their current state. For decades, certain countries had unquestionably encouraged the arrogant attitude of the Zionist régime in denying that the Palestinians had any rights at all in their homeland. Those States should be held primarily responsible for providing a dignified standard of living for the Palestine refugees. The contribution of those countries to the annual budget of UNRWA was not enough to wipe out their past guilt.

85. His delegation was convinced that no relief service provided for the refugees could be a substitute for their dignity. The history of Palestine should be regarded as the record of a just struggle against indignity and not simply as a refugee case.

86. Mr. AL-ATTAR (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Zionist representative had clearly identified himself as an expert in the distortion of history when he had claimed that Syria had been responsible for the damage to UNRWA property. That was patently untrue; the responsibility had been Israel's and derived from its invasion of Lebanon in 1982. The Syrian presence in Lebanon had been the result of a joint decision by the countries of the Arab League to make every effort to restore peace and security in Lebanon, to preserve the unity of that country and to protect it against the Israeli invasion. His delegation would be interested to learn the grounds on which Israel based its calls for peace. If the Zionists were seriously interested in restoring peace, Israel should withdraw from all Arab and Palestinian territories.

87. Mr. DAAER (United Arab Emirates) said that the statement of the representative of Israel had been both absurd and disingenuous. He had claimed that the Arabs of Palestine were not of homogeneous stock, thus implying either that the Palestinians were an exception to the historical process of the amalgamation of peoples or that such a process had never existed. In the latter case, most of the countries represented on the Committee could not be regarded as homogeneous. The United Kingdom, for example, had been invaded by Celts, Romans, Anglo-Saxons, Gaels and Normans; Israeli logic would therefore have it that the United Kingdom population was not homogeneous.

88. The Israeli representative had said that he wished to dispel the illusion that the Arabs were the indigenous population of Palestine. If the Arabs were not the indigenous population, then who were? In 1922, the Arab population of Palestine had outnumbered the Jewish by more than seven to one. By 1944 however, as a consequence of Jewish immigration, that proportion had shrunk to a little over three to one. The truth was that Israel denied everything to the Palestinians, including even their very existence.

89. Mr. AL-HASSANI (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Zionists, who had earlier tried to rewrite international law to fit their expansionist designs, were now trying to rewrite history. Figures and statistics cited by the Zionist representative about the origins of Arab Palestinians reminded him of the observation by Mark Twain that there were "lies, damned lies and statistics". His references to so-called Arab immigration and to Jewish immigration had not mentioned the basic figures relating to the indigenous Arab population of Palestine, and had blamed everyone except the Zionists themselves for the creation of the Palestine refugee problem. The Zionist representative's essential claim was that what had happened before could not be undone, implying that the Palestinian question had been solved by a Zionist fait accompli and that all resolutions of the United Nations on the rights of the Palestinian people were null and void. He did not clarify whether what had happened 2,000 years ago could not be undone for the same reason. The Zionist representative had demanded that history should stop with the League of Nations mandate of 1921, but he should be reminded that history did not stop anywhere, nor at the bidding of anyone.

90. Mr. BARROMI (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that various representatives had disputed his contention that Palestine had been a desolate country before recent Jewish immigration. However, even Lawrence of Arabia had confirmed his contention by describing Jewish colonies, in 1909, as "bright spots in the desert". The important points to remember were the historical title of the Jewish people to the Holy Land, and the fact that the Arab population of Palestine had consisted to a large extent of immigrant workers or their descendants.

91. Syria had presented itself as a staunch defender of the Palestinian cause, but the reality was that Syria had consistently engaged in large scale anti-Palestinian operations, including massacres and attacks in Lebanon, and had also been responsible for the murder of the former Mayor of Hebron in December 1984. A possible explanation of Syria's policy was to be found in a book published in 1976 by the Druze leader, Kamal Jumblat, which stated that the Syrians continued to view the Lebanese, Palestinians, Jordanians and Syrians as the population of one country under Syrian domination, to consider Palestine as an integral part of Syria and to see Syrian leaders as the legal representatives of the Palestinian people. Jumblat had been assassinated by Syrian agents shortly after publication of the book. Syria remained the principal obstacle to any peace arrangement in the region.

92. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Israeli representative continued to make illogical statements and to discuss the policy of Syria instead of the question of the Palestine refugees. In speaking of those who fled from Palestine after the British Mandate, he had given the impression that the majority were Arab immigrant workers. However, figures compiled by the British showed that the total number of Arab immigrants to Palestine between 1922 and 1945 was no more than 37,000, whereas hundreds of thousands had fled in 1948. It was totally incorrect to claim that the rate of Arab immigration had been higher than that of Jewish immigration over the 23-year period.

93. Mr. AL-ATTAR (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Zionist representative had expressed keenness to preserve the life of Palestinians, but appeared to have forgotten that Israel was responsible for brutal massacres in the occupied territories and elsewhere. He had accused Syria of terrorism, but Israel had been guilty of terrorism in Lebanon in 1982 and had recently gone so far as to attack Tunisia. Israel, whose policy was based on colonialism and aggression, had violated all principles of international law.

94. Mr. BARROMI (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had been speaking, when referring to Arab immigration, of illegal Arab immigration. Documentation on the figures was not secret and could be consulted.

95. Mr. ABQUASSI (Lebanon), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that discussions should be limited to the agenda item under consideration. Israel appeared determined to forget the acts of violence perpetrated during the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. Lebanon, which had borne an unprecedented burden as a result of such aggression, was in the position of a plaintiff rather than a defendant, and demanded appropriate compensation.

96. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Zionist representative had tried to prove that Palestine was a country without a people but had been unsuccessful. He had tried to claim that the invasion of Arab countries in 1948 had been responsible for the creation of the refugee problem. However, the true cause of the refugee problem, of the creation of the Palestinian question and of the subsequent invasion and occupation of various Arab territories was the policy of terrorism, expansionism and racism practised by Israel.

97. The views expressed by certain Jewish leaders might persuade the representative of Israel to review his position. A letter signed by many eminent Jews and published in The New York Times on 4 December 1948 described the emergence of the Herut Party, under the leadership of Menachem Begin, as one of the most disturbing political phenomena of the time and compared its organizational methods, political philosophy and social appeal to those of the Nazi and Fascist Parties. Although it publicly advocated freedom, democracy and anti-imperialism, the real character of the Party was betrayed by its actions. Terrorist bands belonging to the Party had attacked the peaceful village of Deir Yassin and killed most of its inhabitants. Although the Jewish Agency had been horrified, the terrorists had been proud of the incident and invited foreign correspondents to view the corpses. The incident described in the letter exemplified the policy of expansionism, terrorism and racism pursued from the outset by the Herut Party, which constituted the backbone of the ruling Likud, and demonstrated the nature of Israel's leaders. It was that nature which caused the continuous threat to all Arab peoples, both in the occupied territories and elsewhere. The Committee should not be misled by the falsifications of the Zionist State.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.