

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FORTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records*



SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
15th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 4 November 1987
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 15th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar)

CONTENTS

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

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DK 2.790, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 79: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued) (A/SPC/42/L.6-L.8, L.9/Rev.1, L.10-L.16)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the draft resolutions relating to agenda item 79, issued as documents A/SPC/42/L.6 to L.16. With reference to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.7, he wished to inform the Committee that the Programme Planning and Budget Division had indicated that under the terms of operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide the necessary services and assistance to the Working Group for the conduct of its work. It was estimated that that provision would entail the servicing of 10 one-day meetings of the Working Group in 1988 as in previous years. On the understanding that those meetings would be scheduled in consultation with the Department of Conference Services, it was further estimated that no additional cost would arise.

2. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.6 entitled "Assistance to Palestine refugees", said that the United States recognized the important humanitarian role played by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) in providing educational and medical services to needy Palestinian refugees.

3. Totally committed to achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, his Government was working energetically towards that end. In the absence of a just and comprehensive settlement, his Government's continued support for UNRWA reflected its concern for the quality of life of those affected by the conflict. The United States remained a major financial supporter of UNRWA, having contributed well over \$1 billion to it over the years. Other nations had also responded to the plight of Palestinian refugees with generosity, and his delegation urged concerned countries to provide sustained support for UNRWA efforts.

4. The United States shared the concerns expressed by other speakers for the security of UNRWA employees who were often called to serve in most dangerous circumstances.

5. Mr. von BARTHELD (Netherlands) introduced draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.7 entitled "Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East" on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by Liberia. He said that the text as worded contained no substantial changes from the draft resolution adopted the previous year. Although the Agency had in 1986 managed for the first time in several years to balance its accounts, it had been felt necessary to express concern once again over UNRWA's financial situation in the preamble. The draft resolution therefore emphasized the continuing need for extraordinary efforts in order to maintain UNRWA activities at least at their current minimal level as well as to enable the Agency to carry out much-needed construction projects.

(Mr. von Bartheld, Netherlands)

6. In his report to the current session of the General Assembly and in his statement at a previous Committee meeting, the Commissioner-General had stated clearly that UNRWA's economic prospects for 1988 remained grim. The proposed budget for 1988 totalled some \$216.5 million. The increase of 6 per cent over the latest estimate for 1987 was a very modest one compared to the growing need resulting from the natural increase of the Palestinian refugee population. Attention must therefore be drawn to the report of the Working Group, in which the international community was asked to recognize that UNRWA would need additional support in 1988. The sponsors of the draft resolution hoped that the response of Member States to the many appeals of the Commissioner-General and the Working Group would enable UNRWA to overcome its financial problems. They also hoped that the Committee would adopt without a vote draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.7, extending the mandate of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA for another year.

7. Mr. LIDEN (Sweden) introduced on behalf of the sponsors draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.8 entitled "Assistance to persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities". Its objective was to reconfirm the General Assembly's endorsement of efforts by UNRWA to provide assistance to persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 war and subsequent hostilities. The sponsors of the draft resolution hoped that in 1987 it would again be adopted by consensus.

8. Mr. HANNAN (Bangladesh) introduced on behalf of the sponsors draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.9/Rev.1 entitled "Offers by Member States of grants and scholarships for higher education, including vocational training, for Palestine refugees", draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.12 entitled "Population and refugees displaced since 1967", draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.13 entitled "Revenues derived from Palestine refugee properties", and draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.16 entitled "University of Jerusalem 'Al-Quds' for Palestine Refugees".

9. Similar resolutions had been adopted by the General Assembly in the past, but the basic problem of refugees remained unchanged and had even deteriorated in some respects. That had made it necessary to reiterate some of the earlier decisions of the General Assembly. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolutions would have the Committee's overwhelming support. Implementation of the resolutions would facilitate the functioning of UNRWA and alleviate the sufferings of the Palestine refugees to some extent.

10. Mr. SHAH (Pakistan) introduced on behalf of the sponsors draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.10 entitled "Palestine refugees in the Gaza Strip", draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.11 entitled "Resumption of the ration distribution to Palestine refugees", draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.14 entitled "Protection of Palestine refugees", and draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.15 entitled "Palestine refugees in the West Bank". Reviewing the main elements of the draft resolutions, he expressed the hope that they would receive the overwhelming support of the Committee, at a time when UNRWA required unequivocal assistance to help alleviate the plight of millions of Palestinian refugees who were in a critical situation.

11. Mr. RAMIN (Israel) said that he wished to make a few comments on the draft resolutions that especially interested his Government. Regarding draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.6, he had already in the general debate given his views on paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 1948 and on that resolution as a whole, which had long since become outdated. Without repeating them, he wished the following comments to be recorded in extenso: any reference to paragraph 11 in the current draft resolution was out of place as it did not contribute to the goal of achieving a comprehensive settlement on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Moreover, such references could only add yet another obstacle on the road that might lead the parties concerned to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967) by direct negotiations. Those remarks applied also to draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.15.

12. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.9/Rev.1, Israel favoured the advancement of education and higher learning everywhere and greater education for all refugees, regardless of their origin. However, as evidenced by both the wording of paragraph 5 and the idea it expressed in the last two lines, the sponsors of that draft resolution had allowed themselves to be guided by purely political considerations having nothing to do with the question of refugees.

13. Draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.10 and L.15 made demands that were contrary to fundamental human consideration, for it was unreasonable to call upon Israel to refrain from providing the refugees in the Gaza Strip with more decent accommodations than in the camps, when the people concerned were themselves eager to move. When the refugees moved into new housing there was no change in their status, and they continued to retain all the privileges connected with it.

14. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.12 was completely out of touch with reality. In his statement on 28 October 1987, he had, however, clarified fully the security and other considerations which guided his Government concerning the return of persons displaced during the 1967 hostilities. Over 72,000 of them had already been permitted to return home.

15. To manage from abroad property situated in Israel, as draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.13 sought to do, was obviously a violation of the principle of the sovereignty of States which no Government would tolerate. Neither the representatives of the Arab States nor the sponsors of the draft resolution had ever suggested that the Organization should take similar steps to protect and administer Jewish property confiscated in Iraq, Syria or any other Arab country. There could be no difference in law, justice or equity between the claims of Arab and Jewish property owners, nor was it possible to limit or restrict Israel's sovereignty by some provision which did not apply to other Member States, since Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Charter stated categorically that the Organization was based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members.

16. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.16 should be unacceptable to all Member States because, by proposing to establish a university for Palestine refugees, it re-established the principle of segregation which the United Nations had always rejected. It might also be asked for which refugees that university was intended: if it was solely for Palestine Arab refugees, it was not clear why it should be

(Mr. Ramin, Israel)

established in Jerusalem rather than Damascus or Baghdad, or under the auspices of Qaddafi. If it was desired to generalize the segregation of refugees in the educational sphere, it should be established in Geneva. There were several universities in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip and the Hebrew university of Jerusalem, with its Institute of Oriental Studies, was open to all the refugees; it was already attended by hundreds of Arab students who had established, within the framework of the General University Students' Union, the Arab Students' Union.

16. Mr. AL 'ADDAWI (Iraq) speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the discussion had been closed and that the Committee was in the process of voting on the draft resolutions. By reopening the discussion, the representative of the Zionist entity was risking a resumption of polemics and sterile debate, and the Iraqi delegation would regretfully feel obliged to participate.

17. Mr. RAMIN (Israel) said that he was unable to accept the remarks of the delegation of Iraq: at the current stage of the debate, it was legitimate for any delegation to make comments so that others might take them into account when coming to their own decision. He had given examples to show that all the refugees had in fact the opportunity to profit from higher education in the territories administered by Israel.

18. The CHAIRMAN said that if no other member wished to speak, he would take it that the Committee was ready to take a decision on draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.6 to L.16.

19. It was so decided.

20. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.6.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 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, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of

Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

21. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.6 was adopted by 125 votes to none, with one abstention.
22. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.7 was adopted without a vote.
23. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.8 was adopted without a vote.
24. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.9/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 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, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

25. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.9/Rev.1 was adopted by 126 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

26. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/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, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 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, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Liberia, Zaïre.

27. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.10 was adopted by 123 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

28. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.11.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia,

Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Greece, Spain.

29. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.11 was adopted by 103 votes to 19, with 5 abstentions.

30. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.12.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

31. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.12 was adopted by 102 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions.

32. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.13.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

33. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.13 was adopted by 99 votes to 2, with 25 abstentions.

34. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.14.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Swaziland, Syria, 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, Venezuela,
Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire.

35. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.14 was adopted by 102 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions.

36. A recorded vote was taken on draft A/SPC/42/L.15.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 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, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia, Zaire.

37. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.15 was adopted by 121 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

38. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/42/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, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 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, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

39. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.16 was adopted by 125 votes to 2, with no abstentions.

40. Mrs. KALKKU (Finland), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.14 in order to express its deep concern for the security of the Palestine refugees as well as its strong support for all measures to improve their protection. Concerning paragraph 2 of the resolution, however, it was not the responsibility of the Secretary-General to guarantee the security of the refugees, since he had no means to do so. Her delegation also expressed strong reservations concerning paragraph 3, which was indefinite and sweeping in its wording. Finland's understanding was that the damages mentioned in paragraph 6 would be specified in the claim which UNRWA would present to the Israeli Government. Her delegation had also voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.10 in order to express its support for the measures to extend the Agency's services to the Palestine refugees in the Gaza Strip, with the understanding, however, that "all the services" would be extended within the limits of existing resources.

41. Mr. LIDEN (Sweden) said that his delegation had supported most of the draft resolutions because its foremost consideration had been the efficiency and credibility of UNRWA. It had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.14 but had reservations concerning some of its elements. Regarding paragraph 2, his delegation continued to feel that it was not proper to place upon the Secretary-General the responsibility of guaranteeing the safety of the refugees in circumstances where he had no means to do so. Also, the language in paragraph 3 was too sweeping. His Government had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/42/SPC/L.10 and L.15 because it supported their general thrust. Nevertheless, it interpreted the wording used in paragraph 1 of those two draft resolutions as an affirmation of Israel's obligation to refrain from transferring and resettling Palestine refugees against their will. Concerning draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.15, the definite article preceding the words "Palestine refugees" in the fifth preambular paragraph could be misleading.

42. Unfortunately, his delegation had not been able to support a few other draft resolutions, for, as many speakers had repeated, the improvement in the Agency's financial situation should not give rise to complacency. The maintenance of strict priorities in the Agency's operations continued to be imperative. Sweden supported the Secretary-General's decision to accord the highest priority to the educational and health care needs of the refugees and to relieving the neediest among them. Without sufficient financial resources, the resumption of the general ration distribution as requested in draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.11 would endanger those vital activities. Since the request to resume the general ration distribution was again formulated in a categorical way that left no room for the Commissioner-General to exercise his discretion and maintain necessary priorities, his delegation had voted against that proposal.

43. His country upheld the right of those Palestinians who had been displaced as a result of the 1967 war to return to their homes. It was greatly concerned at the Israeli measures taken in contravention of international law, which were affecting the physical and demographic structure of the occupied territories. However, his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.12 since its wording seemed to rule out the possibility of negotiations or discussions on the modalities of repatriation. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.13, his delegation agreed in principle with the sponsors that the Palestine refugees were entitled to their property or to compensation therefor. However, the settlement of such property claims should be dealt with not in isolation but in the context of a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict. His delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.13.

44. Mr. RAMIN (Israel) said that his delegation had been forced to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.6 because it contained an interpretation of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) which did not correspond to the interpretation which Israel had consistently given to it. Since the adoption of that resolution, there had been exchanges of population in the area, and a solution to the problem of the Arab and Jewish refugees in the Middle East could only be envisioned within that framework. Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) provided for a solution of the problem of refugees in the Middle East,

(Mr. Ramin, Israel)

both Jewish and Arab, through negotiations. Any reference to paragraph 11 of Assembly resolution 194 (III) could only place new obstacles in the way of negotiations.

45. He had been forced to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.9/Rev.1 because certain formulations contained in it showed that its true purpose was not the promotion of education but rather an unrelenting propaganda campaign against his country.

46. His delegation had voted against draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.10 and L.15 which displayed a certain degree of cynicism towards the refugees living in the Gaza Strip and disregarded their basic needs for housing. Those texts were new examples of the manoeuvres by which certain Arab countries were trying to promote their propaganda campaign against his country in the United Nations. Israel, however, would continue to act with concern for the real needs of the refugees.

47. He had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.12 because the destructive hostility visible in paragraph 2, directly endangered the peace process in the Middle East. He had also voted against draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.13, which illustrated once again the abusive manner in which the General Assembly was being used for the purposes of the Arab political campaign against Israel. A rational examination would show that there was no logical or legal basis for the measures contained in the draft resolution. In a sovereign State, property rights were governed exclusively by the national laws of that State, which alone was competent to administer and manage property located in its territory. Neither the Charter nor any other instrument gave the United Nations the power to intervene in the regulation of property rights in a Member State. For many years, Israel had managed the derelict lands in order to bring them into productive use; that had been effected with due respect for legality. As for the income, reference was usually made to purely imaginary and astronomical figures. In fact, the Israeli Government had spent vast sums on rehabilitating and developing derelict lands and property, while deriving no financial profit from that endeavour.

48. He had also voted against draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.16, which represented a case of special pleading, since it claimed special rights and privileges for one group of refugees, the Palestinian Arabs, who were among the most advanced in the Middle East in the field of education. It hardly seemed justified to accord preferential international treatment to the children of one group of refugees while other young people the world over, whether refugees or not, were desperately in need of aid. The idea of setting up a university in Jerusalem exclusively for the Palestinian Arab refugees did not meet the real needs for education. As everyone knew, there had been no university in the part of Jerusalem under Jordanian occupation from 1948 to 1967 or in the regions occupied by Jordan west of the Jordan River; but there were now several which had been established and developed under the Israeli Administration, and another one was not needed. Israel would continue its constructive policy and would not be deterred by the propaganda disseminated against it at the United Nations.

49. The Israeli delegation had voted against draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.11 and L.14 for the reasons set forth in the debate.

50. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria) said that Austria had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.10, because it appreciated the slightly different wording of paragraph 2 as compared to the previous year's text. However, as it interpreted it, his delegation believed the request in that paragraph to imply that the means available to the Agency and the need to provide services to the Palestine refugees located elsewhere would be taken into account. Austria had also voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.14, whose text could, however, be improved, particularly regarding paragraph 3, where the insertion of the phrase "detained for political reasons" would have been welcomed by Austria.

51. Ms. GIBSON (Canada) said that Canada had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.14, because the text contained passages whose scope was too general, such as paragraph 3, calling for the release of detainees regardless of the reasons for their detention. Canada was deeply concerned about the need to guarantee appropriate protection to the refugees and it particularly supported new paragraph 5, directly concerning the refugees' plight. Canada had taken note of the Commissioner-General's appeal of 6 October that construction materials should be allowed into the camps in southern Beirut before the onset of winter, so that shelters might be constructed for the population. It called upon all parties concerned to assist the Commissioner-General in his humanitarian efforts to relieve that crisis.

52. Mr. POULSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that, although the Community supported the work of UNRWA, it had not voted in favour of all the draft resolutions. Regarding draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.14, on which the Twelve had abstained in the vote, the European Community was deeply concerned about the safety and security and the legal and human rights of the Palestine refugees. The Twelve had abstained, because the resolution did not reflect in a balanced way the situation of the Palestine refugees in Lebanon, whose suffering resulted from a complex reality and could not be attributed to a single factor. With regard to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, the Twelve deemed that the Secretary-General should not be entrusted with the responsibility of guaranteeing the safety of the refugees. Moreover, responsibility of Israel as the occupying Power vis-à-vis to the civilian population must not be called in question. Concerning the financial situation of the Agency, the Twelve reaffirmed that, despite an improvement during the previous fiscal year, the financing of the construction programme remained insufficient, and the prospects for 1988 were uncertain. They thus wondered whether it was advisable to set the Commissioner-General unrealistic tasks, even though, on a humanitarian and political basis, the Twelve supported the expansion of the various services which UNRWA provided to the Palestine refugees.

53. Mr. SADATIAN (Islamic Republic of Iran) said the fact that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.9/Rev.1 and L.12 and in favour of all the other draft resolutions concerning the Palestinian Islamic territories occupied since 1967 did not mean that Iran recognized the Zionist occupation of territories prior to that date. Iran believed that all of Palestine must be liberated, not only the territories occupied since 1967.

54. Ms. BAILEY (United States of America) said that the United States had reaffirmed its support of the Agency's work by introducing draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.6 and in joining in the consensus on draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.7 and L.8. It had supported draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.9/Rev.1, because it continued to believe that the offering of grants and scholarships for the higher education of the Palestine refugees was a practical approach to meeting some of their needs. However, it did not support the part of that resolution dealing with the establishment of a university in Jerusalem. Her delegation had also rejected draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.16 on that same university, because it deemed that approach to be unreasonable and impractical for meeting the educational needs of the Palestine refugees. The United States had voted against draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.10 and L.12 and draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.13, because the latter prejudged certain issues regarding the repatriation and compensation of the refugees, which should be settled through direct negotiations between the parties concerned.

55. The United States had strongly supported efforts to make the most efficient use of the Agency's scarce resources. It respected the judgements of the Commissioner-General concerning the ration distribution system and the relative value of that programme as compared to other priority programmes. Her delegation had thus not been in a position to support the adoption of draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.11. It had also voted against draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.14 which contained an unacceptable and one-sided condemnation of Israel that would complicate and intensify the real problems faced by the Agency. It also noted that, as the United Nations Legal Counsel had pointed out in 1982 during the consideration of a similar resolution, a draft resolution in which the Secretary-General was called upon to guarantee the safety, security and rights of the refugees in the occupied territories raised practical and legal problems owing to possible jurisdictional conflicts. Draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.15 contained a provision calling upon Israel to refrain from the removal and resettlement of Palestine refugees, whose effect was to exclude the implementation of any programme seeking to improve the refugees' quality of life pending an overall political settlement, such as the programmes for the construction of new housing undertaken voluntarily by the refugees themselves and co-ordinated by UNRWA. The United States could not support such a sweeping injunction.

56. Her delegation's votes on those draft resolutions showed that the Government of the United States wished to see UNRWA continue its humanitarian work pending a definitive solution to the problems in that region. However, the United States deemed that it was pointless to adopt resolutions which did not have a chance of contributing to the achievement of the agency's stated objectives. Such resolutions only exacerbated an already difficult situation, and could even prevent the adoption of certain measures which would directly benefit the Palestine refugees. Her delegation hoped that UNRWA would be able to continue its humanitarian work without being distracted by political issues which were extraneous to its mission and that it would receive broad support from the international community.

56. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the Palestine Liberation Organization, as the representative of all the Palestinians, refugees and non-refugees, appreciated the support shown by the international community for the return of the Palestine refugees to their homes. The Zionist representative had tried to convince the Committee that General Assembly resolution 194 (III) and, in particular, paragraph 11 of that resolution, had become obsolete. However, he had failed, clearly showing that the only solution was the return of the Palestinians to their homes and the recovery of their property.

57. Mr. WELTER (Luxembourg) said that his delegation had not been able to participate in the vote on the draft resolutions. Had it been present, it would have voted in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.6, L.7, L.8, L.9/Rev.1, L.15 and L.16, and against draft resolution A/SPC/42/L.11 and would have abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/42/L.12, L.13 and L.14. He also referred to the explanations of vote given by the representative of Denmark on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus completed its consideration of the agenda item.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.